**2014 SIGN CODE UPDATE**

**Public Written Comment Matrix: Kitsap County Draft Sign Code (6/2/2014)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Du Vall, Pat</td>
<td>Eglon, WA</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thank you for allowing me to resubmit my comments from the public meeting on 6/16. I received information there is no video or audio of the meeting. My name is Pat DuVall from Eglon in North Kitsap. My concern with the sign code update is that small communities such as ours be allowed to post informational signs notifying members in our community of upcoming events. Eglon historically has posted informational signs at the corner of Eglon and Hansville roads. Our community has no outlet so everyone who lives here has to come and go via that corner. We have some who live here who do not use computers so electronic notification does not inform all. I did read the updated sign code information provided on the internet and it was not clear to me that such signs are allowed. Some of our concerned citizens have been in contact with Commissioner Gelder on this issue for some time now. I thank him for his understanding of our concerns but would like it to be clearly stated in the new code that such community informational signs are allowed. We are very diligent in following the guidelines of providing a schedule to the county of our community events and of quick removal of the signs after an event. The Hansville community sign which is diagonally across the road from the Eglon corner has been brought up as an option for Eglon to use in the past. There are several issues with that solution first it is not visible from the stop sign of Eglon and Hansville road and when someone would be returning to Eglon you are naturally looking where you are turning so the sign is not in your vision field. The other issue is that it is the Hansville community center sign and is only available when they are not posting events. There are many coinciding events such as Easter egg hunt, Christmas party. In our opinion that is not a workable solution to informing our neighborhood. I want to thank Commissioner Gelder and Mr. Gurnee for quickly responding to the e-mail I sent in regard to this matter. I would like to see it stated clearly in the new sign code that such community informational signs are allowed so we can continue to inform our neighbors of community events. Thank you, Pat DuVall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For 50+ years the Eglon residents have depended on the use of an A frame sign at the corner of Eglon Road and Hansville Road, as the main communication for information of meetings, events and memorial gatherings. While the Sign Code draft is very detailed, we are concerned that small community needs are not addressed clearly in a specific Section, but left up to the interpretation and approval of Commissioners and County Code enforcement staff, who will change over the years. We have four points we’d like the Board to consider.

1. Many of the members of our community, especially the seniors, do not have access to computers for our electronic notifications. The signs posted at the entrance to Eglon help to keep all of our neighbors informed, active and involved in a unique community family, which is one of the goals that we as a Board take very seriously. It is also not uncommon for the signs to draw in folks from other areas which we feel is only helping us to connect as a larger Kitsap County population.

2. The Eglon signs are posted for very limited dates and always removed the day after by a responsible community volunteer. We have attached a copy of this years signs and posting dates, which have already been approved by Commissioner Gelder. Currently he values our community efforts and small community needs. Our greatest concern is that in the future, someone who has different values and priorities may not approve our sign requests.

3. As to the County concerns over the “clutter” of signs at the corner of Eglon Rd and Hansville Rd we’d like to point out that our current A frame sign announcing our Traditional Beach Night is currently ONE of NINE signs, the others being: two real estate signs (which have been up since winter), four farm type signs (of which only two have a physical address in Eglon and usually remain up from spring to fall) and two election signs (these will increase in number and will remain up for months). We feel our one sign posted for three to four days at a time is minimal in comparison to the other sign usage on this corner.

4. We know that there has been a push for Eglon to use the permanent Greater Hansville Sign, which is on the Southwest corner of this intersection. This point was brought up at the 6/16/14 meeting after our representative spoke, so she was not able to address this idea. We offer these points as to why this is not a viable option for our community.

   a. The permanent sign has slots for only two signs and we have been informed that the Hansville Community Center signs are given priority over any of the other neighborhoods and/or organizations that are part of the Greater Hansville Area. Overlapping events, especially during the major holidays and throughout the
active summer seasons, would go unannounced in a local sign venue if we were all limited to the use of this one sign.

b. The placement of this permanent sign is not easy to read for those turning right into Eglon. It’s actually a safety issue; trying to see dates and times to the left, while turning right.

c. The placement is also not readable for people turning out of Eglon onto Hansville Rd, only safely workable for people traveling to and from Hansville.

We want to believe that Kitsap County values the importance of small community needs as much as it does those of cities and more commercial areas. We appreciate your consideration of our appeal for a Section of the Kitsap County Sign Code to state clear guidelines that promote this type of communication for small communities and organizations wishing to use signs for informational purposes only.

Thank you,
The Eglon Community Club Board

Timothy Holbrook, President
Jacqueline Holbrook, Vice President Events and Activities
Sherry Cordiner, Secretary
Patricia DuVall, Treasurer
Kinley Deller, Board Member Elect
Gene DuVall, Board Member Elect
Dana Dukes, Board Member Elect

---

Anonymous
Silverdale, WA

Customer said his business should be able to have signs near their businesses, and with current code, he is unable to place signs out near his business. He said he is abiding by the County Code, but there are businesses in his building (along Silverdale Way) that are not complying with the current code.

He doesn’t agree with big huge banners, but he would like to see the sign code updated to let small business owners place small temporary signs to solicit business.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rase, Gail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton, WA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I would like to submit the following items for public comment in regards to the Draft sign code ordinance for Kitsap County.

There are three types of signs: advertisements, informational, and Public safety/warning. Signs can be video, pictures, words, or symbols, using lighting, air, or wind (examples: inflatables, flags, banners) to enhance or make sign more visible. Advertisements or most commonly referred to as ads are persuasive possibly using video, pictures, symbols, lighting with the intent to persuade a person to purchase, want or need a tangible item. Second category - informational knowledge or fact. Examples would be political signs, event signs, garage/rummage sale bazaars, craft fairs, Farmer’s market (this is an event limited time frame), missing pet other items desiring return or information, church signs, decorations. (Decorations are exempt as they should be as these are personal expressions). Warning or danger signs. These could be lumped into informational but have an urgency component and are for public safety. Therefore murals, paintings, carved tree trunks, decorations of visual appeal are not signs. Again these, if visible need to be in compliance with existing laws, and not illegal or posing a danger to public safety. The definition under Definitions Sect.17.446.020 Line #30, is not clear and does not distinguish between artwork, decorations and signs.

The role of the County government in signage should be to insure that the signage is not dangerous and does not violate someone else's rights. Example: water front views are protected, by size, height restrictions, the sign will not cause any injury or damage to property or persons, and it will not cause accidents by being a distraction. The sign code needs to be simple, clear, and affordable. It should allow for new technology, innovation, and creativity. The content of the signage should not be restricted or limited if it is not illegal. The content would be regulated, determined and governed under existing laws. Example: pornography, slander, copyright laws. This leads me to the next point. Section 17.446.050 Item #7 Approved Religious symbols. This is a violation of Church and State. I believe that the religious organization should determine the symbols that they want to use. This violates my freedom of religious expression, and is an attempt at censorship and regulating content. As stated earlier, I believe that content should not be regulated unless it is illegal. This should be stricken from the sign code. The intent and role of the County should be on the safety of the signs not the content. This could be a violation of freedom of speech. If a person does not like signage clutter, then they should move into a community that has rules and regulations by a homeowners association as its governing body.

For the sake of Public Safety, I express the need for an exemption for lighted signs/electronic signs in rural areas outside UGA's for churches, schools, or buildings such as Grange Halls, to be lit during times that events are being held, or all night. Example Klahowya Secondary School. This sign should be permitted to be lit during the school year. The new regulations for operating times of 6AM is not early enough and 10 PM is too early. I have attended functions at the school that do not get over until well after 10PM. Kids are catching buses to get to school by 6AM. This sign provides directional information, as the school is not visible from the roadway. The
county does not know how well a person knows the area that might be responsible for their children to pick them up after school hours. There have been many field trips, dances, school plays, approved events held at the school by community organizations, that are outside of these approved times. For example I remember picking up my child after 1 AM in the morning, from a band field trips. The same applies to churches, grange halls, or other rural structures used for events such as parties, weddings, meetings. These should be exempted to keep the signage lit for public safety. I find flashing signs, electronic signs, balloons, inflatable, wind signs can be at times annoying, but unless there is a public safety component that is being violated, it should be considered a freedom of personal expression. The same applies for exemptions if it is necessary for public safety.

My last comment relates to the fees. This is not discussed in the draft. Will these fees change and is the public involved in the process?

Thank you for your consideration,
Gail Rase

Gitch, Dave
Poulsbo, WA

Thanks for the opportunity to comment this way on the proposed sign code. The following is more an observation and I am not sure whether the proposed/updated sign code will take into account what I consider to be a sign annoyance and perhaps even running against what may have been a condition of granting a permit and then as time goes by, enforcement is either to difficult or forgotten.

The specific example involves the Chevron gas station/convience store located in the Central Kitsap area, Silverdale Way at Bennington. I recall when that station was proposed there was a lot of discussion/input regarding locating that at the edge of a residential area. As a result, extensive landscaping was put in (I presume a condition) to provide some screening from the neighbors. The area along Silverdale Way was in a natural state and provided some natural habitat. Over the years some of the evergreen plants were cut down in height presumably to provide more visibility for the commercial station/store...but it still looked reasonable. Recently the ownership/management changed and with it those shrubs were cut down even more. Moreover, the buffer between the commercial area and Silverdale way has been grubbed out, a number of trees cut down and, to the point, a bevy of hodgepodge of signs emerged...some tent-type signs, others just stuck in the ground, others tied to trees advertising everything from smoked salmon, store specials, new car wash equipment, new prepared chicken, among other items. Frankly it has turned the area into a trashy sight.

Since there is "new management" in place, one could speculate that new "marketing" ideas emerged including removing vegetation to make the whole area more visible and to stick the signs out to promote the goods for sale.

Here is where I question whether after time passes, people come and go and for the most part the intent and requirements are forgotten (deliberately or innocently), with no one really charged with or having time for "enforcement."

How does the proposed ordinance address this concern.

Although I use that station to purchase fuel frequently, now it "bugs" me each
| From: Pazooki, Paul  
| Bremerton, WA  
| The Pazooki Group  
|  
| To: Commissioners  

**June 4, 2014**

| Subject: Proposed Sign Code  

| From: Honorable Board of County Commissioners  
| Kitsap County  
| Re: Proposed Sign Code  
|  
| Dear Commissioners:  

  I was unable to attend yesterday’s planning commission meeting to offer my input. I am, therefore, writing this letter to offer my comments, concerns and recommendations regarding a limited portion of the proposed Sign Code. First, let me briefly state my background for the record. I have been involved in Land Development, especially Commercial Land Development, as consultant or developer, for nearly fifty years. In addition to Kitsap County, I have worked in many other Cities and Counties in Washington. Some of the recent and larger developments in Kitsap County that I have been involved in include Silverdale...
Costco; Bremerton Fred Meyer; Most of the Plazas in Silverdale; East Bremerton Safeway, Wal-Mart, Walgreens, and IBM call center; Port Orchard Safeway; and Port Orchard Wal-Mart.

Second, I want to praise the DCD staff’s efforts in working with a stakeholder group that included professional sign experts in developing the sign code, and in their further efforts presenting it to various groups.

Third, I would like to re-emphasize the fact that Commercial Centers are developed in response to the community’s needs and become the economic engines of the communities. Commercial Center owners take pride in their centers and control the aesthetics of the centers, including the signage. A national tenant typically anchors the larger Commercial Centers. Majority of the mid size and smaller tenants in such a Center are also national retailers. The National Retailers typically have developed design standards including signage based on extensive studies, and understandably are resistant to major changes to their standards. Their goal in signage is simple, make it as easy as possible for the customers to see and find the store, using the latest technology and making sure that their standard design is aesthetically pleasing.

Lastly, keeping in mind that it is impossible to have a “once size fits all” Code, I respectfully request that the following elements, applicable to SHOPPING CENTERS, remain or be included in the final version of the Code,:
1. Pylon or pole signs—Monument signs at the entrance of the shopping centers with a height limit, restrict the ability of all or most of the tenants to have their signs at the driver’s eye level. Please note that in some of the existing shopping centers the signage extends to the ground level. Higher Pylon signs could be allowed only for centers with 100,000 square feet or more leasable area.
2. Size of the on-premise signs—The size should not be fixed. The Department Director should be given the authority to allow larger size based on evidence provided by the retailer or developer.
3. Electronic Signs—Electronic signs with lighting, common in the industry, and central control are an absolute necessity. It is no longer desirable, practical or cost effective for retailers to have someone change the letters every night pointing out the specials of the next day! Electronic signs need not be unsightly. Their size and designs should be afforded flexibility at the discretion of the Department Director.

I would be happy to meet with you or your staff to discuss my concerns and recommendations further and to offer additional input.

Sincerely,
Paul Pazooki, PE. PLS.

Hanson, Randy
Silverdale, WA
Hanson Sign Company

(Multiple comments were received from this individual/organization and consolidated in this table)

- I have a really busy Monday so I thought I would get my comments to you today. I also have attached James Carpentier’s comments from ISA. My main concerns are on page 14 item 5c.
1. 5c….Exposed neon is the correct term in the industry and is very common still
today and used by many national franchises. It is highly unusual if it is restricted in any commercial district and if it is it's usually is a requirement of a shopping center rather than the local jurisdiction. Exposed neon allows for many design options and creativity. I would understand if it was restricted outside the UGA.

2. 5d. Internally illuminated signs shall be "halo" lighting? Halo lighting in the industry can only be accomplished when using individual channel letters. Because the way they are wired very few buildings can accept this style of letter. Halo lighting does not apply to cabinet style internally illuminated signs. Both the channel and halo letters are in the definitions. I recommend that ALL signs be allowed to be internally illuminated (or not) using lighting application as per industry standards.

Regards,
Randy

- Good afternoon, I have attached several studies on the effects EMCs have on motorists. I think it would be great to share with the planning commission so they can hear the facts and not personal opinions. I believe these would be very helpful in making a responsible decision regarding these types of signs being allowed in the new code. Another thing to consider Darren, it came up in the meeting the other night is clearly define and limit the number of EMCs one single business (not shopping centers) could have. One last thought regarding EMCs and this would pertain to monument/pole signs to limit the size of the EMC to 60% of the overall display being reviewed.

Thanks again for your consideration........

Randy

Texas A & M Traffic Safety & EMCs.pdf
ISA 2014 Analysis of FHWA Study of CEV
cevmsfinal.pdf
DOT study finds digital billboards don't
Carpentier, James
International Sign Association

June 4, 2014
I wanted to let you know that we recently became aware of these issues:
  o We will recommend to allow the pole signs by right at 15' tall (this still allows for 8’ clearance) and at 75 square feet. This will provide an incentive for monuments since the draft allows for monuments at 100 square feet versus 75 square feet for pole signs and reduces the visual impact for pole signs by reducing the height from 20’ to 15’. What this also does is simplify administration since the proposed language will be difficult to administer since it is not clear under what circumstances a pole sign is allowed or the administrative procedure to allow a pole sign.
  o We noticed another issue...on page 21 the sign area for a monument sign includes the structure. This conflicts with the measurement method for monument signs on page 14 which does not include the structure and is accepted practice.

I wanted to make sure you heard about these recommendations prior to the hearing tonight. Let me know if you have any questions.

See you later

James

Bryant, Mary
23rd Legislative District Democrats

Attached please find a letter from the 23rd Legislative District Democrats and the Kitsap County Democratic Central Committee offering our input and comments on the proposed revisions to the sign ordinance.

If you have questions, please feel free to contact Katherine Woods or me at the phone numbers on the letter.

Thank you.

Mary E. Bryant, Chair
23rd LD Democrats

Dear Darren Gurnee,
The Executive Board of the 23rd Legislative District Democrats Central Committee and the Kitsap County Democratic Central Committee have reviewed the proposed revision to the Kitsap County Sign Ordinance. While we understand the visual clutter and maintenance concerns that inspired the proposed change, we do have several concerns with Section 17.446.080 Conditionally Exempt Signs, 4) Political Signs:

  1) We recommend that the height of the signs be increased from 36” to 40”. The wooden stakes readily available and used by the vast majority of campaigns would require a special cut to bring them within the 36” height limit. The 40” limit would allow the signs to be used without requiring a change. Also, the growth of plants along the roadside will hid signs lower than 40” eliminating the effectiveness of the signs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gillespie, Ron</th>
<th>Kitsap County Draft Sign Code: Updated as of 7/23/2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton, WA</td>
<td>(Multiple comments were received from this individual/organization and consolidated in this table)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Purpose**  
  Your Master Plan should encourage the whole community to develop a Signage not just a business or two. “These sign standards and regulations establish a predictable review process for the use of signs that support the business community while also promoting the visual quality of Kitsap County and which may be promoted in community plans.”  
  17.446.080 Regulations for Electronic Signs  
  From what I read in the ordinance and electronic signs have certain requirements such as hold time, transition etc. But it does not describe what they look like. So they could be any of the sign descriptions that you have identified…i.e. Pole Sign, Monument Sign, Window sign, Wall sign, Awning sign, Blade sign etc.  
  So literally we could have the whole street lit up with signs going on and off as they transmit messages, or scrolling signs that will keep us busy reading while we should be looking at the car in front of us. Flashing is a relative term – it is easy to identify when there is only one sign going on and off but what happens when you have a cluster of electronic signs going on and off at different times – I would say that would certainly give you the sense of flashing. If you put aesthetics on top of that then you would describe it as a mess. This has been described as the sign of the future but I describe it as a sign of visual electronic clutter. I can see there are no longer any Pillar signs my suggestion would be in eliminate electronic signs as well, they just add to the sign mess.  
  Enforcement of the regulations is always the issue. You have Klahowya High School that is one of only a few electronic signs in the area and they are violating the regulations – I am quite sure that the other high schools do the same. I absolutely do not believe that once people get electronic 

2) We recommend that the 200’ distance restriction between campaign signs be amended to allow for a sign to be placed on each corner at an intersection, even when the distance is less than 200’. Also, clarification is needed on how the 200’ will be measured. Linear on a single side of the street/road? Across the road?  

3) We recommend that the language regarding removal after elections be changed to clarify which campaigns must remove their signs. We recommend specifying that signs must be removed within 14 days for candidates who were defeated in the primary and all candidates following the general election.  

4) We recommend that the county follow state practice regarding signs that violate the ordinance. This will establish a single standard for sign removal.  

5) We have concerns with the imposition of a fine on a campaign for violations to this ordinance. Sign placement could be open to mischief by opposing campaigns or parties resulting in an unfair and unwarranted financial penalty of an innocent candidate or campaign.  

  We appreciate the efforts of the county to address this issue and the opportunity to share our concerns through the comment process.  

  Sincerely,  
  Katherine Woods Mary Bryant  
  Chair, Kitsap County Democrats Chair, 23rd Legislative District Democrats
signs in that they will comply with the regulations. They will push the envelope and eventually the county will just give up like it has done with the current sign code. The Urban area is quite extensive in this county. Along Tracyton Blvd the west side is rural and the east side is urban so this will make for a lot of unrest if someone puts an electronic sign up. Just what we need to reflect the character of the county, an ordinance that could potentially destroy that character; this is where a Master plan should come in not just a plan for a building or two. Why the exemption? 9) “Electronic signs outside Urban Growth Areas and Type III LAMIRDS; except when authorized or exempted for schools, churches, public safety agencies, and governmental or quasi-governmental agencies. Those signs exempted shall still conform to sign illumination requirements pursuant to section 17.446.070 Regulations for Permanent Signs.” Shouldn’t the county, schools and churches etc. have to comply with the rules and regulations and why not. If there is a special need by the government then write those needs in the code or allow for a variance only if public safety is involved. Not Pratical or enforceable. But at least the fine is taken out 5) Political sign: a) “A political sign is allowed in Kitsap County right-of-way provided that a sign a) using metal faces, metal supports, metal frames, or wire frames is prohibited b) is limited to a size no greater than 4 square feet and may not extend higher than 36 inches measured from the point in which it is placed in the ground to the top of the sign c) shall not be within 200 feet of a sign associated with the same campaign or cause and d) shall be removed 14 days after voting for the associated campaign or cause has occurred.” There are a whole lot of problems here – obviously you have not included a political consultant on your committee. Signs should be at least 40 “ high because most stakes are 4 feet high and it is difficult to sink 12” into the right of way. The price of democracy is signs, the way a party or candidate distributes their signs is a way the campaign feels that they can best reach a voter. The best thing you can do is enforce the 14 day rule after the campaign. Some people think that one sign is clutter others think that a cluster of signs is neat but you are prohibiting a candidate from what they would consider impacting the voter. Only one sign per corner, no signs across the street from each other, no cluster of signs, etc. is ignoring the way campaigns run. You need to do some serious re-thinking here. Who will enforce this 200 feet rule? What if the opposition party moves my sign? Will 4 x8 foot signs have to be registered.

- Kitsap County Comment Form Submittal:

  Name: Ron Gillespie
  Email: r-gillespie@wavecable.com
  Topic: (2) Other
  Comment:
  Since Silverdale will most likely be impacted the most by the sign code why not have a hearing in Silverdale?
  Desire to be contacted: True
  If about road maintenace--
Road Name: NW Gillespie Way
Nearest Cross Street:

- The question I have relates to human signs and political signs. Is it:
  - against the proposed code to hold a sign up that advocates for a candidate or political issue such as Silverdale Incorporation? People stand on corners holding signs advocating for a candidate, people stand on corners advocating for or against issues holding signs. This really gets into the area of freedom of expression. What are these signs considered to be - human signs, political signs..Some exemption should be made to deal with this issue.

- Are Political Signs held by Humans on the Right of Way, Human Signs and thus prohibited? My question on Human Signs was not answered. Are people holding signs for political candidates or issues related to community concerns, considered Human Signs? I would recommend that they be exempt from this definition and allowed under the political Sign section. Does a group of people holding signs to vote for a candidate who are on the public right of way violating code? Do they have to stand 200 feet apart to comply with code? This needs to be addressed because it is a way of communicating with the public that is not business related. A prime example were the people holding signs for anti incorporation – to make an impact they clustered together holding signs – this was a way of communicating their concerns to the public in a manner that they thought was effective. The way that I read the current code this would be prohibited. Electronic Signs are visual clutter and should be prohibited.

  This is a can of worms. Everyone will try and push the envelope and be very creative in the ways that they will attract attention – one business trying to out do the next. By allowing electronic signs you will be creating an unaesthetic environment that could turn into a visual nightmare. Parr Ford Sign is an example – people may not be able to afford this type of sign now but prices will come down and if you have for or five of these going down Silverdale Way you have created a mess. But what has been pointed out – you can get almost anything over the Internet and electronic signs will pop up all over the place. As pointed out before, any or all of the signs on a building have the potential of being electronic signs. Like I said a can of worms that will not be enforced. Signs changing every three seconds as you go down the road is flashing from my perspective. Look how cutesy CK High School sign is – do you expect business to be less creative. Government agencies and Churches should not be exempt. They should be the standard bears. If there is a need for emergency reasons to go beyond the sign code. Please identify them and put them in the code. Otherwise government agencies and churches should not be exempt from the code and the code should prohibit electronic signs.
Dear Mr. Grunee,

The following are my comments regarding the proposed changes to the Kitsap County Sign Code 17.446.010. Please include these comments in the public record.

The sign code is a “development regulation” as defined by the Growth Management Act (GMA) at RCW 36.70A.030 (7). The GMA requires that

“[T]he county and each city located within the county shall adopt a comprehensive land use plan and development regulations that are consistent with and implement the comprehensive plan. RCW 36.70A.040 (4) (d).

This requirement of consistency and implementation also applies to amendments or revisions to development regulations. RCW 36.70A.130(1)(d).

The Hearings Board in 1995 defined “consistency” to mean that one policy may not “thwart or be a roadblock to another” but must work together to achieve a common goal.

Thus the sign code must implement, not contradict, thwart or be a road block to the Comprehensive Plan policies that direct the preservation of rural character and those, such as Policy RL-28, that provide direction specific to signs. The staff assertion that RL-28 “allows for flexibility” is unsupported by the clear language of the policy and with that policy’s context among other rural character preservation policies. It does in fact thwart those policies by allowing internally illuminated signs otherwise limited to urban areas in LAMIRDs and for certain uses in rural areas (e.g. schools, churches and fire stations).

The GMA requirement that various development regulations must be consistent with one another prohibits inconsistencies between the sign code and the zoning code. The current draft Ordinance creates and exemption from sign restrictions in existing Conditional Use Permits (CUPs) and would violate this requirement. Kitsap County Code defines the purpose of CUPs as

...An administrative conditional use permit is a mechanism by which the county may place special conditions on the use or development of property to ensure that new development is compatible with surrounding properties and achieves the intent of the Comprehensive Plan...KCC 17.420.010.

A conditional use permit is the mechanism by which the county may gather input through an open record hearing and place special conditions on the use or development of land. The provisions of this chapter apply to hearing examiner conditional use permit applications. KCC 17.421.010

The zoning code requires that any change to permit conditions of an Administrative CUP be achieved by a Type II amendment procedure (KCC 17.420.050.A.2 referencing KCC 21.04.070) and Hearing Examiner CUPs by a Type III amendment procedure (KCC 17.421.040.A.2 referencing KCC 21.04.080).

The draft sign code would exempt properties subject to a CUP from their sign-related
permit conditions. This directly contradicts the CUP amendment requirements of the zoning code and thwarts the purpose of those permit requirements, i.e. to “ensure that new development is compatible with surrounding properties and achieve the intent of the Comprehensive Plan” including the intent to preserve rural character.

Likewise, the new sign code may not be inconsistent with the specific LAMIRD requirements of the zoning code, which contrary to the staff’s finding of “flexibility”, direct that any conflicts among the various statutory, code and subarea plan provisions relating to LAMIRD standards, “the most restrictive shall apply” (e.g. KCC 17.321A.010).

The GMA limits intensification or redevelopment within LAMIRDs to be consistent with existing condition as of July 1, 1990, the date of enactment for the GMA RCW 36.70A.070.5 (d). Therefore if a LAMIRD was not characterized by internally lit or other electronic signs as of July 1, 1990, it cannot be permissible to allow them there now.

In conclusion the draft sign code in its current form does not comply with the GMA requirements of consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, the Zoning Code and the Procedures Ordinance as they relate to preservation of rural character, LAMIRDs, Conditional Use Permits and amendments to CUPs.

Statutory requirements notwithstanding, Kitsap County made a very public commitment to its citizens in the Comprehensive Plan to preserve rural character, both in rural areas and LAMIRDs. This draft sign code fails to honor that commitment and lets down the citizens of this County who have made their desire for rural character known to the County for decades. That promise should be kept.

Sincerely,

Karanne Gonzalez-Harless