



## Executive Summary

---

**Department:** Department of Community Development  
**Issue Title:** Amendment to Kitsap County Code Title 17 'Zoning' regarding lot sizes in Urban Growth Areas  
**Meeting Date:** May 7, 2018  
**Time Required:** 15 minutes  
**Attendees:** Louisa Garbo, Jim Bolger, Dave Ward, Liz Williams, Darren Gurnee

### **Action Requested At This Meeting:**

Review proposed amendment to the Kitsap County Code and consider public testimony from the February 12, 2018 public hearing prior to the Board deliberations and decision on June 11, 2018.

On February 12, 2018, the Kitsap County Board of Commissioners held a public hearing to consider amendments to the Kitsap County Code Title 17 Zoning. The purpose of the hearing was to consider two exemptions to current maximum lot size requirements in unincorporated Urban Growth Areas (17.420.060 A.25 KCC). At the conclusion of verbal public testimony, the Board extended the closing date to receive additional written public testimony to February 26, 2018.

The attached memorandum (Attachment A) includes a public comment matrix with staff responses for the Board's consideration prior to the June 11, 2018 Board of County Commissioner regular meeting.

### **Attachments:**

Attachment A - Memorandum to the Board of County Commissioners



**MEMORANDUM**

DATE: April 26, 2018  
TO: Board of County Commissioners  
FROM: Darren Gurnee, Department of Community Development (DCD) Planner  
RE: 2018 Code Update: Maximum Lot Size Regulations in Urban Growth Areas

---

On February 12, 2018, the Kitsap County Board of Commissioners held a public hearing to consider amendments to the Kitsap County Code Title 17 Zoning. The purpose of the hearing was to consider two exemptions to current maximum lot size requirements in unincorporated Urban Growth Areas (17.420.060 A.25 KCC). At the conclusion of the hearing, the Board extended the closing date to receive additional written public testimony to February 26, 2018.

The table below represents the cumulative testimony and comments received on this matter through February 26, 2018. It is provided for your consideration prior to the June 11, 2018 Board of County Commissioner regular meeting.

The public comments received are summarized by category. The table includes the Department's response to each comment.

Detailed individual comments are provided at the end of the document.

---

Darren Gurnee, Planner

4/26/2018

---

Date

cc: Louisa Garbo, DCD Director, Jim Bolger, Asst. Director, Dave Ward, Planning and Environmental Programs Manager, Scott Diener, DCD Development Services Manager, Lisa Nickel, Deputy Prosecuting Attorney



# Kitsap County Department of Community Development

Board of County Commissioner Public Comment Matrix: SUMMARY AND RESPONSE			
BoCC = Board of County Commissioners comment period			
PC = Planning Commission comment period			
Issue Ref. No.	Comment Number(s) (BoCC)	Summary of Concern (See comment matrix below for detailed comments)	Staff Response
1	13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 25, 27, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 49  PC 3, PC 5	<p><b><u>Remove the footnote:</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed language is only a step in the correct direction</li> <li>- property owners should be allowed to build a home without subdividing</li> <li>- county infrastructure cannot handle the growth</li> <li>- forcing density immediately is not the solution for growth</li> <li>- forcing subdivision is expensive, increases housing costs, and does not incentivize development – not a reasonable measure</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Change not recommended</u></b></p> <p>The code requirements were established in 2016 as a “reasonable measure” and impacts approximately 422 vacant parcels within unincorporated Urban Growth Areas. The proposed code amendment would reduce the number of parcels impacted to 199. The proposed amendment intends to reduce the creation of lots encumbered by critical areas and protects natural resources by reducing the potential for reasonable use exemptions. Adding additional flexibility for projects that meet minimum density requirements also helps to ensure livable urban communities that offer a variety of housing choices.</p>
2	13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 33, 34, 36, 37, 39, 42, 43  PC 2, PC 5	<p><b><u>Remove the 9,000 s.f. maximum lot size restriction when subdividing</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Lot sizes are too small</li> <li>- Makes future redevelopment more expensive</li> <li>- Lot size constrains a site to not allow for single level construction (aging in place).</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Change not recommended</u></b></p> <p>The intent of a 9,000 s.f. maximum lot size is to ensure that minimum density is met when subdivision occurs.</p>

<b>Board of County Commissioner Public Comment Matrix: SUMMARY AND RESPONSE</b>			
BoCC = Board of County Commissioners comment period PC = Planning Commission comment period			
Issue Ref. No.	Comment Number(s) (BoCC)	Summary of Concern (See comment matrix below for detailed comments)	Staff Response
3	29, 37  PC 5	<p><b><u>Modify language to “contiguous” net developable area</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Large parcels or uniquely shaped parcels may have non-contiguous net developable areas that exceed the 18,000 square foot threshold; however, the individual developable areas are not suitable for subdivision.</li> <li>- A property owner should be allowed to waive future development rights for non-contiguous net developable areas that are unsuitable for development. The area where development rights are waived should be considered in the calculation of net developable area.</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Change not recommended</u></b></p> <p>The Department is considering a future administrative waiver option for parcels that are not suitable for subdivision due to physical constraints. This change would require additional analysis, public review, and consideration by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners.</p>

<b>Board of County Commissioner Public Comment Matrix: SUMMARY AND RESPONSE</b>			
BoCC = Board of County Commissioners comment period PC = Planning Commission comment period			
Issue Ref. No.	Comment Number(s) (BoCC)	Summary of Concern (See comment matrix below for detailed comments)	Staff Response
4	45	<p><b><u>Deny the proposed change from gross acreage to net developable acreage</u></b></p> <p>- Intent of the existing footnote is to ensure that large urban lots meet minimum density requirements as a response to a growth management hearings board decision. Granting relief through a gross to net threshold calculation will reduce the effectiveness of this reasonable measure.</p>	<p><b><u>Change not recommended</u></b></p> <p>The intent of requiring a subdivision is to ensure that minimum density is met but not at the expense of increased impacts to critical areas. The proposed amendment is intended to reduce the creation of lots encumbered by critical areas. In doing so it protects natural resources by reducing the potential for reasonable use exemptions.</p> <p>The proposed amendment is also intended to allow development to meet minimum density without subdivision.</p>
5	37	<p><b><u>Add exemption for substandard access</u></b></p> <p>- Parcels without the necessary access for subdivision requirements should not be required to subdivide (eg. substandard access easement)</p>	<p><b><u>Change not recommended</u></b></p> <p>See staff response to issue # 3</p>
6	16, 33, 34, 35, 37, 39, 40, 47, 49, 50  PC 4	<p><b><u>Add exemption for no-sewer access or lack of infrastructure</u></b></p> <p>- Parcels more than 200 feet away from sewer lines are typically served by septic systems and won't support a subdivision.</p>	<p><b><u>Change not recommended</u></b></p> <p>See staff response to issue # 3</p>

<b>Board of County Commissioner Public Comment Matrix: SUMMARY AND RESPONSE</b>			
BoCC = Board of County Commissioners comment period PC = Planning Commission comment period			
Issue Ref. No.	Comment Number(s) (BoCC)	Summary of Concern (See comment matrix below for detailed comments)	Staff Response
7	41, 28, 29, 31, 33, 34, 35, 37, 39, 40, 46, 49  PC 5	<b><u>Add exemption for parcels unsuitable for subdivision due to shape and condition</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Long and narrow parcels or other parcel shapes with on-site conditions make some parcels not suitable for subdivision.</li> <li>- Existing drainfields and wells</li> <li>- Original plat requirements don't allow for subdivision</li> <li>- Waiver to not develop other areas of the parcel</li> </ul>	<b><u>Change not recommended</u></b> See staff response to issue # 3
8	21, 50	<b><u>Add exemption for church owned properties</u></b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A requirement to subdivide makes it difficult for expansion of church uses.</li> </ul>	<b><u>Change not recommended</u></b> The department is considering a future administrative waiver option for non-residential, permitted and conditionally permitted land uses such as churches, schools, and public facilities. This change would require additional analysis, public review, and consideration by the Planning Commission and Board of County Commissioners.
9	33, 34	<b><u>Reduced fees</u></b> for property owners that are required to subdivide through this regulation.	A fee schedule for permits is established annually by the Board of County Commissioners. Potential fee reductions may be considered at that time.

<b>Board of County Commissioner Public Comment Matrix: SUMMARY AND RESPONSE</b>			
BoCC = Board of County Commissioners comment period PC = Planning Commission comment period			
Issue Ref. No.	Comment Number(s) (BoCC)	Summary of Concern (See comment matrix below for detailed comments)	Staff Response
10	45	<p><b><u>Add a reasonable measure</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Intent of the existing footnote is to ensure that large urban lots meet minimum density requirements as a response to a growth management hearings board decision. If parcels are granted relief from this measure, another should be adopted to balance the action.</li> </ul>	<p>The proposed amendment is intended to allow developments to meet minimum density without completing a subdivision.</p> <p>The intent of requiring a subdivision is to ensure that minimum density is met but not at the expense of increased impacts to critical areas. The proposed amendment is intended to reduce the creation of lots encumbered by critical areas. In doing so it protects natural resources by reducing the potential for reasonable use exemptions.</p>
11	14	<p><b><u>Restrict new development</u></b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- prohibit new construction until all previously developed land meets its full development potential</li> <li>- “Any lot being newly developed should be limited in percentage of trees cut for building purposes. I suggest only 1% of trees be felled”</li> </ul>	<p><b><u>Change not recommended:</u></b></p> <p>The suggestion is outside the scope of the proposed code change. The department recommends that a new code update suggestion be added to the code update list through the online submittal form at:  <a href="https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/Pages/Code_Updates_Main.aspx">https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/Pages/Code_Updates_Main.aspx</a></p>
12	19	<p>“We need a change in the Manchester Village Commercial zone to include residential”</p>	<p><b><u>Change not recommended</u></b></p> <p>The suggestion is outside the scope of the proposed code changes. The department recommends that a new code update suggestion be added to the code update list through the online submittal form at:  <a href="https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/Pages/Code_Updates_Main.aspx">https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/Pages/Code_Updates_Main.aspx</a></p>

<b>Board of County Commissioner Public Comment Matrix: SUMMARY AND RESPONSE</b>			
BoCC = Board of County Commissioners comment period			
PC = Planning Commission comment period			
Issue Ref. No.	Comment Number(s) (BoCC)	Summary of Concern (See comment matrix below for detailed comments)	Staff Response
13	PC 3, PC5	<b><u>Add exemption for shadowplating</u></b> Shadowplating should be allowed instead of a recorded subdivision	<b><u>Change not recommended</u></b> Preplanning or "shadowplating" was established as part of Kitsap County Code until the development regulations were removed as a reasonable measure "to encourage sewer connection and urban densities sooner" as stated in the Kitsap County August 2007 Buildable Lands Report: Appendix C 'Reasonable Measures'.

<b>Board of County Commissioner Public Comment Matrix: DETAILED COMMENTS</b>			
Ref. #	Name	Type	Comments
BoCC 13	Mark S.	Online form	There should be minimum lot sizes but not a maximum. If someone wants a 5 acre lot in the middle of the city, let them have it. Lot sizes have grown so small that most new developments don't have enough land to even have a yard making the property worthless.
BoCC 14	Frances Sholl	Online form	<p>Any lot being newly developed should be limited in percentage of trees cut for building purposes. I suggest only 1% of trees be felled. Kitsap County has squandered too much of resident trees and the care they give this land for free. Replanting post building (which usually includes denuding the ground of healthy dirt as well) allows too much time to pass before new trees are contributing to regeneration of health to the recently raped ground.</p> <p>Also, I think no construction should commence until all previously developed land is fully utilized. New construction may replace existing structures. And all construction should be carefully monitored to ensure our part of this ailing planet is cared for.</p>

Board of County Commissioner Public Comment Matrix: DETAILED COMMENTS			
Ref. #	Name	Type	Comments
BoCC 15	Kevin	Online form	<p>Thanks for providing comments to my initial submission. Please keep in mind that by having the maximum lot sizes, dwelling units per net residential acre doesn't take into consideration the number of people living within a dwelling unit. When looking at trying to build a house on a 9,000 sf lot and trying to accommodate not only a large family, blended family, and situations where family members who would typically be on their own are not due to health or financial situations, it is relatively difficult to build what meets the family needs with the other site development requirements (setbacks, lot coverage, etc). I fully intend to build a house and anticipate that at some point, my parents or my wife's parents may need to come live with me. They likely won't be able to use stairs as well as most people. I would like to build a house that is more horizontal than vertical and I don't want to get hassled in the building process because of other site requirements.</p> <p>The purpose of the regulation seems well intentioned; however, it doesn't take into consideration the pure economics and other potential zoning category options. When the property is zoned for higher density without having to go through an expensive review process, it will be reasonable to make a higher density project happen. Also, when there is a demand for additional housing and there isn't the land to make it happen, redevelopment and higher density zoning will happen to meet the demand. There is plenty of open land within the Cities to meet housing needs when the market gets there, there's no need to encourage small-lot single-family residential housing when apartment/condo living could be a better choice for some people. Also, large lot parcels provide more of an open space environment making it less expensive to redevelop into higher-density housing projects in the future (ie cheaper to knock down one house on a five acre parcel than to knock down 20 houses). There would be a lot more people displaced under this requirement if the property is later rezoned to commercial or industrial. There doesn't seem to be any consideration in the proposed code to the type of zoning or for future land use designations for this lot subdivision requirement. To a large extent, the City not the County should be pushing for urban densities, so that</p>

Board of County Commissioner Public Comment Matrix: DETAILED COMMENTS			
Ref. #	Name	Type	Comments
			projects can be built to City (urban) standards. If the County is doing all the leg work for the City, why would the City need their own planning department except for redevelopment.

<b>Board of County Commissioner Public Comment Matrix: DETAILED COMMENTS</b>			
Ref. #	Name	Type	Comments
BoCC 16	Eric Evans	Online form	<p>Kitsap Public Health is in support of the following action for Amendment ID #1:</p> <p>Provide exemptions from the subdivision requirements for lots over 18,000 square feet in Urban Growth Areas.</p> <p>When the lot to be developed in the urban area is served by septic, the lot size requirements does not meet the minimum lot sizes required for septic. In some cases the lot size requirements will cause the property to not be buildable if a septic solution cannot be found.</p>
BoCC 17	Charles F. DeCosta	Online form	<p>It appears that limiting what I can or have to put on my Property is a outrageous law and should not be enacted. Telling me I have to have one house on every 18,000 Sq Ft of land is outrageous. I own 2.5 acres and would have to subdivide my lot and build more homes on it if this law is passed. Why can not I only have one home on my 2.5 acres of land? There are way too many unnecessary regulations restricting what I can do with my property, even regulating my front porch design ridiculous.</p>
BoCC 18	Anthony Tucci	Online form	<p>I don't see how Kitsap County infrastructure can handle any growth. Lets slow down and stand back take a look at "development and progress" The addition of a few parks only makes our area better for tourists and visitors, which residents don't want only business owners, who are the same folks that whine about all "these people" on our roads. Kitsap still has a quality of life that is getting rare to find lets do our best to keep it, I'm sure we'll be happy we did.</p>
BoCC 19	Frank Tweten	Online form	<p>We need a change in the MVC to include residential Density.</p>
BoCC 20	Teri Laffan	Online form	
BoCC 21	Dale Phipps	Online form	<p>I am suggesting that the code updates include an exemption for Church properties. As some churches own a single property that is divided into several lots... this would make future development for church use difficult. Thanks for your consideration.</p>

Board of County Commissioner Public Comment Matrix: DETAILED COMMENTS			
Ref. #	Name	Type	Comments
BoCC 22	Linda Fischer	Online form	<p>MY POSITION: If you want Kitsap County to look like Seattle then don't show up to this meeting. If Kitsap County had any reasonable economic development success we wouldn't have to slice up our land in tiny lots to provide an economic engine for growth.</p> <p>MY ARGUMENT: Lots sizes are too small. Lots are too small for children to have a back yard play area. Not all parents have the physical ability to go down to a "planned area park" . Many parents want their children close to home for play. Today's builders provide such small back yard areas that Swing sets, sandboxes, climbing areas, wading pools including other backyard toys or even hot tubs or BBQ's (too close to exterior walls R fire hazards) are not options for those purchasing these homes. This is a travesty of epic proportions. It's like individualized apartment living when you can stand between two houses and touch each homes exterior walls by outstretching your arms. I have done this in Poulsbo. Then on top of the limited space between homes; you add a postage stamp back yard; you have children who simply have no place to grow and play. The alternative is a sedentary childhood with E-readers, electronics TV or a home grown gamer on PC's. It is a cultural change and has physiological changes forced upon our children as much as it is anything else.</p>
BoCC 23	KENNETH PATTON	Online Form	<p>WRT Kitsap County Code Title 17:Zoning.</p> <p>My property has a vacant lot adjacent to the lot that my house is on. This vacant lot contains the secondary drain field for my septic system. This lot is classified by the County as a 'garbage' lot, and as such is not deemed appropriate for construction. Regardless, as I stated, this lot is the designed back-up drain field. In the event of a situation where we have to sell this house, that lot will be part of the package deal. I do not want to EVER have to divide this parcel up! In the event of my passing, I NEVER want my wife to have to be encumbered with legal issues or constraints when she has to sell.</p>

<b>Board of County Commissioner Public Comment Matrix: DETAILED COMMENTS</b>			
Ref. #	Name	Type	Comments
BoCC 24	Kurt Russel	Verbal Testimony	Supports the amendment but wants clarification about the 9,000 sf. maximum lot size for subdivisions
BoCC 25	Richard Witty	Verbal Testimony	First time hearing about the 18,000 threshold for subdivision was the postcard. Original plat plan has a standing requirement and shouldn't be subdivided
BoCC 26	Kelli Holt	Verbal Testimony	Property was on the market Feb 2, has pulled it off the market after postcard. Home in family for 50+ years and already subdivided on 4 lots. House is designed with approved septic, received 4 different responses from each planner and wants further discussion about her situation. House location designed to be centrally located.
BoCC 27	Suzan Anderson	Verbal and Written Testimony	Supports extension of the public comment period - public may not be aware of the amendment, parcels may be affected: owns heavily wooded 5 acre parcel, 1.9 acre parcel with 100 yr old house, 1 acre parcel with remains of chicken coop, understands the need for increased density in urban areas but doesn't know if forcing the issue immediately is the solution, supports protection of critical areas  <a href="https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/DAS-ECOPY2 SMTP via LDAP 02-15-2018 14-19-25.pdf">https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/DAS-ECOPY2 SMTP via LDAP 02-15-2018 14-19-25.pdf</a>
BoCC 28	George Post	Verbal Testimony	Owns 5 lots north of Riddel that are not suitable for subdivision, very steep, and shouldn't be required to do so
BoCC 29	Gary Chrey	Verbal Testimony	Provided correspondence for the commissioners, requesting additional relief. Owns a long and narrow parcel on Rocky Point 1.64 acres, steep slopes, waterfront, 90 feet wide and 800 feet deep with steep slope terrain in multiple locations except near the shoreline. Urban Low Residential not suitable for this property. Wants commissioners to direct staff to meet with the property owners to craft individual land owner solutions. No relief after spending money on surveys if determination is that more than 18,000 s.f. available. Suggests that a signed waiver to not develop areas should count towards calculation of net developable area. Will submit 3 pages of notes to staff and each commissioner.

<b>Board of County Commissioner Public Comment Matrix: DETAILED COMMENTS</b>			
Ref. #	Name	Type	Comments
BoCC 30	Mark Winger	Verbal Testimony	Received the card 1 week ago. Owns 4 contiguous parcels .82 ac, .91 ac, .88 ac, and 2 ac that may be affected. Single Family Home should be allowed on any of the parcels without subdivision, doesn't want to build tract housing.
BoCC 31	Margaret Cramer	Verbal Testimony	Subdivision application from prior owner was denied by Kitsap County. Went forward to develop parcel with one home, septic system designed. Ravine, no sewer, and not suitable for subdivision.
BoCC 32	Mary Serbousek	Verbal Testimony	Property on Riddel road and wants more information about the code update, how it may affect her property
BoCC 33	Alan Beam	Verbal and Written Testimony	The proposed amendment is going in the right direction but should go further. 18,000 s.f. lot size is not big enough to subdivide and the requirement to do so doesn't encourage growth, vacant lot definition needs further clarification, to encourage growth 1) reduce the cost of subdivision 2) accessory dwelling units should be allowed 3) build out the infrastructure.  <a href="https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/DAS-ECOPY2 SMTP via LDAP 02-15-2018 14-19-25.pdf">https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/DAS-ECOPY2 SMTP via LDAP 02-15-2018 14-19-25.pdf</a>
BoCC 34	Bill Palmer	Verbal Testimony	Opposed to the reasonable measure when originally proposed in 2016. The proposed amendment is going in the right direction but should go further. Incentives should be the mechanism used to entice development in Urban Growth Areas. 18,000 s.f. lot size is not big enough to subdivide and the requirement to do so doesn't encourage growth, vacant lot definition needs further clarification, to encourage growth 1) reduce the cost of subdivision 2) accessory dwelling units should be allowed 3) build out the infrastructure 4) reduce critical area buffers, only 35 feet is needed. Sewer availability should be considered when requiring a subdivision, Health district requires 20,000 s.f. lot to develop with a septic system.

Board of County Commissioner Public Comment Matrix: DETAILED COMMENTS			
Ref. #	Name	Type	Comments
BoCC 35	KC Patton	Verbal Testimony	Rocky Point property. Many lands in the area are undeveloped b/c there is no sewer and soils are terrible for septic systems. Had to construct septic system on an adjacent lot. If he or his wife need to sell in the future, they should be able to sell without separating the lots and requiring subdivision. No sewer in Tracyton, subdivision should not be required. Code development does cost developers, reference to staff required to attend the meeting.
BoCC 36	Jackie Rossworn	Verbal and Written Testimony	9,000 s.f. lot size is too small for Kitsap County. The county should consider the potential need to "buyback" properties for public use and services in areas that are urbanizing (eg. parks or plazas). Forcing subdivision now will only increase the cost of this "buyback". Growth Management Act not always correct, requirement to subdivide is not appropriate, it will take away from the beauty of the county.  <a href="https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/DAS-ECOPY2 SMTP via LDAP 02-15-2018 14-19-25.pdf">https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/DAS-ECOPY2 SMTP via LDAP 02-15-2018 14-19-25.pdf</a>
BoCC 37	Timothy Poe	Verbal and Written Testimony	Purchased 1.2 acre property in Tracyton in 2017. No sewer, qualified for and designed a drainfield and well. Constructed the well, tree removal, and is now \$135K invested. Existing code requirements result of following GMA and lack of communication with the property owners. Wouldn't have known about this except for the postcard notification. Spoke to multiple people at the county and received different answers, didn't understand why he wasn't informed of this requirement when the tree removal permit was processed, or when he obtained permits through Kitsap Public Health, or why the real estate agents were unaware of the requirement to subdivide when marketing the property in 2017. Property is land locked with a 20 foot access easement, informed that for a subdivision he would need 30 foot access easement and construct improvements. Doesn't want to be a developer, just wants to build his dream home, exemptions for this situation should be adopted.

Board of County Commissioner Public Comment Matrix: DETAILED COMMENTS			
Ref. #	Name	Type	Comments
			<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The DCD confirmed that a minimum 30 ft wide roadway is required to meet the low density subdivision requirement currently on our lot. Unfortunately, the only access to our lot is via a 20 ft wide access/utility easement on the neighbor's adjoining lot. There is no other potential access from our lot to Tracyton Blvd. or any other public roadway. We ask that the requirement for subdivision be eliminated for properties like ours with inadequate/no adequate easement access.</li> <li>2. The 18,000 sq ft lot size, now under consideration, should be defined as contiguous. Encumbrances and setbacks should be factored when determining the net developable lot size. Because our lot is only 111 feet wide, both the well on our property and the neighbor's well adjacent to our southern property line will greatly reduce buildable divisions. Additionally, once setbacks are placed for septic drain field(s), stormwater mitigation, roadways/driveways, sidewalks, and any open space considerations, buildable space will be severely restricted.</li> </ol>
BoCC 38	Rita Hagwell	Verbal Testimony	Surrounded by development and has been pressured with intimidation.
BoCC 39	Larry Meyers	Verbal Testimony	Subdivision into 3 lots (4 way stop @ the fairgrounds), 1 parcel is undeveloped. No sewer available, 9,000 s.f. lot size doesn't allow for septic, subdivision should not be required.
BoCC 40	Robin Richardson	Online	Shoreline parcel on Rocky Point doesn't allow for septic or home. Steep slopes. Parcel not suitable for subdivision. Short plat should be optional, not required. Outreach should have been conducted earlier and been more effective. County website is extremely difficult to navigate and find information - search function does not render any results that are useful.

Board of County Commissioner Public Comment Matrix: DETAILED COMMENTS			
Ref. #	Name	Type	Comments
BoCC 41	Gary Chrey	Written	<a href="https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/Chrey_Gary_2018_0214.msg">https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/Chrey_Gary_2018_0214.msg</a> <a href="https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/Chrey_Gary_2018_0214_EA1.pdf">https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/Chrey_Gary_2018_0214_EA1.pdf</a> <a href="https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/Chrey_Gary_2018_0214_EA2.pdf">https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/Chrey_Gary_2018_0214_EA2.pdf</a>
BoCC 42	Linda Fischer	Written	<a href="https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/Fischer_Linda_2018_0213.msg">https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/Fischer_Linda_2018_0213.msg</a>
BoCC 43	Linda Fischer	Written	<a href="https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/Fischer_Linda_2018_0215.msg">https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/Fischer_Linda_2018_0215.msg</a>
BoCC 44	Rita Hagwell	Written	<a href="https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/Hagwell_Rita_2018_0215_EA.pdf">https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/Hagwell_Rita_2018_0215_EA.pdf</a>
BoCC 45	Jerry Harless	Written	<a href="https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/Harless_Jerry_2018_0124_EA.pdf">https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/Harless_Jerry_2018_0124_EA.pdf</a>
BoCC 46	Dennis and Willo Huard	Written	<a href="https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/Huard_2018_0212_EA.pdf">https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/Huard_2018_0212_EA.pdf</a>
BoCC 47	Bob Simpson	Written	<a href="https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/Simpson_Bob_2018_0214_EA.pdf">https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/Simpson_Bob_2018_0214_EA.pdf</a>
BoCC 48	KBA	Written	<a href="https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/KBA_2018_0222_EA.pdf">https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/KBA_2018_0222_EA.pdf</a>
BoCC 49	Margaret Cramer	Written	<a href="https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/Cramer_Margaret_2018_0226.pdf">https://spf.kitsapgov.com/dcd/PEP%20Documents/Cramer_Margaret_2018_0226.pdf</a>
BoCC 50	Terry Painter	Verbal Testimony	Sewer system is the problem. Church at top of the hill at Sylvan Way. Desires expansion but sewer availability makes it infeasible. Request that the county invest in sewer and sidewalks to serve parcels.

Planning Commission Written and Verbal Public Comment Matrix			
Ref. #	Name	Type	Comments
PC 1	Mark Isis	In-Person at 11/14/2017 Public Hearing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proposals appear to be developed in a vacuum</li> <li>- Maximum lot size: how many parcels are affected by current code, how many would be affected by proposed code, staff should be providing this information, entire requirement should be removed</li> <li>- Staff should provide more analysis so that an informed recommendation can be made by planning commission</li> </ul>
PC 2	Kevin	Online	The maximum lot size exemption shouldn't have been implemented to begin with. If I own vacant land, I should be able to build a single-family dwelling without having to go through the process of subdividing. The net result is having to have unnecessary multiple taxable parcels, which are not guaranteed to be built on, but they sure as heck will be taxed like that. Setbacks and other development restrictions will limit the buildable area. There are too many two-story houses in this community and not enough opportunity for property owners to build something that suits them so they can grow old in place. I hope you end up in a nursing home, because you can't climb the stairs in your house, for even thinking this is a good idea.

Planning Commission Written and Verbal Public Comment Matrix			
Ref. #	Name	Type	Comments
PC 3	Pat Fuhrer	Online	<p>I think that this maximum lot size exemption is a carry over from the legacy lot aggregation Staff proposal during the Comp Plan Update last year.....it is NOT a Reasonable Measure to promote density in the UGA, and will affect citizens who own larger parcels in the subject zones adversely if they plan on building a single home, by FORCING them to do an expensive subdivision, which leads to street frontage improvements, additional storm water improvements, extending sewer mains in the streets, etc.</p> <p>It is NOT a reasonable measure because property owners are not going to do be able to pencil these small subdivisions!</p> <p>If Staff feels that this is a MANDATE from the Growth Management Gurus up on-high and there is no way around the max. lot size.....then lets go back to the pre-plan submittal days of yore, and show how a large parcel MAY be further divided in the future, and require their proposed building to comply with the pre-plan..... and ditch the maximum lot size idea please!</p>
PC 4	Chris Ehlert	Online	I own a .94 acre (UL) 5-9 dwellings per acre lot and would like exceptions. There is no sewer nearby and I have type 4 soils with public water source. There should be exceptions if there is no sewer nearby. The health department requires 18,000 sq. feet minimum for a single family home septic with type 4 soils and a public water source.
PC 5	Gary Chrey	Online and Email	<p>Greetings,</p> <p>I am the owner of Kitsap County tax parcel number 032401-3-095-2004 which is zoned Urban Low Residential and is located in the Rocky Point area of Kitsap County. This email is submitted as a comment regarding the consideration by the Kitsap County Planning Commission and the Kitsap County Board of Commissioners of the proposed revision to the Maximum Lot Size language of Section 17.420.060 A.25 of the Kitsap County Code. I have included with this email as an attachment a copy of the Staff Report for the Planning Commission dated November 6, 2017 that was prepared for the hearing</p>

Planning Commission Written and Verbal Public Comment Matrix			
Ref. #	Name	Type	Comments
			<p>that was held on November 14, 2017 for your convenient reference. Please confirm receipt of this email by return email. Kitsap County implemented this Code provision as a Reasonable Measure to induce more building permits to be issued in the Urban Growth Areas. The proposed revision is proposed to clarify issues that have arisen from the implementation of the initial code provision. For example, if the owner proposes an apartment building on a lot in one of these zones that achieved the gross density allowed by the zone (maximum density, gross acreage times maximum density of the zone), the current code does not recognize that the density goals would be achieved in the absence of a subdivision. As far as the addition of the proposed “net developable area” clause is concerned, it is my understanding that this has already been implemented in practicality because the subdivision standards address minimum required density as being based upon the net developable area. Net developable area is defined as the gross parcel area minus critical areas, roads, storm water management tracts, community drainfields, recreational tracts and so forth. Therefore, it appears that the proposed revisions only provide clarification of the requirement without really addressing the problem. As previously stated, Kitsap County proposed this code element as a Reasonable Measure to achieve a higher ratio of building permits issued in the Urban Growth Areas. The GMA goal is that 90% of building permits should be issued in Urban Growth Areas and therefore less than 10% should be issued in rural areas.</p> <p>It is clear that the proposed revisions do not improve this ineffective and counterproductive code provision. Other jurisdiction have addressed this issue through “preplanning” which requires that the home be positioned on the lot so that the minimum density of the zone can be achieved with a future subdivision. Kitsap County once allowed preplanning but did not have a good experience and deleted the option years ago. Perhaps this provision should be brought back with better application by DCD to avoid the previous problems. As an alternative, perhaps Kitsap County should consider allowing 2 or 3 lot short plats as needed to achieve this minimum density</p>

Planning Commission Written and Verbal Public Comment Matrix			
Ref. #	Name	Type	Comments
			<p>pursuant to an over the counter same day permit. Another alternative would be for this provision to recognize elements such as availability of sanitary sewer or othe Another alternative would be for this provision to recognize elements such as availability of sanitary sewer or other infrastructure required to achieve densities related to 9000 SF lot sizes. For example, should the provision be limited to parcels within 200 feet of an existing sanitary sewer? At the end of the day, perhaps the most straightforward solution would be for this provision to be repealed in its entirety.</p> <p>Please do not hesitate to email or call with any questions.</p> <p>Thank you for your consideration.</p> <p>GARY T. CHREY chrey@shierslaw.com</p>