

Kitsap County Buildable Lands Report

Prepared for:

Kitsap Board of County Commissioners

District 1 Steve Bauer

District 3 Josh Brown

District 2 Jan Angel

Bainbridge Island Mayor, Darlene Kordonowy

Bremerton Mayor, Cary Bozeman

Port Orchard Mayor, Kim Abel

Poulsbo Mayor, Kathryn Quade

Prepared by:

Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

10223 62nd Avenue South

Seattle, WA 98178

Phone 206.723.8793

And

The Kitsap County Department of Community Development



August 2007

Acknowledgements

This report was completed with technical guidance and valuable input from the Kitsap County Department of Community Development and the cities of Bainbridge Island, Bremerton, Port Orchard and Poulsbo.

Kitsap County

Katrina N. Knutson

Cindy Read

Linda Bentley

Bainbridge Island

Steve Morse

Bremerton

Geoffrey Wentlandt

Port Orchard

Jennifer Haro

Poulsbo

Edie Berghoff

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Introduction.....	5
Countywide Population & Housing Growth.....	8
Data Collection & Land Capacity Analysis Methodology.....	17
Population & Housing Analysis by Jurisdiction.....	23
0	
<i>City of Bainbridge Island.....</i>	<i>24</i>
<i>City of Bremerton.....</i>	<i>28</i>
<i>City of Port Orchard.....</i>	<i>32</i>
<i>City of Poulsbo.....</i>	<i>35</i>
<i>Unincorporated Kitsap County.....</i>	<i>38</i>
Commercial & Industrial Land Analysis.....	49
Reasonable Measures.....	55
Appendix (Separate Cover).....	60

Appendices (Under Separate Cover)

Appendix A—Land Capacity Analysis Methodology by Jurisdiction

- Unincorporated Kitsap County
- City of Bainbridge Island
- City of Bremerton
- City of Port Orchard
- City of Poulsbo

Appendix B—Land Capacity Analysis by Jurisdiction

- City of Bremerton
- City of Port Orchard
- City of Poulsbo
- Unincorporated Kitsap County ULCA
 - Bremerton East UGA
 - Bremerton West UGA
 - Central Kitsap UGA
 - Gorst UGA
 - Kingston UGA
 - Port Orchard UGA
 - Poulsbo JPA
 - SKIA UGA
 - Silverdale UGA
 - ULID #6 UGA

***Appendix C-- Kitsap County Reasonable Measures Evaluation
(Appendix C from 10-Year CP Update FEIS)***

***Appendix D-- Kitsap County Countywide Employment Capacity Analysis
(Appendix D from 10-Year CP Update FEIS)***

Appendix E-- KRCC Menu of Reasonable Measures

***Appendix F-- Kitsap County Buildable Lands Program, Procedures for Collecting and
Monitoring Data***

Executive Summary

What was the Amount of Growth from 2000-2005?

- According to the Washington Office of Financial Management (OFM), the total Kitsap County resident population grew by 8,431¹ persons. The majority of this growth occurred in unincorporated Kitsap County.
- Countywide population growth grew slower than anticipated. The Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) predicted an average annual growth rate of 1.44% over the course of the 20-year planning period. Countywide, actual average annual population growth during the past five years was 0.72%. Though most jurisdictions grew faster than the countywide average.
- Kitsap County and the cities cumulatively permitted 9,945 new housing units from 2000-2005². The majority of these new units were permitted in unincorporated Kitsap County.
- Countywide, new single family units accounted for 80% and multi-family units 20% of all new units permitted.
- Approximately 803 existing single family residential units were demolished countywide. More than one-half of those units were in unincorporated rural areas.
- Countywide, 57% of all new permitted housing units were in cities and UGAs and 43% were in unincorporated rural areas. The 2000-2005 urban share of new permitted housing units increased significantly from the previous five year period—from 43% (1995-1999) to 57% (2000-2005). The 57% total countywide share of new urban *housing unit* growth, however, still appears short of the adopted 76% CPP urban *population* growth target. Nevertheless, the data show that there has been significant progress toward this twenty-year goal since the 2002 BLR.
- Approximately 84% of all new permitted housing units in rural areas were located on pre-existing lots.

¹ Total Kitsap County population in 2000 (based on US Census) was 231,969 and 2005 OFM estimated population was 240,400. All jurisdictions experienced population gains, according to OFM estimates, except for Bremerton which lost 2,679 in population from 2000-2005, according to OFM.

² This compares with 8,271 new residential units permitted countywide from 1995-1999 according to the initial 2002 Kitsap County Buildable Lands Analysis report.

- Almost 90% of the approximately 2,800 new lots created countywide through the final long plat process were in cities and UGAs³.
- Kitsap County and the cities cumulatively permitted almost 18 million square feet of new commercial/industrial building space. The majority of this new space was permitted in unincorporated UGAs.

Has Development Occurred at Densities Consistent with Planning Assumptions and Targets?

- In cities and UGAs achieved net platted densities from 2000-2005 met or exceeded the planned densities indicated in the various jurisdiction's comprehensive plan's and implementing regulations in almost all applicable urban zones. In some very limited exceptions, net platted densities fell short of the target plan density. However, these circumstances were characterized by a very small number of plats that did not represent a large enough sample size to effectively assess average achieved densities across the entire applicable zone.
- In unincorporated rural areas, average achieved net platted and permitted densities were generally higher than planned rural densities in the applicable zones. This is attributed to both to pre-GMA vested subdivisions that did not receive final plat approval until 2000-2005 and the fact that the majority of new permitted rural units were on pre-existing small non-conforming lots approved under old pre-GMA density standards.
- Appendix B of the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) allocated 2000-2025 forecast growth among the cities, UGAs and unincorporated rural areas based on a 76% urban/24% rural share *target* for new *population* growth. Official published OFM population estimates for the county unfortunately do not estimate population by GMA class of lands (i.e., urban and rural). So we cannot plainly compare OFM estimated population growth within the UGAs to their forecast CPP target share of new population growth⁴. However, new *housing unit* growth is a significant component of population growth and often serves as a proxy to population growth. Given that approximately 55% of all new *housing units* permitted countywide from 2000-2005 were in cities and UGAs, the data suggest that the urban share of new population growth during the first five years of the planning forecast period is still short of meeting its planned CPP target. Appendix B of the CPPs specifically indicates that should this goal not be met, "*the target may be reaffirmed or explicitly modified*" through the KRCC process during the next five year population distribution review. The next five year KRCC population review will occur prior to 2010.

³ Long plats are a type of land subdivision, subject to RCW 58.17, where a parcel is subdivided into more than four lots for purposes of subsequent development.

⁴ OFM calculates total incorporated and unincorporated county populations only in their published annual county and city population estimates. OFM calculates annual incorporated city population estimates, but not the unincorporated urban (i.e.,UGA) portion of the unincorporated population.

Are Urban Densities Being Achieved within the Urban Growth Areas?

- In all jurisdictions, the average net platted densities of all final approved urban residential plats and condominiums met or exceeded four units per acre.

Is the Capacity of the Land Supply Adequate to Accommodate Forecast Growth?

- Countywide, the existing 2005 residential buildable land supply of all jurisdictions can accommodate a total of approximately 117,387 persons. The planned 2000-2025 countywide population growth forecast is 99,602 persons.
- Cities and UGAs have a combined residential buildable land capacity sufficient to accommodate approximately 79,884 persons. The planned 2000-2025 incorporated city and UGA share of the forecast population growth is 75,697 persons.
- Unincorporated rural lands, including Limited Areas of More Intensive Rural Development (LAMIRDs), have a combined residential buildable land capacity sufficient to accommodate approximately 37,503 persons. The planned 2000-2025 non-UGA share of the population growth forecast is 23,905 persons.
- Cities and UGAs have a combined commercial/industrial buildable land supply that exceeds the forecast demand from 2005-2025.

Recommendations

- Kitsap County should request the Washington Office of Financial Management (OFM) to conduct a special small area population estimate for the unincorporated UGAs using OFM’s Small Area Estimates Program (SAEP) methodology. OFM can prepare such estimates if requested by local governments and supported with county-provided GIS spatial data to delineate the unincorporated UGA boundaries. OFM’s SAEP program analyzes the geography of the delineated UGA lands and matches them to census geography boundaries to ascertain more accurate population and housing estimates. Such a project would more accurately identify existing and future population estimates for the unincorporated urban share of the total county population (UGAs) and be a more reliable method of determining the net UGA share of new population growth in future years. It will help evaluate—through a more statistically valid method—how well the county and cities are doing at achieving their CPP urban/rural share population growth targets. It can also provide better information for KRCC to utilize during its next five year population distribution review cycle prior to 2010.
- Kitsap County should continue to monitor its adopted reasonable measures to encourage more urban growth as required by RCW 36.70A.215(4). Monitoring reasonable measures and key growth management indicators related to land use, population, housing, capital facilities and economic development activities will help evaluate the relative effectiveness of the county’s efforts to encourage a greater share of future urban growth countywide.
- Consistent, comprehensive, and timely permit data collection and reporting is a key foundation to fulfill the buildable lands program requirements. It is also vital to evaluating the success or failure of growth management policies, strategies and plans over time. In spite of clear identification of what the data needs were for the buildable lands program, there were challenges in data collection during development of the 2007 Buildable Lands Report. These included the fact that every jurisdiction in the county, at some point in time over the past five years, changed its land development permitting system. This fact caused problems in permit recording consistency and record-keeping for some jurisdictions more than others when “looking back” at permit data over the past five years. But it was more problematic for the smaller cities who are also faced with smaller planning staffs and budgets. The county and the cities should work together to better coordinate buildable lands data collection and reporting on a consistent annual basis. The jurisdictions should consider a standardized approach to permit data entry protocols and reporting formats.

Introduction

Overview

RCW 36.70A.215 requires counties, in consultation with their cities, to establish a “review and evaluation” program (commonly referred to as the “buildable lands report” or “BLR”) to determine whether a county and its cities are achieving urban densities within urban growth areas. If “inconsistencies” are found between “actual” and “planned” densities in urban growth areas, the statute requires local jurisdictions to implement “reasonable measures” likely to correct those inconsistencies in the future.

The Buildable Lands Report is a diagnostic tool to help jurisdictions evaluate how effective their comprehensive plans and development regulations are at achieving efficient urban development patterns. The program examines development trends in five-year increments and “looks back” to review development trends during the past five years in order to determine whether any “inconsistencies” exist between *actual* and *planned* densities.

According to RCW 36.70A.215(2)(a), the review process for a BLR must:

“Encompass land uses and activities both within and outside of urban growth areas and provide for annual collection of data on urban and rural land uses, development, critical areas, and capital facilities to the extent necessary to determine the quantity and type of land suitable for development, both for residential and employment-based activities.”

The county and its cities jointly adopted county-wide planning policies to establish and implement the review and evaluation program. Those policies include provisions for using consistent methodologies for evaluating buildable lands among the responsible jurisdictions.

The first BLR was prepared by the county in 2002. The statute requires updates every five years. The next BLR Update must be completed by September 1, 2007.

The statute requires several evaluation components to the review and evaluation program. The BLR must:

- Determine whether there is sufficient suitable land in urban areas to accommodate the projected twenty-year population forecast allocated to the county and its cities;
- Determine the actual density of housing that has been constructed and the actual amount of land developed for commercial and industrial uses within urban growth areas;
- Review residential, commercial and industrial land use needs by type and density range to determine the amount of land needed in urban areas for these uses for the remaining portion of the twenty-year planning period; and

- Based upon these evaluation components, determine whether an "inconsistency" exists between the *actual* densities and intensities of land use documented by the BLR during the previous five years and the *planned* densities and intensities of use in the adopted comprehensive plans and development regulations of local jurisdictions.

If the BLR identifies any "inconsistencies" from its analysis, the statute requires the affected jurisdiction(s) to separately "*adopt and implement measures that are reasonably likely to increase consistency during the subsequent five-year period.*" The statute also requires annual monitoring of these so-called "reasonable measures" so that affected jurisdictions can determine their effectiveness over time.

Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) Requirements

The Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC) is comprised of elected officials from Kitsap County and the Cities of Bremerton, Bainbridge Island, Poulsbo and Port Orchard and the Suquamish and Port Gamble S'Klallam Tribes. The KRCC is the body that works collaboratively to coordinate multi-jurisdictional GMA planning in Kitsap County. The KRCC is the venue for collaborative development of County-wide Planning Policies (CPPs) that guide GMA planning efforts among the different jurisdictions. Kitsap County then adopts the CPPs and they are ratified by the cities.

Two components of the CPPs in particular directly affect the BLR. First are the policies directing the "Land Capacity Analysis Program" and second are the "20-Year Population Distributions" that allocate future population growth among all the jurisdictions.

Land Capacity Analysis Program

This CPP outlines how the county's various jurisdictions mutually plan to implement the buildable lands program requirements in the county. *CPP Element B. Urban Growth Areas, Policy 1. Land Capacity Analysis Program* indicates that the county and cities shall maintain a land capacity analysis program to monitor land supply and trends for residential, commercial and industrial lands in order to determine the success of their comprehensive planning efforts. It also requires that the county and cities:

- use a consistent methodology for determining land capacity;
- develop strategies to efficiently utilize available development capacity within the urban growth areas; and
- establish procedures to resolve inconsistencies in the collection and analysis of land capacity data.

20-Year Population Distribution

Appendix B of the CPPs indicates the future 20-year population growth distribution amongst the jurisdictions in the county. These are the forecast growth allocations (derived from OFM countywide forecasts) that each jurisdiction uses in developing its own GMA comprehensive plan. The KRCC Board endorsed Appendix B: Population Distribution 2005-2025 on September 14, 2004. Kitsap County adopted the CPPs, including the appendices, on November 22, 2004.

Population distributions are reviewed every five years by the KRCC. That review must include an analysis of the Cities' and the County's progress in achieving the "target" population distributions. The future growth allocations are based on a "target" of accommodating 76% of new population growth within urban growth areas (UGAs) and 24% of new growth in rural areas. Appendix B notes that if the 76% UGA growth target is met or exceeded, the UGA target for accommodating new growth in the succeeding forecast growth period shall increase to 83% of total forecast countywide growth. It also notes that if the 76% UGA growth target is not met, "*the target may be reaffirmed or otherwise modified*" prior to the succeeding forecast growth period. The next "five year" KRCC review of future population growth distribution should occur prior to 2010.

Buildable Lands Report Public Process

Kitsap County established a Citizen Advisory Group (or CAG) in 2004 comprised of interested citizens, developers, builders, realtors, local residents and growth management advocates to help develop the Updated Land Capacity Analysis (ULCA). The purpose of the ULCA is to establish an objective approach by which to determine the current supply of buildable land and how much population and development Kitsap County can expect to accommodate under current zoning and development regulations in the existing rural lands and urban growth areas (UGAs). The CAG also included staff from the county and local municipalities who provided technical advice and expertise in the development of the ULCA. The CAG met intensely over a period of 7 months to develop and evaluate alternative approaches. The final CAG recommendations—with a focus on incorporating a heightened sense of "reality" to the land capacity analysis—were made to staff in early 2005.

The staff then prepared a draft recommended ULCA framework that incorporated many of the CAG recommendations. The draft ULCA framework was presented to the Kitsap County Planning Commission in early 2005. The Planning Commission reviewed the ULCA alternative approaches and recommended selection of a preferred ULCA framework that was presented to the Kitsap Board of County Commissioners (Board) and the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC). After significant review and evaluation by the Board and the KRCC and subsequent public input, the Board of County Commissioners (Board) recommended a preferred ULCA methodology on April 25, 2005. The ULCA is used as the basis for the land capacity analysis portion of the 2007 Buildable Lands Report⁵.

Kitsap County established a BLR Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) in 2006 to help in the preparation of the 2007 BLR Update. The Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) is comprised of city, county and tribal staff as well as other parties interested in and/or responsible for preparation of the 2007 BLR Update. The TAC met from 2006-2007 to coordinate and ensure consistency in the BLR data gathering, formatting, evaluation and reporting amongst all the responsible jurisdictions in the county. The cities also prepared their land capacity analyses and permit data reports during 2006-2007 in coordination with the TAC.

⁵ See Appendix A. Based upon a decision of the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board, the ULCA is slightly modified from that recommended by the Board in 2005 in that the "sewer reduction factor" was removed.

Countywide Population & Housing Growth

Countywide Planning Policies 2000-2025 Population Growth Forecast

Appendix B of the adopted Kitsap Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) adopts future population growth allocations for all jurisdictions in the county, including unincorporated UGAs, rural areas and the incorporated cities⁶. The CPPs only allocate forecast population growth. There are no forecast housing units or employment adopted in the CPPs. The total countywide population growth forecast is based on the GMA Intermediate Growth Projection provided by the Washington state Office of Financial Management (OFM). The distribution of total countywide forecast growth among the cities, unincorporated UGAs and rural areas is guided by forecast average annual growth rates for each jurisdiction and UGA over the course of the planning period. Existing 2000 population estimates for the jurisdictions are shown in the following table from Appendix B of the CPPs.

Jurisdiction	2000 Population
Cities	
Bainbridge Island	20,308
Bremerton	37,258
Bremerton Port	68
Port Orchard	7,693
Poulsbo	6,813
Unincorporated UGAs	
Kingston	1,871
Poulsbo	901
Silverdale	15,276
Central Kitsap	21,743
E. Bremerton	5,412
W. Bremerton	3,229
Gorst	154
Port Orchard ⁷	11,570
ULID #6/South Kitsap	1,241
SKIA	0
Rural Areas (non-UGA)	98,432
TOTAL	231,969

Source: Kitsap County CPPs, Appendix B: Population Distribution 2005-2025.

⁶ The future population growth allocations are labeled for the twenty year planning period 2005-2025 but also account for forecast growth for a twenty-five year period from 2000-2025.

⁷ The Port Orchard UGA allocation includes the allocation for the Port Orchard UGA Expansion Study Area.

The adopted 2000-2025 future population growth allocations to cities, unincorporated UGAs, and rural areas based on the 76% urban/24% rural targets are shown in the following table. Overall, the county and its cities are forecast to accommodate more than 99,000 new residents in the next twenty-five years. This amounts to a countywide average annual population growth rate of 1.44% over the planning period. The county and the cities are responsible for allocating sufficient land at sufficient densities to accommodate the forecast growth through their respective comprehensive plans.

**Kitsap County
Forecast Population Growth Allocations
2000-2025**

Jurisdiction	Net Population Growth Allocation (2000-2025)	Average Annual Growth Rate (2000-2025)
Cities		
Bainbridge Island	8,352	1.39%
Bremerton	14,759	1.34%
Bremerton Port	-68	-100%
Port Orchard	3,600	1.55%
Poulsbo	3,739	1.77%
Unincorporated UGAs		
Kingston	3,135	4.02%
Poulsbo	3,355	6.41%
Silverdale	8,059	1.71%
Central Kitsap	8,733	1.36%
E. Bremerton	2,210	1.38%
W. Bremerton	2,017	1.96%
Gorst	73	1.56%
Port Orchard ⁸	9,709	1.03%
ULID #6/South Kitsap	8,024	8.37%
SKIA	0	0
Rural Areas (non-UGA)	23,905	0.87%
TOTAL	99,602	1.44%

Source: Kitsap County CPPs, Appendix B: Population Distribution 2005-2025.

⁸ The Port Orchard UGA allocation includes the allocation for the Port Orchard UGA Expansion Study Area.

Countywide Population Growth 2000-2005

The Washington state Office of Financial Management (OFM) prepares annual population estimates for counties and cities (as of April 1 every year) for the allocation of state revenues and state program administration. The estimates are based on a variety of factors that may differ between counties and cities and towns. All cities and counties report new housing units permitted in their jurisdictions to OFM annually. This data is the foundation for OFM's *Housing Unit Method* of estimating population. The housing unit data is the primary source used by OFM to prepare unincorporated county, city and town population estimates. However, there are some weaknesses to relying solely on the housing unit-derived population estimates. Key among them is that accuracy is highly dependent on average household size and housing occupancy rates which are difficult to update since the last census. So OFM estimates total county population by averaging the *Housing Unit Method* with two other methods⁹. Total county population estimates are also determined by OFM by measuring population change since the last census based on births, less deaths, plus migration estimated from school-age migration. This approach is called the *Component Method*. OFM also utilizes a *Ratio Correlation Method* which distributes state level population estimates to counties based on changes to the county's share of state population and other supporting data such as school enrollment, voter and automobile registration, driver's licenses and natural increase. OFM considers the total county *combined method* population estimates more accurate than any single estimate method based on a single indicator of change—such as housing. Finally, OFM adjusts the estimated unincorporated and incorporated populations within each county by comparing the *combined method* total county population distribution estimates with the housing unit method to ensure an accurate estimate of population distribution between incorporated and unincorporated parts of each county.

All of this is to introduce OFM's population estimates for Kitsap County and its cities from 2000-2005 which are shown in the following table. The OFM analysis indicates that the overall county population increased by 8,431 persons from 2000-2005. The majority of that growth occurred in unincorporated Kitsap County followed by the City of Bainbridge Island. Bremerton, notably, lost population according to OFM. While Poulsbo and Port Orchard each gained in the range of 500-600 new residents.

OFM does not disaggregate unincorporated population estimates between urban and rural areas unless a special unincorporated area analysis is requested. So we cannot discern the share of unincorporated population growth between urban and rural areas solely by the OFM population estimates.

⁹ See "Overview of City, Town, and County Annual Population Estimation Process", Washington state Office of Financial Management, agency website, 2007.

Kitsap County
OFM Population Estimates by Jurisdiction
2000-2005

Jurisdiction	2000 Population (1)	Percent of Total County 2000 Pop.	2005 Population (2)	Percent of Total County 2005 Pop.	2000-2005 Population Growth	Percent of Total 2000-2005 Growth
Total Kitsap County	231,969		240,400		8,431	
Unincorporated	159,896	0.69	167,920	0.70	8,024	0.95
Incorporated	72,073	0.31	72,480	0.30	407	0.05
Bainbridge Island	20,308	0.09	22,200	0.09	1,892	0.22
Bremerton	37,259	0.16	34,580	0.14	-2,679	-0.32
Port Orchard	7,693	0.03	8,250	0.03	557	0.07
Poulsbo	6,813	0.03	7,450	0.03	637	0.08

Notes:

(1) 2000 populations from US Census

(2) 2005 population estimates from Washington Office of Financial Management (OFM).

Source: Washington Office of Financial Management

Population growth is influenced by many factors, including regional, national and even global socio-economic events that local governments cannot control. Forecasting growth over a 20 year period or longer therefore is often a challenging exercise. Population growth rarely occurs in a steady state—meaning that growth rates are likely to vary, often significantly, over longer periods of time. But comparing growth during the past five years with the overall 25-year forecast period can provide some early indications of how actual growth is occurring in the county compared to previous forecasts.

Countywide population growth from 2000-2005 occurred at an average annual growth rate of 0.72 %. This rate is one-half the forecast 25 year average annual growth rate of 1.44 %. Estimated population loss in Bremerton over the past five years contributed to overall slower-than-predicted countywide growth for the past five years. In total, the OFM estimates indicate that overall county population growth from 2000-2005 accounted for approximately 8.5% of the total 25 year countywide forecast growth. If growth had occurred at the steady-state average annual forecast rate for the past five years, population growth would have been expected to account for approximately 20% of the total 25-year forecast total.

Nevertheless some individual jurisdictions experienced faster growth than forecast from 2000-2005. Individual jurisdiction growth rates are shown in the following table. The City of Poulsbo experienced the highest growth rate in the county, followed closely by the City of Bainbridge Island and Port Orchard. The unincorporated county, though accommodating the greatest share of total growth, grew at an average annual rate of less than one percent. The City of Bremerton experienced a significant loss of population. Analysis of individual jurisdiction's population growth rates and characteristics is discussed in the Population & Housing Analysis chapter.

**Population Growth Rates
Cities & Unincorporated Kitsap County
2000-2005**

Jurisdiction	2000-2005 Average Annual Population Growth Rate
Total Kitsap County	0.72%
Unincorporated Kitsap County	0.99%
City of Bainbridge Island	1.81%
City of Bremerton	-1.48%
City of Port Orchard	1.43%
City of Poulsbo	1.83%

Sources: Washington OFM; Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

Countywide Growth of the Housing Supply 2000-2005

Kitsap County and the cities cumulatively permitted 9,945 new housing units from 2000-2005. The detailed breakdown of permitted units by jurisdiction is shown on the following table. Unincorporated Kitsap County permitted the largest share (6,873 units or 69% of the total) followed by Bainbridge Island (15%), Bremerton (7%), Poulsbo (6%) and Port Orchard (3%). Countywide, new single family units accounted for 80% and multi-family units 20% of all new units permitted.

Countywide, approximately 57% of all new units were permitted in cities and UGAs while 43% were permitted in unincorporated rural areas.

**Total Permitted Housing Units
Unincorporated Kitsap County and Cities
2000-2005**

Jurisdiction	Permitted Housing Units (200-2005)
Urban	
Unincorporated UGAs	
SFR	1,678
MFR	875
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>2,553</i>
City of Bainbridge Island	
SFR	989
MFR	524
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>1,513</i>
City of Bremerton	
SFR	250
MFR	398
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>648</i>
City of Port Orchard	
SFR	260
MFR	72
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>332</i>
City of Poulsbo	
SFR	458
MFR	121
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>579</i>
<i>Subtotal Urban</i>	<i>5,625</i>
Unincorporated Rural	
SFR	4,320
<i>Subtotal Rural</i>	<i>4,320</i>
<i>Total Housing Units Permitted</i>	<i>9,945</i>

Percentage of Total Permitted Units Created by GMA Land Class	
Urban	57%
Rural	43%

Note: SFR=Single Family Residential; MFR=Multi-Family Residential
Sources: Kitsap County DCD; City of Bainbridge Island; City of Bremerton; City of Port Orchard; City of Poulsbo; Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

The relatively high rate of new rural housing units indicates a strong demand for housing in a rural setting. The majority of this growth appears to be occurring on pre-existing rural lots not on new platted rural parcels. The following table illustrates the share of permitted rural residential units allocated to pre-existing lots compared to new rural lots created from 2000-2005 subdivision activity. The data indicate that if *all* the new rural lots created from 2000-2005 in the county were built upon during the same time period, they could only have accommodated a maximum 16% of the new rural housing units permitted during the past five years. Conversely, this means that at least 84% of all the permitted rural housing units in the last five years were on pre-existing lots. The large pre-existing lot share of new growth is attributed to the supply of smaller legal non-conforming lots found in the unincorporated rural areas—mostly in the Rural Residential zone. These small so-called “legacy lots”—typically smaller than current zoning allows—were approved under old pre-GMA density standards. These non-conforming lots will continue to influence the urban/rural share of new housing unit growth until they have been developed, consolidated, or had their development rights purchased, transferred or otherwise extinguished.

**Unincorporated Kitsap County
Rural Residential Lot Development
2000-2005**

Type of Activity	2000-2005	
	Lots	Units
Rural Subdivisions		
Long Plat	298	
Short Plat	212	
Large Lot	175	
Total New Rural Lots Created	685	
Total Rural Residential Units Permitted		4,320
2000-2005 Rural Housing Unit Growth Share		
Share of Units Permitted on Pre-existing Lots		0.84
Share of Units Permitted on New Lots		0.16

Source: Kitsap County DCD; Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

More than 800 pre-existing housing units were demolished from 2000-2005 countywide. The distribution of residential demolition permits is shown in the following table. If all of these units were replaced by new units during the same time period, the replacement units could have accounted for as much as 8% of the total new permitted housing units countywide. More than one-half of all residential demolition permits were issued in unincorporated rural zones. If all those rural residential demolitions were replaced by new units, those replacement units could have accounted for as much as 9.5% of the total new housing units issued in unincorporated rural areas of the county.

**Residential Demolition Permits
Cities & Unincorporated Kitsap County
2000-2005**

Jurisdiction	Residential Demolition Permits Issued (2000-2005)
Unincorporated Kitsap County	
UGAs	141
Rural	411
City of Bainbridge Island	64
City of Bremerton	148
City of Port Orchard	37
City of Poulsbo	2
Total Kitsap County	803

Sources: Kitsap County DCD; City of Bremerton; City of Bainbridge Island; City of Port Orchard; City of Poulsbo

Another way to view housing development activity (and the effectiveness of post-GMA implementing plans and regulations) in the county is by examining the rate and type of new lot creation. Subdivision activity is an excellent and early indicator of future development patterns and housing unit densities. Long plats are land subdivisions that create five or more new lots. They are the predominant form of land division in both urban and rural areas and account for the creation of more new buildable lots than either short plats or large lot rural subdivisions. Analysis in the following table evaluates the number of new lots created through the long plat process. It identifies the total number of new lots created in each jurisdiction from final approved long plats recorded by the Kitsap County Assessor from 2000-2005. Countywide, 2,790 new residential lots from final long plats were added to the buildable land supply in the past five years. Almost 90% of these new lots were located in cities and UGAs. This shows that the cities and UGAs are on course to increase their share of future housing unit growth.

**New Residential Lots
Created by Long Plats
Unincorporated Kitsap County & Cities (2000-2005)**

Jurisdiction	2000-2005 Long Plat Lots
Urban	
Unincorporated UGAs	
SF Lots	507
MF Lots	785
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>1,292</i>
City of Bainbridge Island	
SF Lots	218
MF Lots	270
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>488</i>
City of Bremerton	
SF Lots	55
MF Lots	70
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>125</i>
City of Port Orchard	
SF Lots	157
MF Lots	8
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>165</i>
City of Poulsbo	
SF Lots	361
MF Lots	61
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>422</i>
<i>Subtotal Urban</i>	<i>2,492</i>
Unincorporated Rural	
Unincorporated Rural	298
<i>Subtotal Rural</i>	<i>298</i>
Total New Lots Created by Long Plat	2,790

Percentage of Total Long Plat Lots Created by GMA Land Class	
Urban	89.3%
Rural	10.7%

Note: SFR=Single Family Residential; MFR=Multi-Family Residential
Sources: Kitsap County DCD; City of Bainbridge Island; City of Bremerton; City of Port Orchard; City of Poulsbo; Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

Data Collection & Land Capacity Analysis Methodology

Overview

There are three major data collection and analysis requirements of the buildable lands review and evaluation program.

1. Conduct a buildable lands inventory to determine existing urban land capacity for future development within the county and cities;
2. Collect permit and plat data on the amount of growth that actually occurred and urban densities achieved from 2000-2005; and
3. Compare forecast growth with available capacity for growth in the urban areas.

The broad methodology, process and significant issues associated with each of these program requirements will be discussed in this section of the report.

Land Capacity Analysis

The land capacity analysis framework methodology for the initial 2002 BLR was updated in 2005. Each jurisdiction was responsible for preparation of their respective 2005 buildable lands inventories. The complete and detailed discussion of the methodology, process, assumptions and factors involved in that analysis are shown in Appendix A. The ULCA methodology was endorsed by the KRCC and used to determine the 2005 buildable lands inventory for all of unincorporated Kitsap County as well the cities of Port Orchard and Poulsbo. The cities of Bremerton and Bainbridge Island utilized the ULCA methodology as their framework for buildable lands analysis. However, in some cases, both cities utilized slightly different definitions and/or assumptions within that overall framework that best applied to the factors affecting land supply for their own respective jurisdictions¹⁰.

The 2005 Updated Land Capacity Analysis (ULCA) involves ten basic steps to determine net population and housing unit capacity for residential lands and net buildable acres for commercial/industrial zoned lands. A brief overview of those steps is shown in the following section¹¹.

¹⁰ See Appendix A: Land Capacity Analysis Methodology for detailed descriptions of the Kitsap County 2005 Updated Land Capacity Analysis (ULCA) methodology as well as the variations to that methodology documented by the cities of Bainbridge Island and Bremerton.

¹¹ The land capacity analysis yields a buildable land supply which can then be compared to population and employment demand to indicate a relative supply and demand comparison for the forecast 20-year planning period. The ULCA begins with determining a gross supply of existing vacant and underutilized lands zoned for future development that can accommodate additional growth. The methodology then applies a series of “reduction factors” to that gross supply of developable land to account for undeveloped or underutilized

2005 Updated Land Capacity Analysis Steps:

1. Define Vacant and Underutilized Parcels by Residential Zone
2. Identify Underutilized Lands Likely to Redevelop over the next 20 Years (-)
3. Identify Critical Areas (-)
4. Infrastructure Constraints—Sewer & Water (-)
5. Future Roads/R-O-W Needs (-)
6. Future Public Facilities Needs (-)
7. Account for Unavailable Lands (-)
8. Yields Net Available Acres by Zone
9. Apply Minimum Density in each Zone Yields Housing Unit Capacity
10. Apply Average Household Size (SF/MF) to Housing Unit Capacity Yields Net Population Capacity

Note: (-) Reduction Factors

Step 1—Define Vacant and Underutilized Parcels by Residential Zone

The first step determines the gross supply of vacant and underutilized parcels by residential, commercial and industrial zone. This data is retrieved from queries of the Kitsap County Assessor’s parcel database.

Step 2—Identify Underutilized Lands Likely to Redevelop over the next 20 Years (-)

Underutilized parcels are those with some existing development that have remaining capacity for growth based on three variables—zoning density, parcel size and assessed value. Underutilized parcels are identified based on the relationship between those three variables¹². This step determines which of the total amount of underutilized lands identified in Step 1 are actually likely to redevelop or accommodate additional future development.

Step 3—Identify Critical Areas (-)

Critical areas are defined by the GMA generally as wetlands, floodplains, geologically hazardous areas, fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas, and critical aquifer recharge areas. These are environmentally sensitive areas that must be protected under the GMA. The ULCA determines actual critical areas boundaries, including buffers and required setbacks through site-specific GIS analysis¹³. Once identified, these areas are deducted from the remaining vacant and underutilized land supply. The GIS applications to determine critical area coverage at the parcel level are based on the currently adopted Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO), as applicable.

Step 4—Infrastructure Constraints—Sewer & Water (-)

RCW 36.70A.215 requires that consideration of capital facilities impacts on land supply be taken into consideration in determining the buildable lands inventory. This step specifically examined the availability and feasibility of public water and sanitary systems to serve new development in the unincorporated UGAs. This analysis originally applied a tiered “reduction factor” to the

lands that, for a variety of reasons, are not likely to accommodate additional residential, commercial or industrial growth.

¹² See Appendix A: Kitsap County 2005 Updated Land Capacity Analysis (ULCA)

¹³ Ibid.

remaining land supply in certain unincorporated UGAs based on zoning density, availability of public sewer lines, distance from the parcel to the closest sewer line, and sewer infrastructure costs. The reduction factor was meant to address the concern that due to location, topography and cost of providing sewer infrastructure, some areas of the UGAs were not likely to develop as planned under the current developer-financed sewer infrastructure improvement requirements of the county code. That portion of the ULCA methodology was appealed to the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board. The CPSGMHB subsequently ruled that the sewer reduction factor was invalid and that all UGAs are presumed, by definition, to have adequate sanitary sewer service provision. The ULCA for this buildable lands analysis was appropriately modified to eliminate the sewer reduction factor for all jurisdictions¹⁴.

Step 5—Future Roads/R-O-W Needs (-)

This step accounts for the fact that future roads and rights-of-way will be needed to accommodate new development in UGAs and that land needed for new roads, trails, and other rights-of-way will not be available to accommodate residential or commercial/industrial development. A standard reduction factor was applied to the remaining buildable land supply at this point to account for future road and rights-of-way needs.

Step 6—Future Public Facilities Needs (-)

This step accounts for the fact that future public facilities will be needed to serve new development in UGAs and that land needed for new parks, schools, stormwater and wastewater treatment facilities, fire and public safety services, libraries and other public-purpose lands will not otherwise be available to accommodate residential or commercial/industrial development. A standard reduction factor was applied to the remaining buildable land supply at this point to account for future public facility needs.

Step 7—Account for Unavailable Lands (-)

This step accounts for vacant and underutilized lands, otherwise considered buildable, but that are likely to be unavailable for further development (i.e., held off the market) based on landowner intent (e.g., property owners who don't wish to sell, properties with legal encumbrances, property owners who choose not to maximize their zoned development potential, etc.). A standard reduction factor was applied to the remaining buildable land supply at this point to account for unavailable lands.

Step 8—Yields Net Available Net Acres by Zone

This step calculates the net buildable acres remaining in each applicable zone after all the “reduction factors” have been applied and accounted for in the ULCA.

Step 9—Apply Minimum Density in each Zone Yields Housing Unit Capacity

This step applies the minimum housing unit density in each zone to determine total housing unit capacity for the applicable jurisdiction.

¹⁴ For further discussion and analysis of capital facilities needs, planned improvements in the unincorporated UGAs, and policy amendments to address the issues of sewer availability in UGAs refer to the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update (2006).

Step 10—Apply Average Household Size (SF/MF) to Housing Unit Capacity Yields Net Population Capacity

Finally average household size populations (taken from the 2000 US Census) are applied to the appropriate jurisdiction to determine total population capacities. This result offers a direct comparison of the total population capacity or supply for each jurisdiction and UGA with its associated 20-year forecast population growth or demand.

Detailed reports on each jurisdiction's 2005 land capacity analysis is exhibited in Appendix B: Land Capacity Analysis by Jurisdiction.

Permitted Development from 2000-2005

This phase of the buildable lands program collects data on new residential, commercial and industrial development permitted from 2000-2005 in each jurisdiction. The building permit data collection methodology was prepared and coordinated with the TAC¹⁵. Each jurisdiction was responsible for collecting and reporting their respective permit data. However, in some instances, jurisdictions did not submit complete information. These instances are noted in the applicable sections of the report.

The permitted development data provides information in several important areas.

- It helps to determine “achieved urban densities”. In essence, to determine whether the actual urban densities achieved on the ground in the UGAs from 2000-2005 are consistent with “planned urban densities” in the jurisdiction’s respective comprehensive plans. There are basically two ways to measure “achieved densities:” By examining “platted densities” and/or “permitted densities”. Each technique illuminates different aspects of the residential growth characteristics for each jurisdiction.
- It helps to assess the integrity of the assumptions used in sizing UGAs; and
- It helps to establish development trends and can be used to evaluate buildable land assumptions incorporated in subsequent land capacity analyses.

However, a note of caution regarding development trends is appropriate. There are potential problems with using the 5-year analysis results as indicators of future activity. First of all, jurisdictions may not have experienced a sufficient level of development to establish statistically valid trends. Secondly, some of the new development reported may be vested under pre-GMA regulations and built to different standards than post-GMA approved development. Finally, jurisdictions may amend planned or allowed densities in their comprehensive plan updates (as Kitsap County has done) that may affect future achieved development densities. All of these situations may affect the veracity of any interpretations made regarding future development trends based on the past five-year permitted development data.

¹⁵ See Appendix D: Buildable Lands Permit Data Collection Methodology Memorandum, from Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant to Kitsap County Buildable Lands Technical Advisory Committee.

Platted Densities

Platted densities reflect the density of new lots created in final subdivisions (long plats) approved from 2000-2005. For this analysis final long plats (subdivisions resulting in the creation of five or more new lots) recorded by the Kitsap County Assessor from 2000-2005 were collected and analyzed for each jurisdiction. Data indicating total gross acres, total common areas not devoted to building lots, net building lot area acres and total number of lots created yielded a *net* “platted density” for each final plat. Those *net* densities were then averaged by zone and reported. In cases where jurisdictions did not report the applicable zoning for each plat, summary net platted densities are reported. Platted densities are the best indicator of “achieved densities” since a *net* density figure can be accurately ascertained that accounts for critical areas, roads, and other lands not devoted to buildable lots as part of the development process.

Permitted Densities

Permitted densities measure the total amount of new residential units permitted in a given time period divided by the total *gross* acres of their associated parcels. This measure examines building activity on existing lots and parcels rather than on new lot creation. This data provides a good indicator of the total amount of land consumed for new residential development in a given period since it measures *gross* acres rather than *net* acres of new units developed. However, the *gross* acre density results from this approach are a less accurate indicator for evaluating achieved *net* densities. This is due to the fact that new units built on larger (non-conforming) parcels are also included in the total permitted density analysis. This has a tendency to artificially deflate overall average gross permitted densities reported for the cities and UGAs.

Commercial and industrial permitted development for 2000-2005 is reported by net square feet of gross floor area (gfa). That is the net square footage of actual commercial/industrial buildings permitted from 2000-2005 by jurisdiction.

Comparing Existing Development Capacity to Forecast Growth Demand

The land capacity analyses tell us how much future growth can be accommodated in the cities and UGAs. The last key component of the buildable lands program is to compare that development capacity with the forecast development over the next 20 years. The purpose of this analysis is to ensure that adequate land has been designated for urban development and at sufficient urban densities to accommodate the forecast growth.

The *supply* and *demand* components of this analysis are reported in the same formats. The 2005 net buildable acres of residential zoned land reported in the ULCA are converted to population (based on average household size) so as to make a direct comparison with the 2005-2025 population growth forecast allocated to every UGA and city through the CPPs. The ULCA reports the supply of commercial/industrial land by net acre. The Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update reports countywide 20-year commercial/industrial demand by employees¹⁶. The BLR utilizes the same methodology used in the 10-Year Update to convert employees to commercial/industrial acres needed for the cities and unincorporated UGAs and to allocate them accordingly. Again, however, a note of caution. The assumptions of forecast employee growth by jurisdiction are derived from countywide forecasts and may not necessarily reflect jurisdiction-specific policy preferences for allocation of commercial/industrial lands.

¹⁶ See Appendix D: Employment Capacity, from the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update (2006), E.D. Hovee & Co.

Population & Housing Analysis by Jurisdiction

City of Bainbridge Island

What was the Amount of Growth from 2000-2005?

OFM Population Estimates Highlights

- The City of Bainbridge Island had a 2000 population of 20,308 residents.
- The City of Bainbridge Island had a 2005 population of 22,200 residents.
- Resident population grew by 1,892 persons from 2000-2005.
- Countywide Planning Policies forecast average annual population growth rate = 1.39%
- Actual 2000-2005 average annual population growth rate = 1.81%

Permitted Residential Development

Summary residential building permit activity for 2000-2005 is shown in the following table. The City permitted 1,513 total new housing units over the past five years. Almost two-thirds of those were single family units.

City of Bainbridge Island Residential Building Permits 2000-2005

Bainbridge Island	Year						2000-2005 Totals
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
<i>SFRs</i>	235	166	136	152	146	154	989
<i>MFRs</i>	40	24	74	69	94	223	524
<i>Subtotal</i>	275	190	210	221	240	377	1,513

SFRs=Single Family Units, Duplexes, Mobile Homes & ADUs

MFRs= Multi-Family Units & Mixed Use Units

Sources: City of Bainbridge Island

What was the Actual Density of Growth from 2000-2005?

This analysis seeks to determine whether development has occurred at densities consistent with planning assumptions and targets.

Achieved densities are measured in two basic ways. The first measure is platted densities. That is the lot density of new subdivisions approved during the past five years. Platted densities include subdivisions that were committed to a specific lot size, whether or not development actually occurred on each separate parcel. Plat data allows for the determination of net densities. The second measure is permitted densities. This technique measures the density of all new units approved on existing lots or parcels. Permitted densities include new units permitted on larger parcels that may not reflect the full buildout value of each parcel based on its respective zoning—

which tends to lower the overall density estimate. They may also include new units permitted on pre-GMA lots of record—which tends to inflate the overall density estimate. Permitted density data also only identifies gross densities. Therefore, platted densities are a generally more accurate means to ascertain achieved densities for the purposes of the buildable lands program. Taken together, however, permitted and platted density data are a good indicator of gross land consumption for residential purposes. Achieved net platted densities can be compared to “plan densities” or the target densities identified in the jurisdiction’s comprehensive plan and implementing development regulations to assess how well those target plan densities are being met based on the creation of new lots.

Platted Densities

Platted density analysis for Bainbridge Island is shown in the following table. The data indicate 11 single-family final plats were recorded during the past five years creating a total of 218 new lots and another 26 condominium and multi-family projects that created 270 multi-family lots. The average achieved net densities in each zone appear to meet or exceed the target plan densities.

**City of Bainbridge Island
Platted Urban Densities
2000-2005**

Zone	Final Plats	Lots	Gross Acres	Net Acres	Gross Density	Net Density	Plan Density
Single-Family							
R-0.4	3	46	134.9	40.4	0.3	1.1	0.4
R-1	2	16	14.1	5.8	1.1	2.7	1.0
R-2	3	104	34.6	17.6	3.0	5.9	2.0
R-2.9	1	18	18.6	3.3	1.0	5.4	2.9
R-3.5	1	24	5.4	3.2	4.5	7.5	3.5
R-4.3	1	10	2.3	2.3	4.4	4.4	4.3
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>11</i>	<i>218</i>	<i>209.9</i>	<i>72.7</i>			
Multi-Family	26	270	53.9	na	5.0	na	
Totals	37	488	263.7				

Densities reported in lots per acre

na=data not available

Sources: Kitsap County Assessors Office; City of Bainbridge Island; Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

Permitted Densities

Permitted density analysis is shown in the following table. The data indicate more than 1,100 acres were utilized for residential development in the city over the past five years.

**City of Bainbridge Island
Permitted Urban Densities
2000-2005**

Zone	Gross Acres	Units*	Units/Gross Acre Density
Single Family*			
R-0.4	692.8	232	0.33
R-1	177.3	164	0.93
R-2	191.9	332	1.73
R-2.9	16.2	64	3.95
R-3.5	15.1	59	3.92
R-4.3	10.4	31	2.99
R-6	0.3	3	10.00
NSC	0.4	5	12.82
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>1,104.3</i>	<i>890*</i>	
Multi-Family			
R-8	26.7	175	6.56
R-14	0.4	4	9.30
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>27.1</i>	<i>179</i>	
Totals			
	<i>1,131.4</i>	<i>1,069</i>	<i>0.94</i>

Note: * Does not include all permitted SFRs; Excludes new mobile homes and other SFR's not linked to GIS zoning database

Sources: City of Bainbridge Island; Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

Is the Land Supply Adequate to Accommodate Forecast Growth?

This analysis seeks to determine whether sufficient development capacity exists to accommodate forecast growth. The analysis compares existing buildable land capacity (converted to population growth capacity) with forecast population growth for the planning period. It determines an estimated net growth capacity surplus or deficiency and expresses that result as a ratio. The population capacity/demand ratio can be viewed as a general indicator of how well the UGA is “sized” to accommodate its forecast population growth. Ideally, the supply/demand ratios should be close to 1.0. However, ratios may vary between 0.75 and 1.25 or even larger and still provide for an adequately sized UGA under the GMA. It should be noted that these ratios do not take into account “market factors” applied to the “demand” side of the population growth equation.

Buildable Land Capacity

The results of the buildable lands inventory comparison with forecast growth for Bainbridge Island are shown in the following table. The analysis indicates a net remaining capacity sufficient to accommodate forecast growth over the planning period.

**City of Bainbridge Island
2005-2025 Population Capacity & Demand**

City	Population Capacity & Demand
Bainbridge Island	
2005 UGA Population Capacity	8,879
2000-2025 Allocated Population Growth	8,352
Net 20-Year Capacity (+ or -)	527
UGA Pop. Capacity/Demand Ratio	1.06

Sources: Kitsap County CPPs; City of Bainbridge Island; Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

City of Bremerton

What was the Amount of Growth from 2000-2005?

OFM Population Estimates Highlights

- The City of Bremerton had a 2000 population of 37,259 residents.
- The City of Bremerton had a 2005 population of 34,580 residents.
- Resident population decreased by 2,679 persons from 2000-2005.
- Countywide Planning Policies forecast average annual population growth rate = 1.34%
- Actual 2000-2005 average annual population growth rate = -1.48%

Permitted Residential Development

Summary residential building permit activity for the city from 2000-2005 is shown in the following table. Despite its estimated population loss, the city permitted a total of 648 new housing units over the past five years. Almost two-thirds of all the new units permitted were multi-family and condominium units.

City of Bremerton Residential Building Permits 2000-2005

Bremerton	Year						2000-2005 Totals
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
<i>SFRs</i>	28	30	31	43	62	56	250
<i>MFRs</i>	143	33	14	16	34	158	398
<i>Totals</i>	<i>171</i>	<i>63</i>	<i>45</i>	<i>59</i>	<i>96</i>	<i>214</i>	<i>648</i>

SFRs=Single Family Units, Duplexes, Mobile Homes & ADUs

MFRs= Multi-Family Units & Mixed Use Units

Sources: City of Bremerton; Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

What was the Actual Density of Growth from 2000-2005?

This analysis seeks to determine whether development has occurred at densities consistent with planning assumptions and targets.

Achieved densities are measured in two basic ways. The first measure is platted densities. That is the lot density of new subdivisions approved during the past five years. Platted densities include subdivisions that were committed to a specific lot size, whether or not development actually occurred on each separate parcel. Plat data allows for the determination of net densities. The

second measure is permitted densities. This technique measures the density of all new units approved on existing lots or parcels. Permitted densities include new units permitted on larger parcels that may not reflect the full buildout value of each parcel based on its respective zoning—which tends to lower the overall density estimate. They may also include new units permitted on pre-GMA lots of record—which tends to inflate the overall density estimate. Permitted density data also only identifies gross densities. Therefore, platted densities are a generally more accurate means to ascertain achieved densities for the purposes of the buildable lands program. Taken together, however, permitted and platted density data are a good indicator of gross land consumption for residential purposes. Achieved net platted densities can be compared to “plan densities” or the target densities identified in the jurisdiction’s comprehensive plan and implementing development regulations to assess how well those target plan densities are being met based on the creation of new lots.

Platted Densities

Platted density analysis for Bremerton is shown in the following table. The data indicate five single-family final plats were recorded during the past five years creating a total of 55 new lots and another 7 condominium projects that created 70 multi-family lots. The average achieved net densities in the applicable zones appear to meet or exceed the target plan densities.

**City of Bremerton
Platted Urban Densities
2000-2005**

Zone	Final Plats	Lots	Gross Acres	Net Acres	Gross Density	Net Density	Plan Density
Single-Family							
Low Density Residential (LDR)	5	55	6.49	5.9	8.5	9.4	5.0
Condominiums	7	70	10.17	na	6.9	na	
<hr/>							
Totals	12	125	16.66				
<hr/>							

Densities reported in lots per acre

na=data not available

Sources: Kitsap County Assessors Office; City of Bremerton; Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

Permitted Densities

Permitted density analysis for Bremerton is shown in the following table. The data indicate an efficient rate of residential land development—approximately 70 acres were utilized to accommodate 648 new residential units over the past five years.

**City of Bremerton
Permitted Urban Densities
2000-2005**

Zone	Gross Acres	Units	Units/Gross Acre Density
Low Density Residential (LDR)			
Single Family	55.85	238	4.26
Multi-Family	11.94	240	20.10
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>67.79</i>	<i>478</i>	
Downtown Regional Center (DRC)			
Single Family	0.37	10	27.03
Multi-Family	2.38	154	64.71
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>2.75</i>	<i>164</i>	
Wheaton Way Redevelopment Corridor (WWRC)			
Single Family	0.15	2	13.33
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>0.15</i>	<i>2</i>	
Neighborhood Center (NC)			
Multi-Family	0.28	4	14.29
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>0.28</i>	<i>4</i>	
<i>Totals</i>		<i>70.97</i>	<i>648</i>
			<i>9.13</i>

Note: Excludes new mobile homes permitted in mobile home parks but includes new mobile homes permitted on individual lots

Sources: City of Bremerton; Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

Is the Land Supply Adequate to Accommodate Forecast Growth?

This analysis seeks to determine whether sufficient development capacity exists to accommodate forecast growth. The analysis compares existing buildable land capacity (converted to population growth capacity) with forecast population growth for the planning period. It determines an estimated net growth capacity surplus or deficiency and expresses that result as a ratio. The population capacity/demand ratio can be viewed as a general indicator of how well the UGA is “sized” to accommodate its forecast population growth. Ideally, the supply/demand ratios should be close to 1.0. However, ratios may vary between 0.75 and 1.25 or even larger and still provide for an adequately sized UGA under the GMA. It should be noted that these ratios do not take into account “market factors” applied to the “demand” side of the population growth equation.

Buildable Land Capacity

The results of the buildable lands inventory comparison with forecast growth for Bremerton are shown in the following table. The analysis indicates a net remaining capacity sufficient to accommodate forecast growth over the planning period.

**City of Bremerton
2005-2025 Population Capacity & Demand**

City	Population Capacity & Demand
Bremerton	
2005 UGA Population Capacity	26,670
2000-2025 Allocated Population Growth	14,759
Net 20-Year Capacity (+ or -)	11,911
UGA Pop. Capacity/Demand Ratio	1.81

Sources: Kitsap County CPPs; City of Bremerton; Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

City of Port Orchard

What was the Amount of Growth from 2000-2005?

OFM Population Estimates Highlights

- The City of Port Orchard had a 2000 population of 7,693 residents.
- The City of Port Orchard had a 2005 population of 8,250 residents.
- Resident population increased by 557 persons from 2000-2005.
- Countywide Planning Policies forecast average annual population growth rate = 1.55%
- Actual 2000-2005 average annual population growth rate =1.43 %

Permitted Residential Development

Summary residential building permit activity for Port Orchard from 2000-2005 is shown in the following table. The city permitted a total of 332 new housing units over the past five years. More than three-quarters of all the new units permitted were single-family units.

City of Port Orchard Residential Building Permits 2000-2005

Port Orchard	Year						2000-2005 Totals
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
<i>SFRs</i>	43	31	48	65	49	24	260
<i>MFRs</i>	4	48	2	0	4	14	72
<i>Subtotal</i>	47	79	50	65	53	38	332

SFRs=Single Family Units, Duplexes,Mobile Homes & ADUs

MFRs= Multi-Family Units & Mixed Use Units

Source: City of Port Orchard

What was the Actual Density of Growth from 2000-2005?

This analysis seeks to determine whether development has occurred at densities consistent with planning assumptions and targets.

Achieved densities are measured in two basic ways. The first measure is platted densities. That is the lot density of new subdivisions approved during the past five years. Platted densities include subdivisions that were committed to a specific lot size, whether or not development actually occurred on each separate parcel. Plat data allows for the determination of net densities. The second measure is permitted densities. This technique measures the density of all new units approved on existing lots or parcels. Permitted densities include new units permitted on larger parcels that may not reflect the full buildout value of each parcel based on its respective zoning—

which tends to lower the overall density estimate. They may also include new units permitted on pre-GMA lots of record—which tends to inflate the overall density estimate. Permitted density data also only identifies gross densities. Therefore, platted densities are a generally more accurate means to ascertain achieved densities for the purposes of the buildable lands program. Taken together, however, permitted and platted density data are a good indicator of gross land consumption for residential purposes. Achieved net platted densities can be compared to “plan densities” or the target densities identified in the jurisdiction’s comprehensive plan and implementing development regulations to assess how well those target plan densities are being met based on the creation of new lots.

Platted Densities

Platted density analysis for Port Orchard is shown in the following table. The data indicate eight final plats were recorded during the past five years creating a total of 157 new single family lots and another 2 condominium projects that created 8 multi-family lots. The average achieved net densities in the applicable zones appear to meet or exceed the target planned urban densities, with minor exceptions. In these instances, the significance of the achieved net density measure is constrained by the limited number of final plats within some zones.

**City of Port Orchard
Platted Urban Densities
2000-2005**

Zone	Final Plats	Lots	Gross Acres	Net Acres	Gross Density	Net Density	Plan Density
Single-Family							
R 4.5	5	79	18.1	12.9	4.4	6.1	4.5
R 8	1	30	7.7	4.7	3.9	6.5	8.0
R 20	1	40	3.3	3.3	12.3	12.3	12-20
CO	1	8	17.4	8.0	0.5	1.0	
<i>Subtotal</i>	8	157	46.5	28.9			
Condominiums							
	2	8	0.7	na	11.9	na	
Totals	10	165	47.2				

Densities reported in lots per acre
na=data not available
Sources: Kitsap County Assessors Office; City of Port Orchard;
Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

Permitted Densities

Permitted housing units by density were not reported by the City of Port Orchard.

Is the Land Supply Adequate to Accommodate Forecast Growth?

This analysis seeks to determine whether sufficient development capacity exists to accommodate forecast growth. The analysis compares existing buildable land capacity (converted to population growth capacity) with forecast population growth for the planning period. It determines an estimated net growth capacity surplus or deficiency and expresses that result as a ratio. The population capacity/demand ratio can be viewed as a general indicator of how well the UGA is “sized” to accommodate its forecast population growth. Ideally, the supply/demand ratios should be close to 1.0. However, ratios may vary between 0.75 and 1.25 or even larger and still provide for an adequately sized UGA under the GMA. It should be noted that these ratios do not take into account “market factors” applied to the “demand” side of the population growth equation.

Buildable Land Capacity

The results of the buildable lands inventory comparison with forecast growth for Port Orchard are shown in the following table. The analysis indicates a net remaining capacity sufficient to accommodate forecast growth over the planning period.

**City of Port Orchard
2005-2025 Population Capacity & Demand**

City	Population Capacity & Demand
Port Orchard	
2005 UGA Population Capacity	3,498
2000-2025 Allocated Population Growth	3,600
Net 20-Year Capacity (+ or -)	-102
UGA Pop. Capacity/Demand Ratio	0.97

Sources: Kitsap County CPPs; Kitsap County DCD; Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

What was the Amount of Growth from 2000-2005?

OFM Population Estimates Highlights

- The City of Poulsbo had a 2000 population of 6,813 residents.
- The City of Poulsbo had a 2005 population of 7,450 residents.
- Resident population increased by 637 persons from 2000-2005.
- Countywide Planning Policies forecast average annual population growth rate = 1.77%
- Actual 2000-2005 average annual population growth rate = 1.83%

Permitted Residential Development

Summary residential building permit activity for Poulsbo from 2000-2005 is shown in the following table. The city permitted a total of 579 new housing units over the past five years. More than three-quarters of all the new units permitted were single-family units.

**City of Poulsbo
Residential Building Permits
2000-2005**

Poulsbo	Year						2000-2005 Totals
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
<i>SFRs</i>	82	73	67	72	85	79	458
<i>MFRs</i>	0	105	16	0	0	0	121
Total	82	178	83	72	85	79	579

SFRs=Single Family Units, Duplexes, Mobile Homes & ADUs
MFRs= Multi-Family Units & Mixed Use Units
Source: City of Poulsbo

What was the Actual Density of Growth from 2000-2005?

This analysis seeks to determine whether development has occurred at densities consistent with planning assumptions and targets.

Achieved densities are measured in two basic ways. The first measure is platted densities. That is the lot density of new subdivisions approved during the past five years. Platted densities include subdivisions that were committed to a specific lot size, whether or not development actually occurred on each separate parcel. Plat data allows for the determination of net densities. The

second measure is permitted densities. This technique measures the density of all new units approved on existing lots or parcels. Permitted densities include new units permitted on larger parcels that may not reflect the full buildout value of each parcel based on its respective zoning—which tends to lower the overall density estimate. They may also include new units permitted on pre-GMA lots of record—which tends to inflate the overall density estimate. Permitted density data also only identifies gross densities. Therefore, platted densities are a generally more accurate means to ascertain achieved densities for the purposes of the buildable lands program. Taken together, however, permitted and platted density data are a good indicator of gross land consumption for residential purposes. Achieved net platted densities can be compared to “plan densities” or the target densities identified in the jurisdiction’s comprehensive plan and implementing development regulations to assess how well those target plan densities are being met based on the creation of new lots.

Platted Densities

Platted density analysis for Poulsbo is shown in the following table. The data indicate eighteen final plats were recorded during the past five years creating a total of 361 new single family lots and another 4 condominium projects that created 61 multi-family lots. The average achieved net densities in the applicable zones appear to meet the target range of planned urban densities.

**City of Poulsbo
Platted Urban Densities
2000-2005**

Zone	Final Plats	Lots	Gross Acres	Net Acres	Gross Density	Net Density	Plan Density
Single Family*	18	361	74.6	54.6	4.8	6.6	4-7
Condominiums*	4	61	10.3	na	5.9	na	
Totals	22	422	84.9				

Densities reported in lots per acre. Plan density range applies to Low Density Residential (RL) zone

* Data not reported by zone.

na= data not available

Sources: Kitsap County Assessors Office; City of Poulsbo; Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

Permitted Densities

Permitted housing units by density were not reported by the City of Poulsbo.

Is the Land Supply Adequate to Accommodate Forecast Growth?

This analysis seeks to determine whether sufficient development capacity exists to accommodate forecast growth. The analysis compares existing buildable land capacity (converted to population growth capacity) with forecast population growth for the planning period. It determines an estimated net growth capacity surplus or deficiency and expresses that result as a ratio. The population capacity/demand ratio can be viewed as a general indicator of how well the UGA is “sized” to accommodate its forecast population growth. Ideally, the supply/demand ratios should be close to 1.0. However, ratios may vary between 0.75 and 1.25 or even larger and still provide for an adequately sized UGA under the GMA. It should be noted that these ratios do not take into account “market factors” applied to the “demand” side of the population growth equation.

Buildable Land Capacity

The results of the buildable lands inventory comparison with forecast growth for Poulsbo are shown in the following table. The analysis indicates a net remaining capacity sufficient to accommodate forecast growth over the planning period.

**City of Poulsbo
Population Capacity & Demand
2000-2025**

City	Population Capacity & Demand
Poulsbo	
2005 UGA Population Capacity	4,225
2000-2025 Allocated Population Growth	3,739
Net 20-Year Capacity (+ or -)	486
UGA Pop. Capacity/Demand Ratio	1.13

Sources: Kitsap County CPPs; Kitsap County DCD; Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

Unincorporated Kitsap County

What was the Amount of Growth from 2000-2005?

OFM Total Unincorporated County Population Estimates Highlights

- Unincorporated Kitsap County had a 2000 population of 159,896 residents.
- Unincorporated Kitsap County had a 2005 population of 167,920 residents.
- Resident population increased by 8,024 persons from 2000-2005.
- Actual 2000-2005 average annual population growth rate = 0.99%

Permitted Residential Development

Summary residential building permit activity for 2000-2005 is shown in the following table. The data indicate that from 2000-2005 the county permitted 6,873 new single-family and multi-family units—of which 63% were in rural areas and 37% in unincorporated UGAs. Housing units permitted in rural areas were exclusively single family. Single family units accounted for two-thirds of all new housing units permitted in the UGAs.

The rate of rural residential unit growth, while not specifically targeted in the CPPs, appears to be occurring at a faster rate than anticipated at least in relation to growth in the supply of urban housing supply from 2000-2005. Interestingly, there appears to be somewhat of a discrepancy between the OFM estimated resident population growth for the county from 2000-2005 and the number of total housing units permitted during that time. OFM estimates that the unincorporated county grew by approximately 8,000 new residents while the county alone permitted almost 7,000 new units. Based on the number of units permitted one would expect a higher unincorporated population figure. This suggests either an increasing delay between when housing units are permitted, built and occupied by new full-time residents and/or that the rural housing supply may be being utilized differently than the urban housing supply. For example, rural units may not be occupied by full-time residents at the same rate as urban units. More of the rural units may be held for seasonal or part-time use, vacancy rates may differ, some units may be permitted but not built, etc. This also suggests that the urban/rural *housing unit* growth share from 2000-2005 may not necessarily be an accurate sole proxy for estimating *population* growth share between the UGAs and rural areas of the county¹⁷.

The County should consider requesting that OFM conduct a special population estimate of the unincorporated UGAs by means of their SAEP (Small Area Estimates Program) methodology to help better understand and delineate future urban/rural population growth as distinguished from urban/rural housing unit growth.

¹⁷ OFM noted in its population estimate methodology that the Housing Unit Method alone often tended to overestimate resident population.

**Unincorporated Kitsap County
Residential Building Permits
2000-2005**

Uninc. Kitsap County	Year						2000-2005 Totals
	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	
Urban							
<i>SFRs</i>	276	300	286	336	246	234	1,678
<i>MFRs</i>	0	9	15	34	3	814	875
Subtotal	276	309	301	370	249	1,048	2,553
Rural							
<i>SFRs</i>	712	694	687	733	765	729	4,320
Subtotal	712	694	687	733	765	729	4,320
Totals	988	1,003	988	1,103	1,014	1,777	6,873
Urban	276	309	301	370	249	1,048	2,553
Rural	712	694	687	733	765	729	4,320
% Urban	0.28	0.31	0.30	0.34	0.25	0.59	0.37
% Rural	0.72	0.69	0.70	0.66	0.75	0.41	0.63

SFRs=Single Family Units, Duplexes, Mobile Homes & ADUs

MFRs= Multi-Family Units & Mixed Use Units

Sources: Kitsap County DCD; Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

What was the Actual Density of Growth from 2000-2005?

This analysis seeks to determine whether development has occurred at densities consistent with planning assumptions and targets.

Achieved densities are measured in two basic ways. The first measure is platted densities. That is the lot density of new subdivisions approved during the past five years. Platted densities include subdivisions that were committed to a specific lot size, whether or not development actually occurred on each separate parcel. Plat data allows for the determination of net densities. The second measure is permitted densities. This technique measures the density of all new units approved on existing lots or parcels. Permitted densities include new units permitted on larger parcels that may not reflect the full buildout value of each parcel based on its respective zoning—which tends to lower the overall density estimate. They may also include new units permitted on pre-GMA lots of record—which tends to inflate the overall density estimate. Permitted density data also only identifies gross densities. Therefore, platted densities are a generally more accurate means to ascertain achieved densities for the purposes of the buildable lands program. Taken together, however, permitted and platted density data are a good indicator of gross land consumption for residential purposes. Achieved net platted densities can be compared to “plan densities” or the target densities identified in the jurisdiction’s comprehensive plan and implementing development regulations to assess how well those target plan densities are being met based on the creation of new lots.

Urban Growth Areas (UGAs)

Platted Urban Densities

Platted urban density analysis for unincorporated Kitsap County is shown in the following table. The data indicate seventeen final plats were recorded during the past five years creating a total of 507 new urban single family lots and another 14 condominium and multi-family projects that created 875 multi-family lots. The average achieved net densities in the applicable urban zones appear to meet the target range of planned urban densities.

**Unincorporated Kitsap County UGAs
Platted Urban Densities
2000-2005**

Zone	Final Plats	Lots	Gross Acres	Net Acres	Gross Density	Net Density	Minimum Plan Density
Single-Family							
Urban Restricted	1	66	9.4	2.5	7.0	26.4	1.0
Urban Low	15	401	119.3	71.6	3.4	5.6	5.0
Urban High	1	40	4.3	2.8	9.4	14.2	11-19
<hr/>							
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>17</i>	<i>507</i>	<i>133.0</i>	<i>76.9</i>	<i>3.8</i>	<i>6.6</i>	
<hr/>							
Condominiums							
Urban Restricted	6	24	41.2	na	0.6	na	1.0
Urban Medium	5	66	10.4	na	6.4	na	6-10
Urban High	1	240	4.7	na	51.3	na	11-19
Urban Village Center	1	3	0.2	na	13.6	na	max 18
Neighborhood Commercial	1	542	4.1	na	133.8	na	
<hr/>							
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>14</i>	<i>875</i>	<i>60.5</i>		<i>14.5</i>		
<hr/>							
<i>Totals</i>	<i>31</i>	<i>1,382</i>	<i>193.44</i>				
<hr/>							

Densities reported in lots per acre. na=data not available

Sources: Kitsap County DCD; Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

Permitted Urban Densities

Permitted density analysis for the unincorporated UGAs is shown in the following table. The data indicate that more than 740 gross acres were utilized to accommodate 1,518 new residential units in the UGAs over the past five years. Platted density analysis indicates that achieved net urban densities are, on average, about twice as high as the reported gross densities. Applying that same relationship to the permitted unit density data in the following table suggests that, overall, the achieved permitted unit densities are likely meeting the minimum urban densities targeted in the County's comprehensive plan and implementing regulations. Some UGA zone achieved densities also reflect development on larger parcels which have lowered the reported gross densities resulting in a distorted average reported gross density.

**Unincorporated Kitsap County
Urban Permitted Densities
2000-2005**

UGA/Zone	Acres	Units	Units/Gross Acre Density
Bremerton East			
Urban Low	30.53	49	1.60
Urban Medium	3.4	4	1.18
<i>Totals</i>	<i>33.93</i>	<i>53</i>	<i>1.56</i>
Bremerton West			
Urban Low	12.93	29	2.24
<i>Totals</i>	<i>12.93</i>	<i>29</i>	<i>2.24</i>
Central Kitsap			
Urban Restricted	81.81	128	1.56
Urban Low	169.98	507	2.98
Urban Medium	4.92	64	13.01
<i>Totals</i>	<i>256.71</i>	<i>699</i>	<i>2.72</i>
Kingston			
Urban Restricted	4.81	7	1.46
Urban Low	26.4	84	3.18
Urban Medium	223.42	84	0.38
Urban Village Center	0.45	2	4.44
<i>Totals</i>	<i>255.08</i>	<i>177</i>	<i>0.69</i>
Port Orchard			
Urban Low	64.22	228	3.55
<i>Totals</i>	<i>64.22</i>	<i>228</i>	<i>3.55</i>
Poulsbo UTA			
Urban Low	27.17	13	0.48
<i>Totals</i>	<i>27.17</i>	<i>13</i>	<i>0.48</i>
Silverdale			
Urban Restricted	3.85	4	1.04
Urban Low	38.97	98	2.51
Urban Medium	2.19	25	11.42
Urban High	3.52	50	14.20
<i>Totals</i>	<i>48.53</i>	<i>177</i>	<i>3.65</i>
McCormick Woods/ULID #6			
Urban Low	42.37	142	3.35
<i>Totals</i>	<i>42.37</i>	<i>142</i>	<i>3.35</i>
Grand Total			
	740.94	1,518	2.05

Note: Excludes new mobile homes

Sources: Kitsap County DCD; Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

Multi-family permitted densities for unincorporated UGAs are the same as multi-family platted densities for 2000-2005. Overall, the multi-family permitted unit average gross density for all the UGAs is more than 14 units per acre.

**Unincorporated Kitsap County
Multi-Family
Urban Permitted Densities
2000-2005**

Zone	Units Permitted*	Gross Acres	Ave. Density (Units/Acre)
Urban Restricted	24	41.2	0.6
Urban Medium	66	10.4	6.4
Urban Village Center	3	0.2	13.6
Urban High	240	4.7	51.3
Neighborhood Commercial	542	4.1	133.8
Total	875	60.5	14.5

* Includes condominiums, apartments and townhouses

Sources: Kitsap County DCD; Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

Rural Areas

Platted Rural Densities

Platted rural density analysis for unincorporated Kitsap County is shown in the following table. The data indicate twelve final plats totaling almost 675 acres were recorded during the past five years creating a total of 298 new rural single family lots. The average achieved net platted densities in the applicable rural zones are higher than the target planned rural densities. This is attributed to pre-GMA vested preliminary plats that did not receive final plat approval until 2000-2005. In these instances, the plats were subject to pre-GMA regulations in effect at the time of their application which generally allowed higher rural densities than post-GMA regulations.

**Unincorporated Kitsap County
Platted Rural Densities
2000-2005**

Zone	Final Plats	Lots	Gross Acres	Net Acres	Gross Density	Net Density	Plan Density
Interim Rural Forest	1	75	448.7	176.4	0.2	0.4	0.05
Rural Protection	4	111	107.8	50.2	1.0	2.2	0.1
Rural Residential	7	112	117.6	63.3	1.0	1.8	0.2
Totals	12	298	674.1	289.9	0.4	1.0	

Densities reported in lots per acre

Sources: Kitsap County DCD; Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

Permitted Rural Densities

Permitted density analysis for the unincorporated rural areas is shown in the following table. The data indicate that more than 10,000 gross acres were utilized to accommodate 4,030 new residential units in the rural areas over the past five years. The overall average gross densities in the applicable rural zones are higher than the target planned rural densities. These higher-than-currently-allowed densities are likely due to the large number of smaller legal non-conforming lots of record (the so-called “legacy lots”) that were approved in the Rural Residential zone under the old pre-GMA density standards. These lots will continue to influence the achieved rural densities analysis until they have been developed, consolidated, or have sold, transferred or otherwise extinguished their development rights.

**Unincorporated Kitsap County
Rural Permitted Densities
2000-2005**

Rural Zone	Gross Acres	Units	Units/Gross Acre Density
Interim Rural Forest <i>(1 unit/20 acres)</i>	937.2	86	0.09
Rural Protection <i>(1 unit/10 acres)</i>	2183.8	736	0.34
Rural Residential <i>(1 unit/5 acres)</i>	6628.2	3,015	0.45
Urban Reserve <i>(1 unit/10 acres)</i>	339.5	193	0.57
Totals	10,088.7	4,030	0.40

Sources: Kitsap County DCD; Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

Permitted LAMIRD Densities

Permitted density analysis for the unincorporated Limited Areas of More Intensive Rural Development (LAMIRDs) is shown in the following table. The data indicate that approximately 54 gross acres were utilized to accommodate 142 new residential units in the Manchester LAMIRD over the past five years. In the Suquamish LAMIRD, 79 new housing units were permitted covering approximately 15 acres. No new housing units were permitted in the Port Gamble LAMIRD from 2000-2005.

The overall average gross densities achieved in the applicable LAMIRD zones do not exceed the maximum planned LAMIRD densities in either Manchester or Suquamish. Both of these LAMIRDs contain small non-conforming lots. However, according to their respective Subarea plans, development in both of these LAMIRDs is subject to maximum density restrictions and lot consolidation for non-conforming lots in common ownership¹⁸.

**Unincorporated Kitsap County
LAMIRD Permitted Densities
2000-2005**

LAMIRD & Zone	Gross Acres	Units	Units/Gross Acre Density
Manchester			
Village Low Density Residential	25.18	39	1.55
Village Residential	29.24	103	3.52
<i>Totals</i>	<i>54.42</i>	<i>142</i>	<i>2.61</i>
Suquamish			
Village Low Density Residential	4.34	11	2.53
Village Residential	11.11	68	6.12
<i>Totals</i>	<i>15.45</i>	<i>79</i>	<i>5.11</i>

Sources: Kitsap County DCD; Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

Is the Land Supply Adequate to Accommodate Forecast Growth?

This analysis seeks to determine whether sufficient development capacity exists to accommodate forecast growth. The analysis compares existing buildable land capacity (converted to population growth capacity) with forecast population growth for the planning period. It determines an estimated net growth capacity surplus or deficiency and expresses that result as a ratio. The

¹⁸ Both the Manchester Village Low Density Residential (MVLR) and the Manchester Village Residential (MVR) zones establish a 0.25 acre minimum lot size. Minimum density for new lots created in the MVLR zone is 0.50 acre unless clustered. The Suquamish Village Low Residential (SVLR) zone requires a minimum 0.10 acre lot size for pre-existing lots and a 0.50 acre minimum lot size for new lots. The Suquamish Village Residential (SVR) zone requires a minimum 0.08 acre lot size for pre-existing lots and a 0.50 acre minimum lot size for new lots. Non-conforming contiguous lots in common ownership must consolidate to meet the minimum density standards in both LAMIRDs.

population capacity/demand ratio can be viewed as a general indicator of how well the UGA is “sized” to accommodate its forecast population growth. Ideally, the supply/demand ratios should be close to 1.0. However, ratios may vary between 0.75 and 1.25 or even larger and still provide for an adequately sized UGA under the GMA. It should be noted that these ratios do not take into account “market factors” applied to the “demand” side of the population growth equation. In some UGAs, “population banking” may have been applied in the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update (2006). This technique may reserve some portion of the 20-year forecast population growth for a particular UGA to be allocated or re-allocated to another UGA or jurisdiction at a later date during the planning period.

Urban Growth Areas (UGAs)

The Updated Land Capacity Analysis (ULCA) was conducted in 2005 for unincorporated Kitsap County¹⁹. The summary results of that analysis are illustrated in the following tables. The ULCA determined net buildable acres by zone for each unincorporated UGA from which net population capacity was determined based on forecast densities for each zone and average household sizes for the respective single-family and multi-family zones.

For summary purposes the following table compares existing 2005 population capacity for each UGA with the 20-year population growth forecast to determine net planned UGA capacity status.

Given that this analysis does not incorporate a market factor for population demand, it appears that, overall, most UGAs appear to be adequately sized to accommodate their forecast 20 year growth. Most of the estimated population capacity/demand ratios are within the target 0.75-1.25 range. One exception is the Gorst UGA but it has an insignificant 20 year population growth forecast. The Central Kitsap UGA appears to have the only significant forecast population capacity deficiency. However, population banking was utilized to reserve some of the forecast population growth allocated to this UGA as part of the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update.

¹⁹ See Appendix A: Land Capacity Analysis Methodology and Appendix B: Land Capacity Analysis by Jurisdiction for the detailed land capacity analysis reports for UGAs and rural areas.

Unincorporated UGA	Population Capacity & Demand
Bremerton East	
2005 UGA Population Capacity	1,557
2005-2025 Allocated Population Growth	1,905
Net 20-Year Population Capacity (+ or -)	-348
UGA Pop. Capacity/Demand Ratio	0.82
Bremerton West	
2005 UGA Population Capacity	1,436
2005-2025 Allocated Population Growth	1,756
Net 20-Year Capacity (+ or -)	-320
UGA Pop. Capacity/Demand Ratio	0.82
Central Kitsap	
2005 UGA Population Capacity	5,882
2005-2025 Allocated Population Growth	7,526
Net 20-Year Capacity (+ or -)	-1,644
UGA Pop. Capacity/Demand Ratio	0.78
Kingston	
2005 UGA Population Capacity	2,942
2005-2025 Allocated Population Growth	2,816
Net 20-Year Capacity (+ or -)	126
UGA Pop. Capacity/Demand Ratio	1.04
Port Orchard	
2005 UGA Population Capacity	8,210
2005-2025 Allocated Population Growth	8,212
Net 20-Year Capacity (+ or -)	-2
UGA Pop. Capacity/Demand Ratio	1.00
Poulsbo	
2005 UGA Population Capacity	2,152
2005-2025 Allocated Population Growth	2,378
Net 20-Year Capacity (+ or -)	-226
UGA Pop. Capacity/Demand Ratio	0.90
Silverdale	
2005 UGA Population Capacity	6,877
2005-2025 Allocated Population Growth	6,988
Net 20-Year Capacity (+ or -)	-111
UGA Pop. Capacity/Demand Ratio	0.98
McCormick Woods/ULID #6	
2005 UGA Population Capacity	7,505
2005-2025 Allocated Population Growth	7,553
Net 20-Year Capacity (+ or -)	-48
UGA Pop. Capacity/Demand Ratio	0.99
Gorst	
2005 UGA Population Capacity	51
2005-2025 Allocated Population Growth	73
Net 20-Year Capacity (+ or -)	-22
UGA Pop. Capacity/Demand Ratio	0.70

Sources: Kitsap County DCD; Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

Rural Areas & LAMIRDs

The Updated Land Capacity Analysis (ULCA) was conducted in 2005 for unincorporated Kitsap County²⁰. The ULCA determined the number of vacant and underutilized parcels by size for each rural zone and LAMIRD—including development potential on remaining non-conforming lots—from which net dwelling unit and population capacity was determined based on allowable densities for each zone and average household sizes for single-family units.

The following table summarizes existing 2005 population capacity for each rural zone and LAMIRD. The analysis indicates that remaining rural and LAMIRD land capacity could accommodate a maximum of more than 37,500 persons. Appendix B of the CPPs indicate the total 2000-2025 countywide non-UGA population growth forecast is 23,905 persons. Sufficient capacity exists within the rural areas to accommodate the forecast non-UGA population growth countywide.

**Unincorporated Kitsap County
Maximum Population Capacity Estimates
Rural Zones & LAMIRDs**

Zone	2005 Dwelling Unit Capacity	2005 Population Capacity
Rural		
Interim Rural Forest/Rural Wooded	277	693
Mineral Resource Lands	46	115
Rural Protection	1,883	4,708
Rural Residential	8,179	20,448
Urban Reserve	768	1,920
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>11,153</i>	<i>27,883</i>
LAMIRDs		
Manchester	1,930	4,825
Suquamish	1,658	4,145
Port Gamble	260	650
<i>Subtotal</i>	<i>3,848</i>	<i>9,620</i>
<i>Total</i>	<i>15,001</i>	<i>37,503</i>

Sources: Kitsap County DCD; Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

²⁰ See Appendix A: Land Capacity Analysis Methodology and Appendix B: Land Capacity Analysis by Jurisdiction for the detailed land capacity analysis reports for UGAs and rural areas.

Commercial & Industrial Land Analysis

Employment Projections

Unlike population, there is no specific employment target for Kitsap County or its jurisdictions. However, based on observed employment trends, a countywide jobs forecast was developed as part of the Kitsap Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update (2006). The 2025 countywide employment forecast is shown in the following table. The forecast indicates a net projected growth of more than 49,000 new jobs countywide from 2005-2025.

Kitsap County Countywide Employment Forecasts 2005-2025

Employment Sector	1995	2004	AAGR	2025	Actual 2004 Share	Projected 2025 Share
Industrial Sector						
Construction Resources	3,331	4,263	2.8%	7,600	5%	6%
Manufacturing	1,303	1,589	2.2%	10,700	2%	9%
Warehousing/Transportation/ Utilities	1,523	1,877	2.3%	3,100	2%	2%
Total Industrial Employment	6,157	7,729	2.6%	21,400	10%	17%
Commercial Sector						
Retail	8,336	9,969	2.0%	15,100	13%	12%
Finance/Insurance/Real Estate	2,504	3,269	3.0%	6,100	4%	5%
Services	21,725	28,541	3.1%	53,900	37%	24%
Total Commercial Employment	60,245	70,386	1.7%	106,000	90%	83%
Totals	66,402	78,115	1.8%	127,400	100%	100%

Note: AAGR=Average Annual Growth Rate
Sources: PSRC; E.D. Hovee & Co.

Supporting analyses in the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update (2006) allocated the 2005-2025 countywide employment forecasts to individual jurisdictions based on a variety of sources, including individual city comprehensive plans, Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) forecasts, and Washington Employment Security Department data²¹. The allocation of 2005-2025 forecast net employment growth by jurisdiction is shown in the following table.

**Kitsap County
Employment Growth Forecasts by Jurisdiction
2005-2025**

Employment Sector Growth by Jurisdiction	Bremerton	Bainbridge Island	Port Orchard	Poulsbo	Uninc. Kitsap County
<i>Industrial Sector</i>					
Construction Resources	176	163	57	87	2,835
Manufacturing	-1,888	73	4	13	10,939
Warehousing/Transportation/ Utilities	631	195	107	9	238
Total Industrial Employment	-1,081	431	168	109	14,012
<i>Commercial Sector</i>					
Retail	2,475	1,469	239	594	387
Finance/Insurance/Real Estate/Services	4,577	490	1,992	2,904	18,266
Govt/Education	1,627	500	374	296	0
Total Commercial Employment	8,679	2,459	2,605	3,794	18,653
Totals	7,598	2,890	2,773	3,903	32,665²²

Source: Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update (2006), Appendix D: Employment Capacity

²¹ See Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update (2006), Appendix D: Employment Capacity

²² Because most of the industrial areas are located within unincorporated UGAs, the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update (2006), Appendix D: Employment Capacity, allocates 90% of the forecast 20-year employment growth in the unincorporated county (approx. 29,228 jobs) to unincorporated UGAs and the remaining 10% (or approx. 3,436 jobs) to non-UGA areas (i.e., rural and resource lands).

What was the Amount of Growth from 2000-2005?

Total square footage of gross floor area associated with permitted commercial/industrial buildings countywide from 2000-2005 is shown on the following table. Unincorporated Kitsap County and the cities of Bremerton and Bainbridge Island cumulatively permitted approximately eighteen million square feet of new commercial/industrial building space from 2000-2005. The majority of the approved commercial/industrial development occurred in the unincorporated Kitsap County UGAs.

**Unincorporated Kitsap County & Incorporated Cities
Commercial/Industrial Permitted Development²³
2000-2005**

Jurisdiction	Permitted Development (Square Feet of GFA)
Unincorporated County	16,745,328
Incorporated Cities	
Bremerton	901,788
Bainbridge Island	326,951
Port Orchard	Data not reported
Poulsbo	Data not reported
Totals	17,974,067

Note: GFA=Gross Floor Area

Sources: Kitsap County DCD; City of Bremerton; City of Bainbridge Island

Estimated Commercial & Industrial Land Demand

The methodology for estimating forecast employment demand countywide, distribution of that forecast employment by jurisdiction, and calculating commercial/industrial land demand necessary to accommodate those forecast jobs is contained in *Appendix D: Employment Capacity, of the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update (2006)*. Total commercial/industrial land demand countywide was forecast for 2005- 2025 based on the countywide employment forecasts for the same time period. Independent city employment forecasts were subtracted from the total countywide job forecast. The remaining residual projected employment was applied to the unincorporated county UGAs. A detailed discussion of the data, factors and assumptions regarding those employment forecasts and the methodology to convert those forecast jobs into land demand are included in Appendix D of the Buildable Lands Report.

²³ Data collection and permit data formatting issues precluded the reporting of total acres associated with these approved commercial/industrial developments.

Commercial/industrial land demand at the sub-county level (i.e., for cities and individual UGAs) was estimated for the buildable lands program based on the same methodology used in Appendix D of the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update to forecast countywide commercial/industrial land demand. That methodology includes assumptions regarding employee space needs, net/gross acre conversions, land market factors and other features of the commercial/industrial land development process. These assumptions were held constant for determining commercial/industrial land demand across all jurisdictions. Those assumptions may not reflect actual or future conditions common across all jurisdictions, however. But they do provide a consistent methodology for converting forecast jobs by employment sector to needed commercial and industrial land supply.

Is the Land Supply Adequate to Accommodate Forecast Growth?

The commercial/industrial land supply for the cities and unincorporated county was calculated based on the 2005 Kitsap County ULCA. A detailed description of the steps involved and the factors and assumptions used in that analysis is contained in Appendix A. Detailed output reports on the commercial/industrial land capacity for each jurisdiction are reported in Appendix B. Summary results of the comparison between commercial/industrial land demand and supply for the unincorporated county UGAs and the cities, respectively, are shown in the following tables.

Note that the calculated surplus or deficiency for each UGA and city are based on assumed distributions of forecast employment demand. They do not necessarily reflect local preference for siting new employment in particular locales or economic development initiatives based on specific cities or UGAs. Readers are cautioned that forecast commercial/industrial land demand estimates do not necessarily reflect the jurisdiction's policy preference for those geographic entities. The more significant reading to take from this analysis is whether, in total, enough land is designated countywide to accommodate the countywide forecast demand for commercial/industrial development.

Unincorporated Kitsap County

In unincorporated Kitsap County, total 2005 industrial land capacity exceeds the forecast demand for the planning period. The SKIA UGA is the single largest and most dominant provider of industrial land supply in the county. The Silverdale UGA provides the only other significant supply of industrial lands in the unincorporated county.

Total commercial zoned land capacity also exceeds forecast demand for the unincorporated county. The Port Orchard and Silverdale UGAs provide the largest share of available zoned commercial land supply. The largest forecast demand for new commercial space is in Silverdale.

**Kitsap County Unincorporated UGAs
Commercial/Industrial Land Supply & Demand Analysis
2005-2025**

UGA	Industrial (Net Acres)			Commercial (Net Acres)		
	2005-2025 Demand	2005 Capacity	Surplus or Deficit	2005-2025 Demand	2005 Capacity	Surplus or Deficit
Bremerton East	19	0	-19	2	3	1
Bremerton West	26	16	-10	37	7	-30
Central Kitsap	136	0	-136	97	42	-55
Gorst	34	13	-21	3	22	19
Kingston	34	5	-29	35	21	-14
Port Orchard	75	34	-41	56	266	210
Poulsbo	42	5	-37	19	0	-19
Silverdale	240	205	-35	160	198	38
SKIA	181	895	714	19	0	-19
ULID #6/South Kitsap	4	0	-4	1	34	33
Totals	791	1,173	382	429	593	164
Land Supply/Demand Ratio			1.48			1.38

Sources: Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update (2006), Appendix D: Employment Capacity (E.D. Hovee & Co.); Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

Incorporated Cities

For the incorporated cities, total 2005 industrial land capacity also exceeds the forecast demand for the planning period. The City of Bremerton is the single largest and most dominant provider of industrial land supply among the cities and is second only to the SKIA UGA in total industrial land capacity countywide.

For the incorporated cities, total 2005 commercial land capacity slightly exceeds the forecast demand for the planning period. Bremerton and Poulsbo provide the largest share of available zoned commercial land supply among the cities. Among all the cities, the largest forecast demand for new commercial space is in Bremerton.

**Incorporated Cities
Commercial/Industrial Land Supply & Demand Analysis
2005-2025**

Jurisdiction	Industrial (Net Acres)			Commercial (Net Acres)		
	2005-2025 Demand	2005 Capacity	Surplus or Deficit	2005-2025 Demand	2005 Capacity	Surplus or Deficit
Bremerton (1)	-14	265	279	232	265	33
Bainbridge Island (2)	32	35	3	77	83	6
Port Orchard	23	13	-10	67	43	-24
Poulsbo	26	26	0	99	92	-7
Totals	67	339	272	475	483	8
Land Supply/Demand Ratio	5.05			1.02		

Notes:

(1) Bremerton reported a vacant and underutilized supply of 531 total combined Commercial/Industrial net acres. This table assumes a 50/50 split of those acres between Industrial and Commercial zones. This excludes available commercial land within the neighborhood centers.

(2) Bainbridge Island reported 21 acres vacant commercial, 30 acres underutilized with a high likelihood of redevelopment to commercial and 32 acres underutilized with a potential for redevelopment to commercial.

Sources: Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update (2006), Appendix D: Employment Capacity (E.D. Hovee & Co.); Kitsap County DCD; City of Bremerton; City of Bainbridge Island; Mark Personius, AICP, Growth Management Consultant

Reasonable Measures

RCW 36.70A.215(4) requires that:

“If the evaluation required by [the buildable lands statutes] demonstrates an inconsistency between what has occurred since the adoption of the county-wide planning policies and the county and city comprehensive plans and development regulations and what was envisioned in those policies and plans as the inconsistency relates to the evaluation factors specified [in RCW 36.70A.215(3)], the county and its cities shall adopt and implement measures that are reasonably likely to increase consistency during the subsequent five-year period. If necessary, a county, in consultation with its cities...shall adopt amendments to county-wide planning policies to increase consistency. The county and its cities shall annually monitor the measures adopted...to determine their net effect and may revise or rescind them as appropriate.”

The initial 2002 Buildable Lands Analysis Report (2002 BLR) indicated that in some cases, urban densities (defined as 5 du/acre in the 1998 Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan) were not being achieved within certain UGAs. However, the report noted that since the Growth Management Act (GMA) compliant Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan (Plan) was adopted in 1998 and the 2002 BLR used a 1995-1999 analysis period, “...only one year of data reflects the current GMA-compliant [Plan]. Therefore, comparing zoning from 1995-1999 is problematic. A more meaningful analysis will be available for the next 5-year analysis period.”²⁴ The 2002 BLR reported plat densities were also influenced by “pre-GMA” low-density vested plats recorded from 1995-1999.

The 2002 BLR also identified an issue between “planned” and “actual” development patterns in that more growth was occurring in rural areas than was targeted in the Countywide Planning Policies (CPP). The 2002 BLR reported that from 1995-1999, the rural areas of the county including LAMIRDS²⁵ accounted for 57% of total new permitted residential units. The cities and unincorporated UGAs accounted for the remaining 43% of all new permitted dwelling units²⁶. At that time, the CPP target share of new growth was 83% urban and 17% rural.

²⁴ The 2000-2005 buildable lands analysis indicates that urban densities have been achieved in the UGAs—resolving the 1995-1999 inconsistency.

²⁵ Limited Areas of More Intensive Rural Development

²⁶ The 2000-2005 buildable lands analysis indicates that the urban/rural share of new permitted housing units increased significantly from the previous five year period—from 43%/57% (1995-1999) to 57%/43% (2000-2005). But the share of new urban/rural housing unit growth still appears short of the adopted 76%/24% CPP population growth target.

Subsequently, Appendix B of the Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) was amended in 2004, which adopted a new 20-year population growth allocation and identified a new target population growth share for urban and rural areas. The new target indicates that 76% of the 2005-2025 forecasted population growth in the county should be accommodated within urban growth areas (including cities and unincorporated UGAs). The remaining 24% future growth should occur in rural areas outside of UGAs. The 2002 BLR noted that “...a central issue concerning rural development is that much of it occurs on [already platted] parcels that are smaller than the prescribed density standard... Until these...” legacy lots” are fully absorbed, the County may face some obstacles in its efforts to direct most of the new growth towards urban areas”.

In 2004, the County amended the 2002 BLR Report to adopt a set of “reasonable measures” meant to help increase consistency between actual development and that envisioned in the countywide planning policies and the county’s comprehensive plan. The County recognized eighteen (18) reasonable measures already in existing in Kitsap County Code and existing sub-area planning documents, in Resolution No. 158-2004, including:

1. Encourage Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) in single-family zones
2. Allow clustered residential development
3. Allow duplexes
4. Allowing townhouses and condominiums in single-family zones
5. Encourage development of Urban Centers and Villages
6. Encourage Mixed Use Development
7. Create annexation plans
8. Allow manufactured housing development
9. Urban amenities
10. Targeted capital facilities investments
11. Master planning large parcel developments
12. Interim development standards (e.g., urban reserve designation)
13. Encourage transportation-efficient land use
14. Density bonuses in UGAs (only in Poulsbo Urban Transition Area)
15. Increase allowable residential densities
16. Urban growth management agreements
17. Locate critical “public” services near homes, jobs and transit
18. Transit-oriented development

The County committed to adopting and implementing adequate reasonable measures to help meet the urban/rural population growth target identified in Appendix B of the CPPs in Kitsap County Resolution No. 158-2004 which stated, in part, “...2. *In addition to those reasonable measures that the County has already adopted and implemented, ... Kitsap County staff should begin the process of identifying additional reasonable measures the Board of County Commissioners should consider adopting and implementing.*”

In 2005, the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC) identified a “menu” of forty-six (46) “Reasonable Measures” to encourage urban growth and increase residential development capacity in existing UGAs (i.e., to promote “infill” development) for jurisdictions to consider during their comprehensive plan updates, in compliance with RCW 26.70A.215.

Subsequently, in 2006, the County augmented existing measures and adopted an additional fourteen (14) new reasonable measures intended to attract and accommodate a greater share of future urban growth as part of the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update. These measures are specifically intended to increase consistency with the urban and rural population growth target identified in Appendix B of the Countywide Planning Policies.

The measures focus on several objectives: to make development more feasible in UGAs; to increase the efficient utilization of urban land and improve permitting efficiency; and craft development regulations more responsive to current housing and land market conditions. The reasonable measures address a number of issues related to each of those objectives. Some may address multiple objectives. A more detailed discussion of the new 2006 adopted reasonable measures follows by objective.

IMPROVE URBAN DEVELOPMENT FEASIBILITY

- **Allow for Alternative Sanitary Sewer Systems in Unincorporated UGAs** to ensure urban-level sewer or equivalent wastewater service in all UGAs for the 20-year planning horizon. New policies allow for alternative systems such as package plants, membrane systems and community drain fields in areas where other sewer provision is not financially feasible. This measure will provide significant benefit to aquifer recharge and would enable Kitsap County to monitor and maintain those facilities to ensure their long-term effectiveness.
- **Provide for Regional Stormwater Facilities in Unincorporated UGAs** to increase development feasibility on small and/or development constrained parcels. This new reasonable measure would allow for funding and construction of regional stormwater treatment facilities in areas where individual on-site treatment facilities are not financially feasible.
- **Strengthen and Amend Policies to Promote Low Impact Development.** Policies have been adopted that support clustered development with surface water features that allow for minimal site disturbance. This could allow for innovative infrastructure resulting in more efficient use of developable land.
- **Bonus Incentives for Increased Building Height Limits** to accommodate higher density residential development, increase residential development capacity within existing UGAs and promote more efficient development patterns in areas appropriately zoned to accommodate such development with supporting urban services and amenities.

IMPROVE URBAN LAND UTILIZATION & PERMITTING EFFICIENCY

- **Minimum Densities for New Subdivisions** are now mandated to ensure that any new urban lots created through the subdivision process meet the minimum urban densities specified in their respective zones.
- **Remove Pre-planning Allowances in UGAs.** Development regulations have allowed subdivisions to “shadow plat” and show how urban densities can be achieved in the future and how sanitary sewer can be accommodated to serve all lots when fully developed. In the meantime, portions of the “shadow plat” can be developed with on-site

septic systems. To increase the incentive for sewer provision and urban densities, the pre-planning regulation requirements have been removed.

- **SEPA Categorical Exemptions for Mixed Use and Infill Development & Increased Thresholds for SEPA Categorical Exemptions** were adopted to streamline the development review process and encourage more efficient development within existing UGA boundaries.
- **Consolidated Comprehensive Plan Land Use Designations** will make it easier to rezone urban parcels in the future without the additional time and expense of a comprehensive plan amendment process.
- **UGA Management Agreements** are scheduled to be adopted between 2007-2008 to address transformation of governance issues such as delivery of urban services, annexation plans, applicable development regulations and standards, etc., for unincorporated UGAs, including Bremerton East and West, Central Kitsap, South Kitsap Industrial Area, Gorst, ULID #6/McCormick Woods and Port Orchard/South Kitsap.
- **Policies Addressing and Promoting Reasonable Measures** to increase efficient use of UGAs by requiring consideration of reasonable measures prior to any proposed future UGA expansion.

RESPONSIVENESS TO LAND & HOUSING MARKET CONDITIONS

- **Adjusting Residential Densities within Existing UGA Boundaries** by rezoning specific parcels within the existing UGAs to higher densities and increasing the range of allowable densities in some of the County's urban residential zones. Parcel-specific "up-zones" in the adopted 10-Year Update were accompanied by development code changes to allow for a higher range of allowable maximum densities in multi-family and mixed use zones (to encourage and make mixed use development more feasible) and by slightly lowering the minimum density required in the Urban Low and Urban Cluster Residential zones from 5 units/acre to 4 units/acre (to allow for "family-friendly" larger homes and yards but still maintain minimum urban densities). The 4 unit/acre density minimum in the Urban Low and Urban Cluster Residential zones remains GMA compliant²⁷.

Changes to the range of allowable zoning densities in the Kitsap County 10-Year GMA Update in 2006 compared to the initial 1998 Comprehensive Plan are presented in the following table.

²⁷ According to the CPSGMHB, "Generally, any residential pattern of four net dwelling units per acre, or higher, is compact urban development and satisfies the low end of the range required by the [GMA]". [Bremerton I, 5339c, FDO, at pg. 50]

**Kitsap County 10-Year GMA Update (2006)
Allowable Density Amendments**

Land Use Designation	1998 Plan Allowable Density Ranges	2006 Plan Allowable Density Ranges
Urban Low	5-9 units/acre	4-9 units/acre
Urban Cluster	5-9 units/acre	4-9 units/acre
Urban High	19-24 units/acre	19-30 units/acre
Neighborhood Commercial *	10-24 units/acre	10-30 units/acre
Highway Tourist Commercial *	10-24 units/acre	10-30 units/acre
Regional Commercial*	10-24 units/acre	10-30 units/acre
Mixed Use	None	10-30 units/acre

*Note: Residential uses are encouraged but not required in these commercial zones

Source: Kitsap County DCD

- **New Mixed Use Zones** were adopted for the Silverdale, East and West Bremerton and Central Kitsap UGAs to promote more transit-oriented urban development and increase residential development capacity within existing UGA boundaries.
- **Design Guidelines for Silverdale** have been adopted to promote pedestrian and transit-friendly development and increased aesthetic appeal to encourage more efficient and higher density residential development within the Downtown core of the Silverdale UGA.
- **Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) Policies and Implementing Regulations** were adopted to allow for the transfer of development capacity from rural parcels to UGAs in order to encourage more efficient development patterns countywide.

Conclusion

An assessment of all reasonable measures adopted by Kitsap County was conducted to the extent practical as part of the Comprehensive Plan 10-Year Update (2006)²⁸.

The County’s continuing growth monitoring will address the RCW 36.70A.215(4) reasonable measure monitoring requirements. The monitoring program will seek to further examine and assess the effectiveness of these adopted reasonable measures at accommodating a greater share of urban growth in future years. The growth monitoring program may also consider further actions that the county or cities could take to increase the share of future urban growth countywide and explore some of the situational factors that influence urban growth rates such as the supply of non-conforming rural lots and local real estate market conditions.

²⁸ See Appendix C: Reasonable Measures

Appendices

UNDER SEPARATE COVER

Appendix A—*Land Capacity Analysis Methodology by Jurisdiction*

Appendix B—*Land Capacity Analysis by Jurisdiction*

**Appendix C—*Kitsap County Reasonable Measures Evaluation*
(*Appendix C from 10-Year CP Update FEIS*)**

**Appendix D— *Kitsap County Countywide Employment Capacity Analysis*
(*Appendix D from 10-Year CP Update FEIS*)**

Appendix E— *KRCC Menu of Reasonable Measures*

**Appendix F—*Kitsap County Buildable Lands Program, Procedures for Collecting and
Monitoring Data***