The Kitsap County Planning Commission met on the above-stated date at the Presidents Hall, 1200 Fairgrounds Rd, Bremerton, Washington 98311. Members Present: Tom Nevins, John Ahl, John Taylor, Monty Mahan, Michael Gustavson, Mark Flynn, Lary Coppola, Deborah Flynn and Dean Jenniges. Staff Present: Eric Baker and Holly Anderson, Secretary.

Chair Nevins Called the Meeting to Order and made introductions

Approval of Minutes

May 11, 2004

A motion was made by Deborah Flynn and seconded by John Taylor that the minutes of March 9, 2004 be approved subject to a wording change on page 86, line 19. Add words “in ready for development area” following the word hanger. Motion carried. The vote: yes-8, Against-0, abstained-1.

PUBLIC HEARING

Draft ordinance and potential amendments to the County Code, addressing regulations for Agriculture and Equestrian activities.

Chair Nevins explained the process for public comments stating there would be a three-minute time limit on each comment and asked that comments be directed towards actions citizens would like the Planning Commission to take.

Eric Baker, Department of Community Development staff - Two years ago in July of 2002, Kitsap County embarked on a process to revise existing agricultural and equestrian regulations. The process began with an open house attended by approximately 130 citizens at the Silverdale Community. Attendees outlined a series of concerns they
had with existing regulations, some of which made it overly
prohibitive, if not impossible, for certain agricultural activities such as
commercial stables and riding arenas to exist. The Board of County
Commissioners then decided that the process to revise current
regulations should start with a Community Committee comprised of
six members of the agricultural community, two from each of the three
commissioner districts, four members of the regulatory community
and two members of the Conservation District for a total of twelve
individuals. This group met 11 times over the course of a year at
various Kitsap County locations. Public testimony was received at
the beginning and end of each meeting with time for discussion
amongst the audience members as well as the Committee members.
The Committee covered a diverse range of topics including
agricultural structures, livestock quantities, setbacks, riding arenas
and stables. The Committee reviewed all comments and information
received as well as regulations from other jurisdictions and Best
Available Science (BAS) from locations around the western Puget
Sound region and other western states. In July of 2003, the
Committee came up with a recommended set of regulations heard by
the Planning Commission on February 10, 2004, at its first public
hearing on this matter. Approximately 40 citizens testified on the
proposed amended regulations. Comments addressed areas such as
corns about livestock density, confinement area vs. pasture and
the recommended five-acre exemption for livestock densities. This
proposed provision states that properties five acres and larger are not
restricted in the number of animals on the property nor do they need
to apply for a Conservation District Farm Plan. Pursuant to that
public hearing, the Planning Commission made a number of changes
to the proposed amended regulations. These changes are noted on
the document before the Commission at this hearing. Baker then
reviewed concerns about current regulations. These included their
being too static; whether they either could or could not be met and
lack of flexibility to the regulations. Also, the Conservation District
that has an excellent program to develop Farm Management Plans
was not given any stake in the current ordinance creation process.
For example, if you had a Farm Plan allowing for a certain number of
animals on your property, if the regulations stated you must have a
smaller number, then the Farm Plan was not available to allowing for
any flexibility. Staff and the Board of County Commissioners thought this was wrong and that the Conservation District Farm Plan is an excellent method to do a site-specific analysis on a piece of property to determine how many animals would be appropriate based on certain waste management strategies and that flexibility should be given. The proposed new regulations regarding animal densities, setbacks for confinement areas and manure storage areas, are all flexible based on the outcome of the Conservation District Farm Plan analysis. Kitsap County contains a wide variety of property uses with topography either complimentary, or not, to current uses. The Conservation District Farm Plan gives the option to do the site-specific analysis of each property to inform property owners what the holding capacity should be. The Farm Plan has three excellent qualities: 1) the ability to determine how to maximize the use of your land while maintaining Best Management Practices (BMPs); 2) Farm Plan if done by the Conservation District, is free; and 3) it opens up an avenue to federal subsidies that are currently not available without a Farm Plan. Lastly, with regard to riding arenas and existing stables, current regulations only allowed for obtaining a Conditional Use Permit if money is received to board a horse because it is considered a commercial business. The facility also must be 200 feet away from the nearest property line. Not many Kitsap County properties would be able to operate under these restrictive regulations. The Committee looked to revise this restrictive regulation. It concluded that only properties of a particular size or properties where buildings are a certain distance from property lines or other homes, would need to apply for any permit, most specifically not a Conditional Use Permit, which cost $2,500 and are very cost prohibitive. The current proposed change is that only properties less than two and a half acres in size or if a stable or arena facility is within 100 feet of other residences or 50 feet from property lines, need to apply for an Equestrian Impact Activity Permit, the equivalent of a Home Business Permit, costing $250. This would allow properties less than two and a half acres in size to have riding arenas and riding stables, while still mitigating concerns from members of the non-agricultural/equestrian community. It appears the non-agricultural/equestrian community has not been well represented at the various committee meetings, work/studies and public hearings on
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this issue. Kitsap County rural areas have a wide variety of
residential uses such as forestry, agricultural, cross-country
motorcycle racing as well as shooting ranges. These various uses
need to be compatible with one another. The proposed regulations
include the flexibility of a Conservation District Farm Plan that will
make it easier for the citizens in rural Kitsap County to peacefully co-
exist with the variety of uses. The Planning Commission asked Baker
to add that a Farm Plan does not necessarily need to be prepared by
the Conservation District. There are private consultants available for
this service as well. All plans are designed based on the Department
of Agriculture standards.

Chair Nevins gave an overview of public hearing protocol and stated
that each speaker would have three minutes to make oral comment.

Jerry Darnall – North Kitsap resident with a 15-acre Ferrell-to-Fork
swine operation near Kingston, spoke addressing three issues with
newly proposed regulations. 1. The definition of pastures and yard
setbacks. On March 9, 2004, Eric Baker stated the County receives
80-90 complaints per year, less than five being in excess of five
acres. He questions whether or not the larger acreage needs to be
included in new regulations. No reason for more regulations and
government control on the small farmers. 2. Problem with requiring
80% vegetative cover in pastures. He does not grow grass, but a
proprietary mix that his pigs only graze off the top 6 inches. After that
he diskes it, replants and it is ready for grazing again in sixty days.
There are short periods of time when he has no pasture. Does this
meet pasture requirements or is he out of compliance and will need to
move to another county? 3. Setback of 50 feet from property line. If
this goes into effect, the North and South Kitsap FFA programs are in
violation because they are right at the property line.

Lorrie Ekstrom - Asked to be able to submit additional written
comments following this hearing. Does not believe three minutes is
adequate time to address concerns. Six people were on the
Agricultural Committee for over eleven months and worked hard on
the overall plan for Kitsap County. She then read their mission
statement to the Planning Commission the main theme being to
protect the economic and recreational vitality for all citizens in support of the agricultural community. The Committee feels that although the Farm Plan is a good idea, it should not be mandatory.

Chair Nevins said that although the intent was to end all comments at the close of tonight’s hearing, he would allow two more days until close of business, 4:30 PM, on May 27, 2004. Hard copy mail and email will be accepted. He asked that the email be sent directly to the Planning Commission Secretary.

Sharon Call – Washington State Horse Council, thanked the community and the Committee members for their efforts to develop new regulations but does not see the need to rush to adoption. Still have additional issues that need to be considered. Noted the Kitsap County livestock owners to be primarily horse owners. These citizens enjoy the rural lifestyle with the beauty of the natural surroundings. This is why these people chose to live in Kitsap County. The County has the second and third largest Washington State Horseman’s Club as well as many other associated clubs and activities. She specifically mentioned a special event called Corey’s Day on the Farm for special needs children. Equestrian farmers have asked for little and given much to the local communities. Does not believe many citizens appreciate farming activities. These citizens complain about associated and necessary functions of farming and how they are handled. Farmers pay property taxes the same as the rest of the County’s citizens and she asked that their right to farm be protected. Animals teach children many good lessons. This is a traditional way of life that deserves protecting.

Thomas Hallett – owns property of a little over one acre in size. Proposed regulations are far too restrictive and are set up to expand only with a Conservation District Farm Plan. Thinks the process is backwards. If no problem, let the Conservation District restrict the use and make legal restrictions more expansive. As written, it is an enforcement tool. There are other ways to deal with problems such as a farm advisory commission to set up guidelines for the right to farm. The committee could also arbitrate conflicts. Referenced other jurisdiction’s regulations that include wording to the affect that existing
uses may continue or be grandfathered. The proposed changes do not have this wording.

Scott Hall – Resident of South Kitsap and a member of the Howe Farm Stewardship Committee, works with agriculture properties throughout the County. He is also helping an elderly man decide if he wants to continue agriculture use of his property given the proposed changes. Needs assurance his right to farm is protected. Hall is in favor of a farm commission with representation of people with larger acreages and/or larger income-producing agricultural activities. These residents are owners of very expensive land that could eventually come down to cows vs. condominiums.

James Kent – A Central Kitsap resident and employee of the Sheriff’s Office, thinks major issues are with the process that has taken place for amending the current code. Does not think the composition of the Committee is a true representation of the majority of property owners in Kitsap County. He referenced Baker’s statement that there were 70-80 complaints against farm uses last year, the majority of which were against people with less than five acres. Most people are small hobby farmers. This process started with the intent to remove overly restrictive language, however it now appears to be more restrictive to small property owners and less restrictive to those owning more than five acres. Told would be a tool to use when complaint filed against someone. Rules are not needed to apply when someone doesn’t like what the neighbors do. Other issues deserve more attention for enforcement than this issue.

Sheridan Kent – Agrees with everyone tonight. Asked what is less restrictive about the proposed changes other than no Conditional Use Permit (CUP) is required costing $2,500. Does not think most people even applied for a CUP anyway and if so, it wasn’t being enforced. Should not be an issue of how much land a person owns, but should be an issue that everyone is a landowner with livestock. The agricultural/equestrian community needs to work together on issues to help keep Kitsap rural and keep farms in Kitsap County. Everyone has a right to farm and are protected under state laws relative to nuisances. The Humane Society and Health District are available to
deal with specific issues such as animals and water quality. Requiring 80% vegetative ground cover will require irrigation that is
counter to water conservation during dry summer months. A 50-foot
setback creates more of a problem. It puts animals into a smaller
confinement area with the same amount of waste production. Again, this is a management issue and neighbor issues should be
reasonably mitigated. If a farm exists first when someone moves in next door, then the new resident is aware of the existing farm when they move in and can therefore expect to be living next to farming activities. At the last public hearing it seemed as though speakers were not being heard. Nothing has changed in the proposal. It also appears that even if changes were made, they are now back to the original wording. She asked that the peoples’ comments be considered.

Margaret Vingo – North Kitsap resident with 2 ½ acres. Property is in compliance but thinks this proposed change is entirely unnecessary. Do not need supervision to manage animals. Science is constantly changing. Willing to upgrade and maintain horses in best possible situation because of pride in her animals. Her horses are a breed that grows on air; therefore maintaining two inches of grass for an eco-pasture around the perimeter of her house is ludicrous. When she asked her veterinarian which one of her horses should be on grass, he just rolled his eyes. Changes are unnecessary for grown-ups to have imposed on them.

Lou Fitch – A lifetime resident of Kitsap County with family owning horses back in the 1940’s. Her parents started the Silver Spurs Saddle Club. Thinks proposed regulation changes are wrong and agrees with every speaker tonight. Asked the Planning Commission to take a serious look at this issue for the citizens of Kitsap County.

Sue Boblett – Resident of a 20-acre Central Valley farm with approximately 25 horses. The Conservation District prepared a Farm Plan for them last year and her family was excited about it. The Plan is unworkable. Cannot live with the Conservation District’s regulations. The Conservation District requires six inches of grass at all times. The farm has a boarding stable and what the Conservation
District wanted to do was confine animals to a small area around the barn, with the remainder of the property in six inches of grass. Boarders would not agree to leaving their horses on a farm with a mud hole around the barn. Does not see how anyone can have six inches of grass year around in Kitsap County. Horses are supplemented with hay and grain; they do not rely on grass for feed. Hopes the revised regulations are not approved.

Regina Twidwell – Many people are just getting involved in this issue yet it seems like the Planning Commission is getting ready to conclude the matter. Asked the Planning Commission members to recognize that farmers may have rights that are being violated. Thinks Kitsap County proposed this change because it made an error in judgment due to fear of urban sprawl. Need to consider the farm community’s right to farm. Seems farms are under attack from government that collects revenue from farmers. Logic dictates that if farmers do not care take their land, it will not serve their needs. It is unrealistic to assume that all farmers are guilty of poor care taking. She asked the Planning Commission to stop attempting to regulate peoples’ rights with what they can do with their lands. If the main reason for the Planning Commission’s discussion is about County revenue, she recommended a different approach. The Conservation District is undermanned to handle the need if all farmers approached them simultaneously for a Farm Plan. Does not think the Conservation District is a friend to the farmer. She noted that there are many volunteers in this industry in many ways. Realistically, 35% of volunteers are affected by the County’s regulations and may be forced to move out of the area. Read statement urging people to get involved. She suggested using the election process to remove people from office thus indicating displeasure with regulations.

Chair Nevins Tom requested that speakers adhere to the three-minute time limit to allow everyone time to speak and noted that Planning Commission members are volunteers, not elected officials. He said if each speaker did not have enough time to make all points during the three-minute time allowed, written comments will also be accepted through close of business, 4:30 PM, on June 27, 2004.
Sally Sullivan – Is a South Kitsap resident and owner of a pig sanctuary. Biggest concern is the 5-acre issue. With easement to the road, she has 5.01 acres; without the easement, she has 4.86. Which scenario will the County consider? She encouraged horse people to keep fighting to protect their interests. Another concern she sees in the proposed amendments is the classification of ferrets as a farm mammal. Caution was given urging citizens to be aware of government sneaking unwarranted issues into existing regulations.

Mary Stever – Her problem is different than most. Has cock fighting roosters next door and does not see any regulations for this problem. Where is help for her? The noise and smell is unbearable. She sees new regulations making it worse and she has no recourse but to move.

Neal Cooper – President of homeowners association in area where Mary Stever lives. He concurred that the problem with the fighting cocks is unbelievably bad. There are 100 cock fighting roosters, raised to fight and kill, not as pets. Impossible to get assistance from any agency. Have already tried Health District, Sheriff's Office, and Community Development. His neighborhood needs help.

Collin Young – Asked who was behind this proposed regulation change and who will benefit. Believes this is based on issues with animal waste and complaints from neighboring properties. Animal waste should be addressed by the Health District. Believes this is another opportunity to make government bigger, more wasteful and more invasive of citizens’ rights and liberties. With this ordinance amendment, Kitsap County Code Enforcement will be responding to complaints about every chicken and duck. Suggests that every complaint be filed in writing and fined if not valid. Finally, if Board of County Commissioners votes for this proposed change, the public needs to remember this at election time. He referenced a specific Farm Plan cost.

Kristina Cullefer – She is disappointed with the Planning Commission. Not happy with members passing notes while people are speaking. She hopes the members are getting the message from the people
that the new regulations are not wanted. She spoke in favor of a farm commission. Has never had complaints from neighbors. Believes she has a right to do as she pleases with her own land.

Nadine Ross – Told that as of today, only the original draft of code changes were posted on the County’s website. The latest version is not there, only the 10/24/03 version. This frustrates and confuses the public, as they are not able to come to hearings of this nature with correct information. Thinks the County has current ordinances in place to deal with issues such as the fighting roosters. If County staff cannot handle the problem with existing regulations, why impose more? Objects to the Farm Plan requirement. Not sure the about natural resource clause. Is it State, local or Conservation District?

Ron Ross – Submitted four different copies of regulation changes. The first dated 4/2/03, second, 10/24/03, third 3/17/04 and the fourth again 10/24/03. Asked which one is being worked with? Said this is absolutely out of hand. The entire program should be aborted. At first people with riding arenas were asked to sign a document stating they would never be used for commercial purposes. This is wrong. If it is a private facility, it cannot be used commercially. It should not be made so that commercial endeavors in farming are bad. Again, the mention in the regulations for the Department of Natural Resources. Kitsap County does have a Department of Natural Resources. This is confusing because it is not clear which DNR is being referenced. The County should not be dealing with small animals of any kind. Nothing is mentioned about what can be done on small parcels. On page 2, bottom line, it references 24 poultry. Before that in the definition section, it states 12 poultry. Regarding setbacks, do not put all of the burden on livestock property owners. Neighbors should also be involved in adjoining setbacks.

Janet Arrants – Have owned horses in Kitsap County for 18 years and have never had complaints from neighbors. How will proposed regulation changes affect her property? Will citizens get to vote on use of their own property?
George Arrants – Thinks the Committee has been directed to put regulations on small property owners that are financially prohibitive. Currently have buildings on property that do not meet proposed setbacks. How will these be affected? Density in area has increased dramatically. Emphasized that cause is not from animal owners it is from people that move into areas where they are unfamiliar with existing uses. The Board of County Commissioners needs to understand this. Asked why reference to existing enforcement ordinances is not listed in proposed regulations. Also asked who will enforce complaints. He talked with Sheriff’s Office and was told that their work load has already increased due to animal complaints. He is disenchanted with Kitsap County and with Silverdale. When he retires in seven ½ years he will probably move out of the County because government is making it too difficult to live in the County.

Patricia Sisson – Owns a small farm on a narrow strip of land surrounded on three sides by unused property. Her horses are in woods around her home on undeveloped property she does not own. Can only afford a small parcel. Will be forced to move to another county. Suggested that additional population is the problem and asked that the County stop allowing commercial zoning on property that is currently farmland. Thinks Kitsap County is turning into another Seattle.

Bill McLaughlin – Resident of Seabeck – Does not see anything addressing the requirement for new neighbors to build 100 feet from his buildings. Sees this as an education problem. Believes complaints come from new residents unaware of existing farming uses in the area. Conservation District is already overworked. What will guarantee he could get a Farm Plan prepared in a timely manner? The proposed new regulations will not work. Nothing to address grandfathering existing non-conforming parcels.

Donald Todd – Resident of Seabeck – Questioned what is being regulated. Referenced complaint numbers from Conservation District as being 80-90, some of which are small farms. At the last public hearing, the Conservation District representative said they responded to 2,000 complaints per year. The current proposal is not less
restrictive but more prohibitive. With proposed setbacks horse will be in 40 feet of land. Understand that commercial stables could not exist under current rules. Suggested changing regulations for commercial stables. The new regulations will prohibit farming in Kitsap County. Right to farm commission is good idea. Tell Board of County Commissioners to allow citizens to vote on this ordinance change. Let the neighbors work it out by vote. Give the property owner flexibility and stay off his farm.

Diane Ramsey – 18 year resident of Kitsap County - Moved from Bellevue to get away from urban sprawl. She applied for a Farm Plan 2 ½ years ago and is still waiting for a call back. Thinks this process is flawed because enforcement is writing and interpreting laws that should be written by elected representatives, interpreted by courts and enforced by enforcement officers. Need to set this proposal aside, impose a moratorium and set up a farm commission of sorts. Many other jurisdictions have set up similar advisory committees with a dozen members (see hand-outs submitted) thus avoiding enforcement creating laws. She explained what other counties did for right to farm. Already have right to farm under State law. Skagit considers farming and ranching a natural resource to be protected from suburban sprawl. We need this in Kitsap County. The Planning Commission has a resource in one of its members who assisted in establishing an Agricultural Advisory Committee in Pierce County. Since this has been done before, she believes it can be done again in Kitsap County.

Ron Gascoyne – Is a fifteen-year resident of Kitsap County and a member of the Agricultural Committee. Gave example of an unusable regulation in the original ordinance wherein a building could be place 200 feet from the property line but with five acres (320 feet wide and 600+ feet long) where can a barn legally be placed? The Committee did listen to the entire community. He has two five-acre parcels joined as ten. He gave example where his permit was approved but not in compliance with ordinance. He does not think divisions in the County are communicating. He has a stable in Seabeck and has never received a complaint about his operations. Any issues are dealt with among neighbors. Citizens do not need to
be regulated on farms because of a few complaints. Kitsap County is a rural area that people enjoy. Kitsap County needs fewer regulations, not more. What a person has on their property should be their own.

Linda Heath – Is a proud member of the equestrian community. When her family purchased their home, the real estate brokers specified the equestrian activities allowed as a benefit. Need to be allowed to keep what activities were allowed at time of purchase or have them grandfathered in so as not to have these amenities taken away. Asked if any of the Planning Commission members actually live on property with animals. There are ways to handle complaints on a case-by-case basis. The proposed regulations are unreasonable and unaffordable. Establishing a farm commission is a good solution. Most people take pride in their animals, which is one reason why they live here. There are places of higher home density for others to live if they do not want to be located next to a farm.

Chuck Hislop – Is a local fire fighter who married into horses. If agricultural and equestrian property is not managed properly, it dies. It is a management problem. He addressed costs associated with developing his farm. Explained the many problems he had with the County during this time. The ordinance amendment is challenging their way of life. Increased home density is the problem. Farm people take care of their land. Neighbors that complain about farm smells purchased their homes knowing a farm, with associated noise and smell, already existed next door. Government regulations are troublesome. This way of life is being challenged and needs protected.

Sue Machacek – Is a resident of Mason County. Explained why she left Kitsap County. She did not like the fact that she purchased land, paid her taxes; yet, local government dictates what she can do with portions of her land that she pays for with her tax dollars. In other words, she does not agree with required setbacks that she is still required to pay for with her taxes but cannot use as she sees fit.
Al Whitworth – Owns a horse farm owner in Hansville that is also used for other activities such as weddings. If proposed regulations are approved, his liability insurance costs will put him out of business. Wants to retain his right to farm and keep his business. If have to keep his horses on 6 inches of pasture his veterinarian will not like it.

Angela Schauer – Member of the County Farm Bureau, Washington Farm Bureau and American Farm Bureau. The problems addressed at this hearing are not new. Since 1997, she has become an advocate for farming. Problem is with the proposed regulations. Thinks they are full of loopholes. As a Farm Bureau Member, there are policies in place. These policies include the desire to not have excessive government. Believes the Planning Commission members should also be fighting against excessive government. Farmers in Kitsap County are a minority that needs an association to protect their rights. People who abuse animals have created this problem. County has right to prosecute offenders. Worried that regulations proposed touches too many things under agriculture term. The word agriculture means different things in different regions of the state. Need to be aware of the creation of a farm commission because it could also become a bureaucracy. Most people are not generating income from their farm but are working to support it. Have met farmers from every state in the union. Universal problem is created when human interaction is eliminated through regulations. We need arbitration and mediation with reasonable people. Asked government not to try to solve this problem with written code. The human factor is needed.

Frank Tower – Addressed all farm issues but mostly horses. Has watched other states regulate farms out of business. The horse industry is large industry supporting 141 million jobs. It is also one of the largest recreational business in the United States. Regulations will not help. Would rather see money go to help law enforcement protect citizens against violators.

Tom asked if anyone else wanted to speak.
Ron Griffin – Addressed large commercial operations. Recommended building heights be limited as well as square footage and recommended percentage of land used for confinement and consider all buildings in the lump sum. Suggested moderate requirements on wetland areas and a volume limit on manure storage. Possibly 25 to 50 cubic yards without additional buffers should be required. Thought a Conditional Use Permit should be required as it allows the public a chance to comment on a proposed development use. The purpose of the proposed regulations is to ease the burden on small farming businesses. Asked the Planning Commission to consider easing of restrictions by responding to questions not debated or fully discussed by the Committee. His questions addressed consistency with how other home businesses of similar scale and impact are treated, if a different activities is proposed generating similar light, noise, traffic and visual impacts, would it be permitted without a Conditional Use Permit or other review process to allow all stakeholders the opportunity to comment on the proposal. If the proposed regulations are approved, he supports a process allowing for interested parties and nearby landowners to have an opportunity to review and comment before new or expansion is permitted to an existing operation. His family has farmed in the Puget Sound region since the late 1800’s and he supports agriculture as well as forests and open space. Has not seen a farm replace a subdivision of homes. Has seen forests and open space become parking lots and riding arenas. Cautioned giving development special treatment under the term agriculture. Riding arenas are recreational facilities, not agriculture. Asked the Planning Commission to consider impacts from farming activities the same way it considers any other development activity.

Michelle McFadden – Attorney representing a property owner having a code enforcement action filed against him. The owners purchased a farm that had been a 16-stall horse farm on ten acres and used as a breading farm. When the new owners chose to board horses at his farm instead of continuing with the previous use, he was told this would be a non-conforming use and was fined $1,600. The County eventually refunded the money but this was the beginning of the County’s action to amend the existing regulations. Thinks the
ordinance needs to be changed, as it is not effective as it stands now. She sent a letter to the County with suggestions regarding: a grandfather clause for existing operations and riding stables, public vs. private, being problematic because a farm owner could change their mind. Some standards are still too rigid. New homes being built next to existing farms should not cause a nonconforming situation. She suggested changes to riding stable provisions. Does not see need for equestrian impact activity permit. Dust, noise and parking are issues most grown-ups can deal with. The density issue also needs to be addressed using common sense. Her clients would like the amendments to go forward and commended staff for doing the job knowing that this issue is being presented because of complaints filed with the County. She also thanked the Planning Commission for its good work and hoped her suggestions would be helpful.

Brenda Veneer – Moved to Kitsap County about a year ago, bringing livestock with them. Enjoys living in Kitsap County because of the variety of living conditions available. Will be showing livestock at Kitsap County Fair this year. Asked that her right to farm be protected as well as the rural lifestyle her family enjoys.

Tim Matthes – President of KAPO. KAPO has received several emails regarding the agricultural provisions. KAPO has not taken an official position on this. It does support ways to improve distribution of timely material prior to hearings as well as allow public more time to testify at hearings. He encouraged the County not to rush adoption of new regulations because some of them may be inadequate or incomplete.

Chair Nevins closed the oral public comment portion of the public hearing. Written comments will be received through close of business, 4:30 PM, on Thursday, May 27, 2004. US mail or email will be accepted.

Michael Gustavson – Commented that he serves on Planning Commission with the eight other members present. Reminded audience not to forget that the final decision on this ordinance amendment will be made by the Kitsap County Board of County
Commissioners. The Board will also hold a public hearing on this matter. The date is unknown at this time.

Chair Nevins suggested a good way to be involved in the public process is to read the public notices in the newspapers to access dates and times for upcoming public hearings. He then noted Holly Anderson’s email address for additional written input.

Public hearings are also posted on the County’s website.

No further business being heard, a motion was made by Dean Jenniges and seconded by Michael Gustavson that the meeting be adjourned. The Vote: Aye-9; No-0. Motion carried.

Exhibit No. Description
A. May 25, 2004 Planning Commission agenda
B. Sign-in sheet from May 25, 2005 public hearing
C. Packet of letters received prior to the May 25, 2004 public hearing
D. Packet of hand-outs received from citizens at the May 25, 2004 public hearing
E. Packet of emails received after the May 25, 2004 public hearing and before the cut-off deadline of 4:30 PM, Thursday, May 27, 2004
F. Two written comments (one letter, one email) from citizens who missed the May 27, 2004 cut-off deadline, with responses back from staff
G. KitsapFarm Website submitted by Jerry Darnall (included in public hearing hand-outs)
H. Washington State Horse Council handout submitted by Sharon Call (included in public hearing hand-outs)
I. Legal Notice published in The Sun for the May 25, 2004 Planning Commission public hearing

MINUTES approved this ___________ day of __________________, 2004.

________________________________________
Tom Nevins, Chair

Planning Commission Secretary