



Introduction to the Planning Commission Public Response Comment Matrix: PART 1

This Comment Response Matrix includes all public comments received during the Kitsap County Planning Commission comment period of August 20, 2021 – September 21, 2021 and extended to September 24, 2021 by Planning Commission on September 21, 2021. The comments are organized by commenter, summary of comments received and Department response. Column one is the number of the comment. Column two indicates the name and organization, if applicable, of the commenter. The Summary of Comment column includes a summary of each public comment. The Department Response column indicates whether a change to the proposed code amendment is recommended and associated rationale. The full written comment letters have previously been transmitted to the Planning Commission in advance of the October 5, 2021 meeting. Additionally, given the volume of comments received, Department comment responses will be distributed in two phases to ensure adequate time to address comments received. Specifically, this is Part 1 roll-out of Department responses. Responses to topics **Highlighted yellow** notes where Department responses are pending. It is the Department goal to respond to all comments received during the comment period by the Planning Commission’s October 19 meeting.

Planning Commission Public Comment Matrix: DETAILED COMMENTS				
Ref #	Name (Org)	Type	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
PC 1	Ron Cleaver	Online	Combining "Engineering and Construction Offices" with "General office and management services" is automatically restricting permitted use to less than 4,000 SF in Urban Industrial Zones. Please either; 1. Make all sizes in UI "P" or 2. Keep as separate classification. All "General Office" classes should be "P" in Urban Industrial anyways.	The Department recommends changing the proposal to allow General office and management services 4,000 sf or greater through an Administrative Conditional Use Permit (ACUP). Smaller engineering and construction offices are still allowed as a permitted use. Larger projects require an ACUP which allows the Department to require conditions of approval. These conditions of approval can mitigate potential nuisances such as light, sound, general aesthetics, traffic, water provisions, or sewer provisions, as it relates to impacts to neighboring properties. Department Proposed Revision Revise categorical use number 270 to change the permissibility from prohibited to "ACUP" in the IND zone.
PC 2	Berni Kenworthy (Kitsap PUD)	Email	Supports the proposed changed to split public facilities into two categorical uses and reducing the level of permit review required for smaller facilities.	The Department recommends change as proposed in current draft. Comment noted. Thank you for your feedback regarding public facilities during the update process.
PC 3	Nathan Daniel (Greater Peninsula Conservancy)	Online	17.110.165Club. "Club" means a place where an association of persons or 501 C3 non-profits organized for some common purpose to meet. This definition may include a clubhouse."	The Department recommends changing the proposal as suggested. Department Proposed Revision Revise definition 17.110.165 <i>Club</i> to ""Club" means a place where an association of persons or 501 C3 non-profits organized for some common purpose to meet. This definition may include a clubhouse"

PC 4	Katherine Koch	Online	Revise the standards to allow larger sizes for Accessory Dwelling Units, attached and detached or allow building a second home on all properties.	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>Consistent with the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) established in 1990, development within an Urban Growth Areas (UGA) must be “urban” which in incorporated Kitsap County can range from a minimum of one dwelling unit per acre (for developmentally constrained zones) up to 19 dwelling units per acre depending on the urban comprehensive plan designation and zoning classification in the applicable unincorporated UGA.</p> <p>In rural areas outside of Limited Areas of More Intense Rural Developments (LAMIRD), the minimum parcel size is the result of litigation over the appropriate size of rural parcels. As such, Kitsap County minimum parcel size for rural zones were set as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 5 acres in Rural Residential (RR) (1 unit/5 acres); • 10 acres in Rural Protection (RP) (1 unit/10 acres); • 20 acres in Rural Wooded (RW) (1 unit/20 acres); and • 40 acres in Forest Resource Lands (FRL) (1 unit/40 acres). <p>Any increase to the number of dwelling units allowed on one parcel in a rural zone would be inconsistent with GMA. Keep in mind that an accessory dwelling unit can be constructed as a second home on most parcels, subject to size and other restrictions to clearly identify it as accessory to the primary residential dwelling unit.</p>
PC 5	Nick Bond (City of Port Orchard)	Email + Attachment	<p>Manufactured/Mobile/RV/Park-Model/Tiny Home Park:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Separate these building types, vehicles, and trailers, into individual categorical uses. • Do not include recreational vehicles as part of the dwelling unit definition. • Inconsistency with RCW 58.17.040 State Subdivision Act • Find a method to ensure that these facilities are distributed evenly in all areas of the County, possible overlay district. • Kitsap County needs to acknowledge the need to manage, inspect, and monitor the condition of the existing stock of these projects for code compliance and life safety issues. • Only allow this use for non-profit organizations, not private ownership <p>Recreation Vehicle Camping Park</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Keep this as a separate categorical use as shown in the existing use tables. • Maintain the existing definition. <p>Places of worship and Schools</p>	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>One of the project goals of this effort is to reduce housing barriers in UGAs consistent with GMA and the County Comprehensive Plan. Additionally, in March 2020, the Kitsap County Human Services Department and City of Bremerton issued a Housing Affordability and Availability Report which included information on needed housing units at a variety of income levels countywide. The Draft Buildable Lands Report findings also noted a need to achieve adopted growth targets, etc.</p> <p>Kitsap County zoning code’s current definitions of manufactured and mobile homes do not violate state law and do not require amendment. The current draft ordinance does not include changes to the definitions of manufactured homes or mobile homes. State law has multiple definitions of manufactured and mobile homes which do not, unfortunately, all match, including in RCW 35.63.160, RCW 43.22.335, WAC 296-150M-0020, RCW 43.22A.010, RCW 46.04.302, RCW 59.20.030, RCW 59.30.020, RCW 65.20.020, and RCW 82.45.032.</p> <p>Some of the requirements captured in some of the various state definitions are captured in the standards in 17.415.305. The uses were consolidated for the ease of</p>

- Keep the existing Conditional Use Permit (CUP) review requirement for these uses.

the reviewers and applicants and to allow a greater diversity of housing types available for a range of incomes.

The Department does not support a quota, proximity, or any other system to regulate location and number of the proposed Manufactured/Mobile/RV/Park-Model/Tiny Home Park use. The zones where this use is allowed are distributed throughout the county. Nor does the Department regulate landowner intent, though the Department would be supportive of non-profit or community-led ownership models, that will not be the only model allowed.

Department Response pending regarding Subdivision Act

Additionally, code compliance is a separate issue from permitting and standards associated with issuing permits. Kitsap County’s code compliance system is complaint driven. If there are any code compliance concerns, please submit complaints/requests for code compliance inspections to [Kitsap 1](#).

Port Orchard’s current SEPA appeal is ongoing litigation. In accordance with chapter 21.04 KCC, current applications are vested to development code at the time of application completeness.

To improve internal consistency with the proposed changes to other applicable Titles, the Department recommends repeal of Kitsap County Code Chapter 6.16 Mobile Home Parks. Because Recreational vehicle camping park is no longer in the use table, the Department recommends repealing that definition as well.

Department Proposed Revision

- Repeal Chapter 6.16 ‘Mobile home parks’.
- Repeal definition 17.110.655 ‘Recreational Vehicle Camping Park’

In regards to schools, the zoning use table update was about removing barriers to development, and to that end, moving schools and places of worship, depending on size to appropriate lower level of review, specifically to a Type II decision as an Administrative CUP helps move the process along. As a Type II decision, notification is still required, and conditions of approval may still be placed upon the project. The difference between an ACUP (Type II decision) and a CUP (Type III decision) is the decision authority (Type II requires Hearings Examiner approval following a public hearing). The applicant shouldn’t have to go through a higher level of land use review

				if not necessary and can be accommodated through an ACUP review.
PC 6	Greg Englin (Port of Kingston)	Email + Attachment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add a new definition for an “Urban Port” to read as follows: <u>17.110.729 “Urban Port” means a Port District with public taxing authority established under RCW 53.04.010 that is located within a designated unincorporated Urban Growth Area that operates an existing marina and that owns, manages, and maintains properties that are contiguous to or near the waterfront for the purposes of economic development.</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Proposed definition would apply to certain uses in the UL zone, such as: • 222 Automobile, recreational vehicle or boat rentals: Change the permit review requirements from prohibited to an allowed use that requires a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). • 314 Marina support services: Change the permit review requirements from prohibited to an allowed use that requires a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). 	<p><u>The Department recommends changing the proposal</u> to incorporate the Urban Port definition as follows:</p> <p><u>17.110.XXX “Urban Port” means a Port District with public taxing authority established under RCW 53.04.010 that is located within a designated unincorporated Urban Growth Area that operates an existing marina and that owns, manages, and maintains properties that are contiguous to or near the waterfront for the purposes of economic development.</u></p> <p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> regarding the suggested change to allow the following categorical uses in the Urban Low Residential zoning designation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 222 Auto/recreational vehicle/boat rentals; or • 314 marina support services. <p>Changing the permit review requirements in the table as suggested would allow these uses on any parcel with an Urban Low Residential (UL) zoning designation. These uses do not align with the intent of the Urban Low Residential zoning designation or within the existing, adopted SEPA documents. The proposed changes have ramifications to other urban areas outside of Kingston and should be evaluated further to understand potential impacts. The Department is supportive of evaluating an Urban Port overlay as part of the 2024 Comprehensive Plan update.</p>
PC 7	Carol Malmquist	Email	<p>A little clarification please. Under detailed changes there is a section on home business 'incidental' and home business 'minor'</p> <p>Says; permissibility not changing BUT went from ACUP to P on both. I don't understand.</p> <p>Could you add a little more detail for me?</p> <p>Also under detailed changes and definitions the section on nursing homes said 'repealed' along with race tracks and movie theaters. I don't understand the repealed.</p>	<p><u>Thank you for your comments and questions, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>Permissibility for home businesses is already in current zoning code but is found in the footnotes (footnote 53, which referenced Section 17.410.060(B)). To ensure ease of use by applicants and reviewers, these standards were relocated in the Draft Proposal found in 17.415.275. Additionally, the current permissibility of home businesses was also added to the use table as it is often missed given its current location in the zoning code. The proposed draft does not change current code, but merely reorganizes.</p> <p>In the draft proposal, nursing homes, race tracks and movie theaters were all combined into other, more broad uses – movie theaters are captured in “entertainment facility, indoor,” the two previous types of race track (minor and major) were combined as they have similar impact levels, and nursing homes are captured in “group living”. Because the uses no longer exist, their definitions are no longer</p>

				needed, and the way to remove definitions is to repeal them. Similar to home businesses, the uses are still allowed in the draft proposal, just organized differently.
PC 8	Tim Trohimovich (Futurewise)	Email + Attachment	The amendments must limit the uses to the LAMIRDs in which they were located in 1990 and must limit their size and scale of those uses in that LAMIRD in 1990.	Department Response Pending on specific recommendations to LAMIRD allowed uses in the draft proposal.
PC 9	Diane Fish (Conservation District)	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Food and beverage production use seems to prohibit value added farm products production Storage, vehicles and equipment seems to prohibit storage of farm machinery Slaughterhouse or animal processing: Allow as a primary use in the Rural Industrial (RI) and Rural Commercial (RCO) zoning designations through an Administrative Conditional Use Permit (ACUP). Ensure that farmers are allowed to retrofit storage containers to support agricultural activities. Don't make changes that would affect the permissibility of accessory agricultural uses as identified in Chapter 17.455. 	<p><u>One change recommended – thank you for your comment.</u></p> <p>Department proposed revision Revise use 542 Slaughterhouse or animal processing from “C” to “ACUP” in the RI zone.</p> <p>The Zoning Use Table is specifically for primary uses.</p> <p>Food and beverage production as a value-added farm product are still allowed as an accessory use. Proposed changes do not have impacts on accessory uses.</p> <p>Storage, vehicles and equipment is for a primary use. Farm machinery storage is an accessory use to a farm.</p> <p>Slaughterhouse or animal processing is as a primary use. Proposed changes do not affect accessory uses on farms. Staff supports changing from a CUP to an ACUP in the Rural Industrial Zone.</p> <p>Only change for definition of shipping container is to code section number. Accessory uses of shipping containers are not affected by use table update. No changes to permissibility of Storage, indoor in RR zone.</p> <p>No change to definition of Use, only renumbering of code.</p>
PC 10	Carrilu Thompson	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend the Planning Commission public review period and conduct additional outreach for the Manchester community. Thought changes would not impact LAMIRDs 106 Guest Houses: require an Administrative Conditional Use Permit (ACUP) in the Manchester Village Low Residential (MVLRL) and Manchester Village Residential (MVR) zoning designations. 108 Cottage housing development: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only allow as part of a mixed use development project with commercial uses in the Manchester Village 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to extend the Planning Commission public review period.</u></p> <p>The Department provided numerous opportunities to participate through community surveys, presentations to organizations, community workshops (of which two members from Manchester Citizens Advisory Council participated), open house sessions, two virtual meetings, and solicitation for individuals or organizations to request consultations about the proposal all as of July 30, 2021. The Manchester Citizen Advisory Council had a virtual meeting with the Department on July 6, 2021 as well where we offered to meet further to discuss. No request by the MCAC was made. Additionally, the Department held multiple work study sessions with the</p>

- Commercial (MVC) zoning designation.
- Prohibit in MVL and MVR zoning designations.
 - 110 Duplex:
Prohibit in the MVL and MVR zoning designations
 - 262 Day-care center, home-based:
require an ACUP in the MVL and MVR zoning designations.

Planning Commission. These sessions were open to the public and were announced in advance, with specific outreach to Manchester residents and other communities as an opportunity to learn about the project and ask questions for clarification (see attached outreach summary for additional detail) Furthermore, after the Planning Commission deliberates and makes a recommendation, the public will have another opportunity to provide comments during the Board of County Commissioner public review process scheduled for Quarter 1, 2022.

Regarding the allowance of different residential product types in the Manchester zones, the Department proposal updates uses and activities that would be allowed, and the level of permit review (Chapter 17.410, Allowed Uses) in the following areas:

- Unincorporated Urban Growth Areas;
- Limited Areas of More Intensive Rural Development (LAMIRDS); and
- Rural Commercial and Rural Industrial zones.

The proposal also revises the level of permit review to remove economic and housing barriers in the locations noted above and to foster desired outcomes consistent with the County's Comprehensive Plan. This includes allowing a mix of uses, as appropriate, to serve individual communities.

The discussion about whether changes would happen in LAMIRDS was about whether anything had changed from when the zoning use table update process began in 2019 and relaunched in 2021 and if there were differences between what was discussed during the initial public participation phase and when the Department began working towards wrapping up the project, a detailed change document is attached.

Allowed density (as noted in Chapter 17.420) does not change as part of this proposal, nor do zone intent or Comprehensive Plan/Sub-Area Plan policies change. The draft proposal is intended, rather, to implement those guiding principles. Even though certain housing product types are being considered as part of the draft proposal, it does not change the required compliance to density of the zone or other development requirements. The allowed densities are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and various sub-area plans, as well as Chapter 17.420, and will determine the number of units allowed on a given project.

Department Response Pending on specific recommendations to LAMIRD allowed uses in the draft proposal.

The Department does not recommend changing the proposal to require an Administrative Conditional Use Permit (ACUP) for categorical use 262 *Day-care center, home-based* in the MVL and MVR zones. RCW 36.70A.450 prohibits

				jurisdictions from imposing more restrictive requirements on these uses than are imposed on other residential dwellings in the same zone. As such, an ACUP is inappropriate.
PC 11	Cheryl Ebsworth	Email & Online form + Attachment	<p>Revise the following categorical use as follows to allow a single car capacity car wash with a fueling station:</p> <p>#230 Fuel or charging station <u>with accessory car wash limited to a one car capacity</u> and convenience store.</p>	<p>Staff recommends adopting proposed change: Thank you for your comment. While the update is for primary uses, the clarification proposed to allow fuel or charging stations to have an accessory car wash with one car capacity is useful.</p> <p>Department Proposed Revision Revise definition 17.110.291 <i>Fuel or charging station, with convenience store</i> to: “Fuel or charging station, with convenience store” means a facility that provides gasoline and/or diesel fuel, electric vehicle charging stations to retail consumers with a facility that sells convenience goods as a secondary activity and <u>may have an accessory car wash limited to one passenger vehicle capacity.</u></p>
PC 12	Sherri Wender	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 140 Vacation rentals, 1-4 rooms and 142 Vacation rentals, 5 or more rooms: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Require additional notifications to alert neighbors of proposed vacation rentals. ○ Limit the number of people, not rooms. ○ Require approval from neighbors when the rental allows use of community owned property. 	<p>The Department recommends no change to the proposal – thank you for your comment. The changes noted in the draft proposal are for reorganizational purposes. Additionally, the scope of the proposed use table update was never intended to address vacation rentals, which is undergoing a separate code update process, but which has been experiencing delays due COVID. For more information regarding changes to vacation rental code, please visit the Commissioners project website at https://www.kitsapgov.com/BOC_p/Pages/STR.aspx</p> <p>We will also forward your comments to the Commissioners policy staff as they formulate draft revisions to short-term rentals. Any draft changes to development code will require consideration, public hearings, and a comment opportunity before the Planning Commission and finally with the Board of Commissioners. We encourage you to engage in that update process.</p>
PC 13	Kathlene Barnhart (Suquamish Tribe)	Email + Attachment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) in rural areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ ADUs whether Attached or Detached increase density. ○ ADU attached should be considered the same as detached when the impacts to the land are the same such as water provisions or expansion of septic systems. ○ Should require a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) ○ Prohibit ADU’s in rural areas. • Public Facilities: Develop a separate Critical Areas Review permit for all public facilities, large or small • Airport: Revise the definition of an airport by removing “areas of land”, such that the County can also regulate the use of seaplanes. 	<p>The Department recommends no change to the proposal - Thank you for the comments.</p> <p>The proposed revisions to permissibility of urban ADUs are consistent with GMA and the Comprehensive Plan, as well as draft Buildable Lands Report findings. The ALQ revision is consistent to reflect a director’s interpretation issued in 2019 and found at CBO - Accessory Living Quarters Attachment Requirements.pdf (kitsapgov.com). Changing rural ADU standards is outside the scope of this update process but may be a reasonable measure associated with the Buildable Lands Report in upcoming Comprehensive Plan and development regulation updates.</p> <p>The Department recommends no change to the proposal to Public Facilities nor to require a separate CAO permit. Regardless of zoning code permissibility, review for compliance with Title 19 Critical Areas Ordinance is already incorporated as part</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campground: Do not include the “for rent” portion of this definition. • Home Business: Include definitions for what distinguishes a “home business” as ‘incidental’, ‘minor’, and ‘moderate’. • Transportation Terminals-Marine: Add a note that SMP requirements may not permit the use even with ACUP for zoning. This should probably be removed from this table and addressed in the SMP as they are likely to only be permitted within the High Intensity Shoreline Environment Designation. • Top Soil Production and Stump Grinding: The Use Table has added ‘firewood cutting and composting’ and reduced permit review. It should be clarified in the Use Table that this refers only to COMMERCIAL top soil production, stump grinding, firewood cutting and composting. • The amendments must limit the uses to the LAMIRDs in which they were located in 1990 and must limit their size and scale of those uses in that LAMIRD in 1990. 	<p>of the application review process. Even if a proposed use is permitted outright, the Department does conduct a review of critical areas with each building permit application to ensure compliance with Title 19. This also holds true for other development code requirements such as Title 12 (stormwater drainage), Title 15 (flood hazard areas), as well as Title 22 (shoreline master program), Title 14 (buildings and construction) and other applicable requirements in Title 17 (zoning).</p> <p>The Department recommends no change to the proposal regarding Airports. The FAA regulates and has oversight over landing sites. The current SMP adopted June 28, 2021, approved by Ecology on Sept 23, 2021, and effective October 6, 2021 regulates intensity of uses and docks. Any changes to SMP allowed uses should have been brought forward for consideration as part of that process.</p> <p>The Department recommends no change to the proposal regarding the definition of Campground. The definition reference of transitory contemplates non-rental situations.</p> <p>The Department recommends no change to the proposal regarding home businesses. The definition of Home business is broad, and each type of Home business is identified in the standards based on intensity of use, see new section 17.415.275. The draft proposal does not change current code standards, just reorganizes them into a new Special Use Provision chapter and in the use table.</p> <p>The Department recommends no change to the proposal regarding Transportation Terminals Marine. Both the SMP and the zoning code are reviewed for applications on the shoreline.</p> <p>The Department recommends no change to the proposal regarding Top soil production and stump grinding. The zoning use table is for primary uses, the non-commercial uses as identified in the comment letter would be allowed as accessory uses.</p> <p>Department Response Pending on specific recommendations to LAMIRD allowed uses in the draft proposal.</p>
PC 14	Lisa Hurt (Kitsap Environmental Coalition)	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Don’t allow increased development, or intensity of development, until the infrastructure needed to handle that development is in place. • Doesn’t want high density development • Concerned about quality of life and impacts to the 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA) directs that urban growth (higher density and intensity) be located in urban areas to preserve rural character</p>

			<p>environment</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would prefer to make development more difficult, not easier 	<p>and critical areas. The draft proposal does not change requirements noted in the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan, in applicable sub-area plans, nor in implementing development regulations that set minimum and maximum density allowances for each noted (see Kitsap County Code Chapter 17.420).</p> <p>Additionally, we agree growth is happening and will continue to happen according to population projections and targets set by GMA, the Puget Sound Regional Coordinating Council (PSRC) Vision 2050 and ultimately growth targets set in the Kitsap Countywide Planning Policies. Currently, growth projections for both urban and rural areas are set for a planning horizon to 2036. These targets are incorporated into local comprehensive plans and capital facilities on how to accommodate growth. Additionally, local governments are required to have development regulations to implement GMA and comprehensive plans. These include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Title 11: Roads, Highways and Bridges (<i>Reviewed concurrently with the Kitsap County Department of Public Works</i>) · Title 12: Stormwater Drainage · Title 13: Water and Sewers (<i>Reviewed concurrently with the Kitsap County Health District regarding septic and well requirements</i>) · Title 14: Buildings and Construction (<i>Reviewed concurrently with the Kitsap County Fire Marshal regarding structure and fire including emergency access requirements</i>) · Title 15: Flood Hazard Areas (<i>floodplains</i>) · Title 17: Zoning · Title 18: Environment (<i>State Environmental Policy Act</i>) · Title 19: Critical Areas Ordinance (<i>wetlands, streams, aquifers and geological areas</i>) · Title 20: Transportation Concurrency (<i>Reviewed concurrently with the Kitsap County Department of Public Works</i>) · Title 21: Land Use and Development Procedures · Title 22: Shoreline Master Program <p>Applications for new and redevelopment projects are reviewed for consistency with these requirements. As these various elements are updated overtime, we encourage you to participate and welcome your feedback.</p>
<p>PC 15</p>	<p>William Palmer</p>	<p>Verbal</p>	<p>5:50 pm</p> <p>Objects to timeframe for response to comments. 197 page document in July, now it's a 300 page document. Last minute changes make it impossible to review, highly incensed. May as well forget about making comments at Planning Commission</p>	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal.</u> Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>No changes to the draft proposal have been made since its July 30, 2021 release. These changes built off of preliminary discussion drafts that were subject to public outreach efforts conducted in 2019 and 2020. These preliminary drafts are also</p>

			<p>and just give comments to Board of County Commissioners. Most confusing document in the last 20 years. Will be submitting two letters.</p> <p>No tracking for moving it into section 17.415. Most disorganized documents he has been able to review. Don't know where changes come from.</p> <p>6:17 pm</p> <p>Still a procedural issue. Found some proposed changes that is not bolded and underlined (example: multifamily housing design criteria). Confused that there are changes in the rural locations, told previously that the County won't change rural regulations. Need to change Multifamily design guidelines, but what is fair game for review, it's not clear in the instructions for how the document should be reviewed.</p> <p>Doesn't think the changes are supportable or defensible.</p> <p>Affordable housing, every time regulations are added it increases the cost of a house. Incomes in the area don't support increased housing cost. We need to eliminate regulations we don't need.</p>	<p>available on the project website at Zoning Use Table Update (kitsapgov.com). As you can see, in addition to the draft ordinance that follows legislative writing procedures, the Department developed user guides (see attachment D supplemental materials) to see detailed changes to definitions, allowed use, and footnote relocation.</p> <p>With regard to rural uses, rural commercial and industrial zones have always been part of the process from the beginning, as identified in the project scope to increase economic development opportunities throughout the county. Additionally, if there was a new use added, consistent with GMA and the Comprehensive Plan, additional provisions were prepared to ensure compliance/applicability to rural areas.</p>
<p>PC 16</p>	<p>Dick Brown</p>	<p>Verbal</p>	<p>5:54 pm</p> <p>This is a piece of crap. Too complicated, takes a couple of engineers and lawyers to understand what is happening. No one can do anything themselves anymore, have to hire a consultant. Planning commission doesn't represent the public anymore, only represents the staff.</p> <p>6:24 pm</p> <p>Most people not involved in planning don't realize the county doesn't have any options. Until the Growth Management Act is overturned there won't be affordable housing. GMA wants people to live in urban areas in apartments, there won't be affordable lots b/c of GMA. The commissioners need to fight at the state level. We need people to get in and live in housing to</p>	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal.</u> Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>The draft proposal allows additional housing types in many zones and should help make it easier for more families to own homes. The proposal is not intended to be non-compliant with state laws such as GMA nor inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The proposal is intended to further implement those guiding requirements to ensure internal consistency and remove barriers to those objectives. Additionally, the draft proposal is not intended to change other implementing development requirements.</p>

			<p>build equity, can't do that with this. Builders aren't selling low end housing but leasing it.</p> <p>Giving property to children isn't possible without \$30K these days. Kitsap County use to represent the people, it doesn't anymore. Stormwater costs are too high.</p>	
PC 17	Regina Adamson (Kitsap Public Market)	Verbal	<p>5:55 pm</p> <p>Kitsap Public Market. Needs to change back to allow commercial. Property owner wasn't informed of a zone change and wants to establish a mini mart at the former location. Wants to know how to change the zone. Confusing to know which meetings to attend.</p>	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal.</u> Thank you for your comment.</p> <p>The current zoning for the site is Urban Low Residential (UL) and has been since 1998. Land use zoning is set as a part of the Comprehensive Plan via a legislative process and action by the Board of County Commissioners. Requests to change zoning are handled through a site-specific comprehensive plan amendment request through procedures outlined in KCC 21.08. We encourage you to participate in this process. Please contact DCD for further information.</p> <p>Currently, we expect the Commissioners annual docket will not re-open for consideration until early 2022 and the scope of what could be considered will be set at that time.</p>
PC 18	Carrilu Thompson	Verbal	<p>5:59 pm</p> <p>From Manchester. Feels like a rushed process. Told at a minimum that there would be a few changes to LAMIRDs, proposal changes a lot. Want more time to review the changes. Sent a letter and commented about a few differences, worried about the neighbors affected not being included in the review process. No opportunity to work through as a community. One Zoom call does not warrant the changes proposed. Neighbors aren't included in the process.</p> <p>6:16 pm</p> <p>Re-iterate that with COVID restrictions we understand meetings are difficult, but we need a community discussion to better approach the community. Allow the community to speak towards what can be expanded. Further community review is needed. Don't want people to be surprised by what can go in next to them. Let the community speak about the changes.</p>	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to extend the Planning Commission public review period.</u> Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>See response # 10.</p>

PC 19	Lisa Hurt	Verbal	<p>6:01 pm</p> <p>Lived in this area for 55 years. Zoning keeps changing even after you buy. People come here for the beauty and quality of life. Shocked at the development allowed, lack of infrastructure (including biking trails). Don't want high density development. Proposed ease of permitting is overwhelming, should have stricter permit review processes to protect quality of life.</p> <p>6:13 pm</p> <p>What is the overall game plan? We have a beautiful place and hope that the commission can grasp what's happening. Things are now changing, will be like Bellevue soon. Looking at the Kitsap Herald, there are thousands of building sites going in. Traffic is already terrible, risking her life every time getting on a bicycle. Mass transit isn't functional. The County makes it impossible – put in infrastructure first, then develop. Quality of life will drop with hordes of new people.</p>	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>See response #14.</p>
PC 20	Margaret Tufft	Verbal	<p>6:03 pm</p> <p>Agrees with previous speakers. Couldn't review any more pages. Natural world is going away. Anytime we ask about the natural world we are "patted on the head" and do it anyway. Forest removal, wetland loss, no added infrastructure to support development. Turning into Seattle with traffic. Things aren't taken care of as it stands today. Need numbers and facts. How does this impact water?</p> <p>6:21 pm</p> <p>No sense that anyone is addressing the environmental things. Same building types don't work anymore. Are there environmental consultants that know their stuff reviewing proposals. Tree removal, pervious concrete, no planning from an environmental perspective for the quality of life of those living here. Farming not supported with what's happening. Sounds like the developers have a hold of you all. Ask what can be done</p>	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> - Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>See response #14.</p> <p>Additionally, the state's building code, which also included updates to energy code requirements went into effect February 1, 2021. See Kitsap County Code Title 14 (buildings and construction) , as well as the Washington State Building Code Council for more information Home SBCC (wa.gov).</p>

			from an environmental perspective? Plan ahead for the climate emergency.	
PC 21	Mary McClure (Port of Kingston)	Verbal	6:06 pm Referenced Port of Kingston suggested edits. Importance of the changes can't be overstated. Port needs further flexibility regarding what the port is allowed to do on port property. Kingston is in a pivotal moment, especially with the passenger ferry. Need to ensure that the zoning supports the economic development efforts the Port of Kingston wants to pursue. Appreciate clarification and simplification.	Thank you for your comments. See response #8.
PC 22	Greg Englin (Port of Kingston)	Verbal	6:08 pm Thanked DCD staff for a successful update process, thought it was easy to navigate the proposed changes. Proposed in writing what the Port of Kingston would like to see changed as Kingston moves toward incorporation during the 20-year planning horizon. Add definition for the Urban Port to get in onto the table for changes during the 2024 comp plan and possible port overlay district. UL should change Auto/RV/Boat rentals and Marina support services to CUP. Thanks to the hard work and the staff efforts to help inform the Port about the proposal. Noted that it was a multi-year process with plenty of opportunity to get involved.	Thank you for your comments. See response #8.
PC 23	Sheila Sokol	Online form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Suggests adding drones as a definition and allowed use • Discusses potential future ubiquity of drone delivery services 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The proposed draft and associated scope are not intended to address drones. Specifically, the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) regulates the use of drones or unmanned aircraft. Additionally, in 2019 code changes were adopted in Kitsap County Code Chapter 10.62 to address the launching and landing of unmanned aircraft in proximity to Kitsap County military installations. Prior to this adoption, careful consideration was also given to possible use of drones for service deliveries. However, this was not included given the FAA regulates the use of drones in airspace.</p>

PC 24	Roni Smith	Online form	It would be really great and beneficial to see agriculture added to anything. There's public use, housing etc, all based on growth, but nothing for agriculture. Please keep your local ag community in mind while planning your growth and development of Kitsap. Thank you.	<u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments. Located in Kitsap County Code Chapter 17.455 is the County's agriculture code and allowed uses, as well as other provisions. The draft proposal does not include changes to this section.
PC 25	Beverly Parsons	Online form	I'm deeply concerned about the lack of attention to our changing climate in this zoning plan. Economic development must be redirected away from more building to rethinking how we protect our environment and live in a healthy relationship with our land, air, and water. Please change your orientation to protection of our environment as the top priority.	<u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments. See response # 14.
PC 26	Margaret Tufft	Online form	I'm very concerned about the apparent disregard of our environment and the environmental crisis we are all dealing with. It seems money is trumping everything else, with little regard for the lives and wellbeing of the people who live here, and the flora and fauna of our area. When I look at pictures of new housing, all I see is bare ground, all the trees and plants removed.	<u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments. See response # 14 and 20.
PC 27	Jennifer Sutton	Online form	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU), attached and detached: should be permitted outright in all residential areas, especially the areas that already have sewer and water service. • Transition all land zoned Suquamish Village Low Residential (SVLR) to the Suquamish Village Residential (SVR) zoning designation. 	<u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments. The draft proposal is intended to improve consistency with GMA, the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan and zoning classifications' purposes. The draft proposal also does not change density requirements set forth in Chapter 17.420. LAMIRDs under GMA are neither urban nor rural but reflect historical development patterns prior to GMAs enactment in 1990. Additionally, ADUs in rural areas also have density and GMA implications. Allowing increased density in rural areas or LAMIRDs is inconsistent with GMA, the Comprehensive Plan and Chapter 17.420.
PC 28	Reed Blanchard	Online form	Please make protection of the natural environment the highest priority. More density near the ferry and protection of the green undeveloped areas seems like a very reasonable and great idea. The proposed Arborwood is an example of what we do NOT want. Eco-Kitsap should be our theme. Given all of our current crises, we should not be conducting business as 'normal'. Thank you. Reed	<u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments. See response # 14. Additionally, the Arborwood project is located in the Kingston UGA and was included in the UGA in 2006. This development is guided by a Development Agreement for a total of 751 homes that would be developed over a 15-20 year period. Several land use approvals were reviewed and approved in 2008 and 2016. The first initial phases

				of this project (163 homes) are now under construction with the issuance of the Site Development Activity Permit issued in the summer of 2021. These various development applications are reviewed for compliance with applicable environmental and other development codes at the time of submittal.
PC 29	Diane Fish	Online form	Slaughterhouse or animal processing: Allow as a primary use in the Rural Industrial (RI) and Rural Commercial (RCO) zoning designations through an Administrative Conditional Use Permit (ACUP).	Thank you for your comments. See response # 9.
PC 30	Joe Morrison (Kitsap Economic Development Alliance)	Online form + Attachment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Supports the goals of the project. • As such, we advocate for increasing housing supply and responsible development in order to continue to keep costs manageable in Kitsap for citizens. 	<u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal.</u> Thank you for your comments.
PC 31	Regina Adamson	Online form	What steps need to be taken to move forward with rezoning the address of 2544 Stone Way ne Bremerton, 98311 back to mixed commercial residential or getting a variance to reopen The Little Store/ Templeton's Meat Locker back as a Mini Mart?	<u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments. See response # 17.
PC 32	Stacy Smith	Email	<p>17.110.316 Group home. “Group home” means a dwelling unit containing up to eight unrelated persons who are mentally or physically impaired who are protected under the Fair Housing Act, along with support or supervisory personnel or family members who may reside at the facility.</p> <p>A. The term mental or physical impairment includes conditions such as blindness, hearing impairment, mobility impairment, HIV infection, alcoholism, drug addiction, chronic fatigue, learning disability, head injury, cognitive impairment, memory loss, and mental illness.</p> <p>B. Current users of illegal controlled substances, persons convicted for illegal manufacture or distribution of a controlled substance, sex offenders, and juvenile offenders are not considered mentally or physically impaired under the Fair Housing Act.</p> <p>17.110.318 Group living. “Group living” means the residential occupancy of a structure that does not meet the definition of family living. Generally, group living facilities have a common eating area for residents,</p>	<p><u>The Department recommends changing the proposal.</u> Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Department Proposed Revision Revise definition 17.110.316 <i>Group home</i> as follows: ““Group home” means a dwelling unit containing up to eight unrelated persons who are mentally or physically impaired who are protected under the Fair Housing Act, along with support or supervisory personnel or family members who may reside at the facility.</p> <p>A. The term mental or physical impairment includes conditions such as blindness, hearing impairment, mobility impairment, HIV infection, alcoholism, drug addiction, chronic fatigue, learning disability, head injury, cognitive impairment, memory loss, and mental illness.</p> <p>B. Current users of illegal controlled substances, persons convicted for illegal manufacture or distribution of a controlled substance, sex offenders, and juvenile offenders are not considered mentally or physically impaired under the Fair Housing Act.”</p> <p>Revise definition 17.110.318 <i>Group living</i> as follows: “Group living” means the residential occupancy of a structure that does not meet the definition of family living.</p>

			<p>and residents may receive care or training. Group living includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Assisted living facility. B. Boarding house, rooming house, or lodging house. C. Congregate care facility. D. Convalescent, nursing or rest home. E. Dormitory. F. Hospice. G. Monastery or convent. H. Independent living facility. I. Shelter, non-transitory accommodation. J. Skilled nursing care facility, <u>memory care, convalescent, or rest home.</u> 	<p>Generally, group living facilities have a common eating area for residents, and residents may receive care or training. Group living includes the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A. Assisted living facility. B. Boarding house, rooming house, or lodging house. C. Congregate care facility. D. Convalescent, nursing, or rest home. D. Dormitory. E. Hospice. F. Monastery or convent. G. Independent living facility. H. Shelter, non-transitory accommodation. I. Skilled nursing care facility, <u>memory care, convalescent, or rest home</u>". <p>As a Planning Commission member, we encourage you to bring this forward as part of the deliberations through a motion to revise.</p>
<p>PC 33</p>	<p>William Palmer (Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners)</p>	<p>Email + Attachment</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document organization is extremely confusing. • The scope was expanded beyond what was originally conveyed to the public. • There is no way to effectively review all of the proposed changes in a summary. • Which definition is DCD staff using to pair “equity” with diversity? And how is “Diversity” defined? • How are equity and diversity measured? How can one determine if there is a “wide array of housing product types” that are also “just, impartial or fair?” • The project goals/objectives should include protecting the basic right of individuals to own and use their property. • The two following sub-objectives do not translate into achieving the goal of promoting economic development: • 1) Scaling land uses to streamline the level of permit review required and 2) adding new land uses based on project submitted to the Department and comparison of other jurisdictions. • The proposal adds regulations, how does it make the zoning ordinance easier to use? • Section 17.415 doesn’t reference the existing code, the public can’t understand what is changing. • What provisions of the code are subject to change? Can the provisions of the ordinance pertinent to Port Gamble change? 	<p>We agree the ordinance is not the easiest document to get through. As a result, the Department issued 3 supplemental documents at the same time as the ordinance in order to make review easier.</p> <p>The project scope has not changed since it was initially brought before the Planning Commission in May 2019, where it was described as: updates to the zoning use table to modernize, streamline, and correct discrepancies for UGAs, LAMIRDs, and rural commercial and industrial zones; revisions to level of permit review to remove barriers and foster desired development outcomes consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; reorganization of the footnotes to reduce surprises and clarify development standards; updates to ancillary related sections of code (for example definitions) to ensure consistency and predictability; and NOT including updates to site design or development standards.</p> <p>All documents except the SEPA determination were released for public review more than a month before the public hearing, on July 30, 2021. That is 54 days until the close of the comment period on September 21, before the additional days the Planning Commission extended the comment period at their public hearing that day.</p> <p>PRSC’s Vision 2050 defines equity as “All people can attain the resources and opportunities that improve their quality of life and enable them to reach full potential. Those affected by poverty, communities of color, and historically marginalized communities are engaged in decision making processes, planning, and policy making.” Diversity can also be understood as “variety”. A diversity of housing types</p>

		<p>Can the Multi-family design standards change?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Some provisions change the code in rural areas, previous planning commission meetings stated that regulations won't change for rural areas. This is confusing. 	<p>helps achieve equitable outcomes by providing housing affordable to those at varying income levels. A diversity of housing types is identified as a need in both the current Buildable Lands Report as well as the Affordable Housing Report issued by Kitsap County Human Services and City of Bremerton.</p> <p>Property rights are a required consideration in the adoption of every ordinance or ordinance amendment and thus it would be redundant to state it is a goal or objective. Consistent with RCW 36.70A.370, the County evaluates every ordinance proposed for adoption to avoid the unconstitutional takings of private property.</p> <p>Scaling permit review appropriate for the intensity of use does help promote economic development, as many of the uses have been changed from a CUP to an Administrative CUP. Administrative CUPs are a bit more than half the price of a CUP (\$3,900 vs \$6,890) and take less time to process due to not requiring a public hearing. Adding new land uses to the zoning use table helps promote economic development as it establishes the level of review and standards, rather than relying on a director's interpretation as established in 17.100 when uses are not specifically listed. This helps promote predictability for property owners and those proposing to start new businesses.</p> <p>While there are some added regulations (largely for new uses or clarifications for existing uses), largely the changes proposed are focused on things like moving the footnotes to a new section which can be linked to from the zoning use table, moving all uses into the zoning use table which had previously been in other areas of code. This does make the code easier to use, as the applicant and reviewers will be able to find things more effectively.</p> <p>Page 41 of the draft Ordinance, lines 24-26 identify that chapter 17.415 is where special provisions for a use are located. Additionally, throughout the public participation process the Department has stated that the footnotes would be relocated to a new section. Given that starting on page 73 of the draft Ordinance and continuing through page 80, where the new chapter "17.415 Allowed Use Standards" begins, almost all of the footnotes are repealed, it should be fairly clear where what the purpose of the new chapter is.</p> <p>Provisions relating to Port Gamble cannot change. The Port Gamble Redevelopment is already vested to the existing code at the time of permit approval in 2020. It is being moved to an Appendix solely for reference purposes and following discussions with the property owner and the Suquamish and Port Gamble/S'Klallam Tribes.</p>
--	--	---	---

				<p>Multifamily development standards have always been outside the scope of this project. The only reason they are mentioned in this update is to clarify which projects they apply to. Consistent with the Draft Buildable Lands Report findings, it is expected these multi-family standards will be reviewed as part of the mandated 2024 comprehensive plan update.</p> <p>Changes to rural industrial and commercial zones have been part of the scope of the zoning use table update from the beginning of the project, as have changes to LAMIRDs. Additionally, if there was a new use added, consistent with GMA and the Comprehensive Plan, additional provisions were prepared to ensure compliance/applicability to rural areas.</p>
PC 34	Russ Shiplet (Kitsap Builders Association)	Email	<p>Once again, I would like to thank you for providing Zoning Use Table Update workshops and allowing for feedback from participants and KBA members. The workshops were informative and well presented.</p> <p>I have shared the workshop presentation materials with KBA Developers & Builders, encouraging them to provide comments (positive or negative) to you and your team or me.</p> <p>The only feedback I have received has been positive comments about attached ADUs. To date, I have received no negative comments about any portion of the Zoning Use Table update.</p> <p>Keep up the great work, and please let me know how else I can assist the department.</p>	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p>
PC 35	Denise Burbridge	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend the Planning Commission public review period and conduct additional outreach for the Manchester community. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>See response # 10.</p>
PC 36	Mattie Walters	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend the Planning Commission public review period and conduct additional outreach for the Manchester community. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>See response # 10.</p>
PC 37	Terence Simons	Email	<p>Extend the Planning Commission public review period and conduct additional outreach for the Manchester community.</p>	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>See response # 10.</p>

PC 38	Tonya Rothe	Email & online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend the Planning Commission public review period and conduct additional outreach for the Manchester community. Do not allow multiple family dwelling units in Manchester. Concerned about impact to the environment. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>See response # 10.</p>
PC 39	Robert Lindgren	Email	Do not allow multiple family dwelling units in Manchester.	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>See response # 10.</p> <p>Additionally, the draft proposal to allowed uses intended for internal consistency with the Comprehensive Plan, various sub-area plans, as well as zone purposes. While different housing products types are proposed for some Manchester zones, it does not change the required density noted in Chapter 17.420.</p>
PC 40	Susan Shaw	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend the Planning Commission public review period and conduct additional outreach for the Manchester community. Do not allow high density housing in Manchester. Concerned about impacts to environment and infrastructure. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>See responses # 10 and 39.</p>
PC 41	Jodi Carson	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Opposed to the proposed changes in Manchester. Do not allow multiple family dwelling units in Manchester. Existing retail in Manchester is limited, so more vehicle trips would be required with more new residents, causing infrastructure issues 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>See response #39.</p> <p>New development in Manchester will be required to meet applicable roadway/access standards, including 16.24 or 11.22 as well as parking standards in 17.490.</p> <p>While existing retail development in Manchester is limited, proposed changes to the use table include allowing additional uses in the community.</p>
PC 42	Linda Murnane	Email	<p>Event Facilities in rural areas:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reduce the number of people allowed per event. Don't differentiate between indoor and outdoor events. The regulations for outdoor events should apply to indoor events. One event per day and leaving ten consecutive days of each month free of events allows too many events to occur. Change to allow only 2 events per month. Amplified sound should not be allowed if code enforcement cannot enforce the noise ordinance (e.g., 10.28.040 and 10.28.145(4)) Participants should leave property 1/2 hour after closing time. Also, if event facility serves alcohol, those sales should cease 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments. Department recommends changes as identified below.</u></p> <p>No change proposed to the standards for numbers of participants. Given the variety of lots sizes found in the rural area, the standards for event facility outdoor events as drafted in 17.415.195(A)(1) allow the director or hearing examiner to change the limit of participants allowed based on potential impacts to neighbors. Indoor events are less impactful.</p> <p>No change proposed to the number and frequency of events. The standards for number and frequency of outdoor events allow the director or hearing examiner to change the number and frequency of events based on potential impacts to neighbors in 17.415.195(B)(3).</p>

			<p>1/2 before closing time.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Events should end at 8:30pm and all guest leave property by 9pm. • Require a permanent visual barrier. Vegetation is not a permanent visual barrier due to leaf drop in the fall. • Require consistent dBA monitoring overseen by a third party. • Outside amplified sound violates Kitsap County Noise Ordinance and should not be allowed for any business in areas zoned rural residential, rural protected. • Kitsap County Code Enforcement should be allowed to enter the property during business or event hours unannounced and unimpeded. 	<p>No change proposed to standards for amplified sound. Kitsap County Sherriff's Office is responsible for enforcing noise violations, not Kitsap Department Code Enforcement. Additionally, 17.415.195(F) may require that amplified sound at event facilities may require a noise analysis and possibly noise mitigation. The draft proposal makes note of this consistent with SEPA rules in state law and Kitsap County Code Chapter 18.04.</p> <p>Department recommends a revision regarding hours of operation. Department proposed revision: 17.415.195(C) Hours of operation. The event facility shall limit all event activities to occur between the hours of operation specified below. All noise, music, amplified sound, and sound-related equipment shall be turned off or stop at the end time specified. <u>Any alcohol sales shall cease half an hour before the end time.</u> All participants shall be off the property no later than <u>half an hour</u> after the last time specified. The director or hearing examiner may increase or decrease the hours of operation allowed per outdoor event based on site size or conditions implemented to reduce the potential impact to neighbors. Event facility hours of operation: Monday through Saturday: 8:00 am to <u>8:30</u> pm Sunday: 8:00 am to 8:00 pm</p> <p>Department recommends a revision regarding buffer. Department proposed revision: 17.415.195(E) Landscaping and fencing. The event facility shall include a site obscuring fence, wall or landscape buffer <u>as defined in 17.500.027(B)(1)</u></p> <p>No change proposed to standards for amplified sound. See 17.415.195(F).</p> <p>Department recommends a revision regarding compliance inspections. Department proposed revision: <u>17.415.195(G) Event facility operators agree to allow Kitsap County inspectors to view the premises of event facilities and attend events in order to monitor compliance with permit conditions of approval.</u></p>
PC 43	Mary Dalrymple	Email	Extend the Planning Commission public review period and conduct additional outreach for the Manchester community.	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Please see Response # 10</p>
PC 44	O. Ray Pardo	Email	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extend the Planning Commission public review period and conduct additional outreach for the Manchester community. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p>

				Please see Response # 10
PC 45	Ronald Tarver		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend the Planning Commission public review period and conduct additional outreach for the Manchester community. Do not allow Duplexes or multiple family dwelling units in Manchester. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Please see Responses # 10 and 39</p>
PC 46	Jennifer Korjus		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> People assume uses are the same as when they bought their property Difference between direct mailing about a proposed use initiated by a neighbor and broad scale changes to uses that have general public notice Comments regarding home businesses <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Believes the definition of home business changes whether the use must be entirely within the dwelling unit Wants definition to not allow retail uses as home business Wants “clearly secondary” to be defined requests changes to footnotes be made available Comments regarding parks <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Keep parks and recreation facilities in public facilities definition No definition of park, new definition of recreational facilities is expressly commercial County has benefitted from donations of land to parks system, should not be converted from “public” Will parks and recreational facilities be protected from adult entertainment uses? Changes to allowed uses in parks compromise all county owned parks, need statutory framework to establish constraints, including public notice Allowing residential use outside of caretaker home converts property at the benefit of the developer and detriment of community Does not want group living 7+, homeless shelters allowed in parks Does not want third party control of government owned recreational facilities Comments regarding permanent temporary accommodations <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transitory accommodations code is about temporary 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>The definition of Home Business is updated to reflect the several different ways that home businesses are handled by the county, depending on the intensity of the use. The standards for Home Businesses in the new chapter 17.415 reflect whether a use must be in the primary residence or in an accessory structure – incidental and minor home businesses must take place in the residence; moderate home businesses may take place in an accessory structure. Additional parking as well as signage are also addressed in the standards. Changes to the footnotes/applicable standards are and have been available on the project website https://www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/Pages/Zoning-Use-Table-Update.aspx, see the draft Ordinance as well as D.6 Detailed Changes, Footnote Re-location Guide.</p> <p>Public Facilities definition revised to reflect the kinds of facilities that are contemplated under that use in the use table. Parks and open space are a separate use in the use table, so it doesn’t make sense for them to be included in the definition for public facilities. Schools are also separate uses in the use table.</p> <p>Adult entertainment uses have specific distance restrictions (e.g., KCC 10.52.030) and the proposed draft does not change those restrictions.</p> <p>The proposed changes to the allowed use table relative to the Parks zone were made with the understanding that chapter 17.340 will apply to guide any development and that these uses in some circumstances may in fact be a benefit to the citizens of Kitsap County. Moreover, additional requirements set forth in the Comprehensive Plan chapter for Parks and Open Space regulate future development, per KCC 17.340.030.</p> <p>All references in the Zoning Use Table update to transitory accommodations are to bring the definitions, uses, and standards that are already adopted in code under KCC 17.505 into the zoning code for ease of reference and review. KCC 17.505</p>

			<p>structures, how can this be a permanent use?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Remove the designation from rural residential and park zones 	<p>already has provisions for temporary approval of transitory accommodations to become permanent as well as allowing transitory accommodations indoors. The structures would continue to be temporary, but the use on that location would not be temporary.</p>
PC 47	Susan Shaw	Emails and online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Extend the Planning Commission public review period and conduct additional outreach for the Manchester community. ● Do not allow multiple family dwelling units in Manchester. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Please see Response # 10.</p>
PC 48	William Palmer (KAPO)	Email + Attachment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The proposed Zoning Use Table Update has too many problematic issues and is not therefore, ready to be forwarded to the Board of County Commissioners for adoption. The substance of KAPO's testimony is two-fold: 1.) the proposed ordinance provisions do not meet the original intent of the Use Table Update, 2.) is a most confusing and convoluted document to review and 3.) is adding regulations that are not needed. ● The proposed ordinance is not consistent with the Growth Management Act. ● Conduct in-person meeting with the professionals in the County to determine what is appropriate and what is a handicap to business development, this includes a review of site plan development standards. ● Restart the update process and increase the project scope to allow revisions to other chapters of code such as 17.420 'Density, Dimensions, and Design'. ● Allow public review of the Director's interpretation from March 2020, regarding 17.420.060 Footnote number 25 and the requirement to subdivide or meet density requirements in the Urban Low Residential (UL) and Urban Cluster Residential (UCR) zoning designations. ● Resolve the proposed ordinance numbering system to make it a.) compatible with the existing Zoning Ordinance reference' system and b.) easier to locate its provisions. Keep the footnotes in section 17.410.050. ● Eliminate the ADU size restriction in urban designated areas. ● Eliminate all proposed provisions that affect rural portions of the County (possible exception for LAMRIDs). ● Revise the document format by removing the ordinance section numbers. For public review, only show Kitsap County Code sections, not ordinance section numbers. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> regarding the suggested change to the project scope, timeline, or document organization.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● As stated on page four of the Staff Report released on July 30, 2021, the proposed code amendments were developed according to, and are compliant with, the requirements of GMA, Chapter 36.70A RCW, the Kitsap County Countywide Planning Polices, the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan, and other applicable laws and policies. ● The proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Better aligning allowed uses with the purpose for each zone (see Attachment D2 - Zone Purpose Statements). ○ Removing economic and housing barriers to development in Urban Growth Areas and Limited Areas of More Intense Rural Development. ○ When a new categorical use is proposed, proposing appropriate development standards in rural areas consistent with the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan goals and policies. ● Public participation includes public review of the proposed code amendment as required by GMA, the State Environmental Policy Act (– Attachment C2 - SEPA Checklist), and Kitsap County Code. ● The Department has been consistent in its messaging and implementation of the project scope. This messaging always reiterated that revisions to Chapter 17.420 would exceed the scope of this project, require further analysis, and ultimately result in a significant increase to the project timeline. ● The addition of new categorical uses requires that the Department establish a level of permit review for all zones. In some circumstances these new uses will require regulations to accompany the level of permit review – this includes rural lands. Event facilities are currently allowed through a similar use determination and use the categorical use 306 Club, civic or social land use permit process. This required a Conditional Use Permit where allowed in rural zoning designations. Conditions from past permit processes and code compliance concerns provided the basis for the proposed language for event facilities in rural locations. ● The Zoning Use Table update is a complex project that covers multiple chapters in Kitsap County Code. The Department prepared the proposal in an adopting

- Add code references as an appendix to the Use Table Update so that the reviewer can better understand what is being changed and what is not subject to change.
- Eliminate 17.330.030 - Special Provisions for "outdoor storage," which restricts outdoor storage to be conducted wholly within a building as part of another business.
- Eliminate the separate application for rural located ADUs allowing them to be approved in the building permit process. Also eliminate, at least, the following criteria for their approval - B.2, B.5 and B.9 and modify B.3 to stipulate a maximum size of 1,200 S.F. regardless of the size of the existing house.
- Eliminate the allowed use regulations for Event Facilities as it adds regulation to Kitsap County Code.
- Eliminate all proposed changes, references to and provisions of Chapter 17.470 'Multifamily Design Criteria'. If contrary to this recommendation there is somehow a need to make amendments to this chapter of the code, then a.) the scope of the "use table update" needs to be clarified and b.) the public needs to be reinvolved in the process to propose and promote changes to the "whole Zoning Ordinance," not just the advertised "Use Table Update."
- Eliminate whatever the correct subsection reference would be for an "Environmental Mitigation Agreement" as applied to Junk Motor Vehicles as found on page 177 of the proposed ordinance.
- Eliminate Section F.17.110.367 'Impervious Surface'. If it remains the definition should be revised as follows:
"grasscrete, "geowebs with soil and grass planted cells, any surface structure that allows for the propagation of grass capable also of bearing the weight of vehicles or field areas planted to grass where parking of vehicles occurs principally in the dry months of the year." Amend Title 12.08.245 if necessary to accommodate this language in the Title 17 definition.

ordinance format as the basis for Planning Commission recommendations and Board of County Commissioners adoption processes (see [Attachment A1 – Ordinance](#)). The supplemental materials provided as staff report Attachments D1-7 clearly articulate the proposed changes. Another appendix for code references would add another document that repeats the same information located in the staff report Attachments.

The Department recommends the following changes regarding Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) in urban areas.
17.415.010 G. Size. Dimensions are determined by interior measurements. An ADU shall not exceed 900 sf ~~or 60% of the habitable area of the primary dwelling, whichever is smaller.~~

The Department recommends no change to the proposal regarding permitting of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU), detached in rural areas through a building permit only; removing the approval criteria in 17.415.015 B.2, B.5, and B.9; and modifying 17.415.015 B.3 to stipulate a maximum size of 1,200 sf regardless of the size of an existing house.
Changing rural ADU standards is outside the scope of this update process. Additionally, revisions to rural ADUs is already noted in the Draft Buildable Lands Report findings as a future reasonable measure consideration to align development trends with GMA, including case law, as well as regional policy frameworks and the Comprehensive Plan.

The Department recommends no change to the proposal regarding the review of the Director’s interpretation dated March 31, 2020 ([T17 - DI Applicable to Development Within Kitsap County](#)), regarding 17.420.060 Footnote number 25 and the requirement to subdivide or meet density requirements in the Urban Low Residential (UL) and Urban Cluster Residential (UCR) zoning designations. Section [17.100.060 'Relationship to procedures ordinance'](#) states that Title 21 'Land Use and Development Procedures' shall control in the event of a conflict between Title 21 and Title 17 KCC. The Director’s interpretation mentioned above is consistent with the authority granted in Section [21.04.040 'Directors Interpretations'](#) and applies to all zones.

Section 21.04.040 C.3. Director’s Formal Interpretations. The director may respond to formal inquiries regarding code provisions. The interpretation shall be in writing and will be made available by the department pursuant to this section. Formal director’s interpretations are binding and may be appealed. A

fee for a formal interpretation shall be assessed at the hourly rate of the department and the prosecutor's office.

This interpretation was made available on March 31, 2021 on the Kitsap County website (<https://www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/Pages/CodeInterpretations.aspx>). No appeals were filed pursuant to Section [21.04.290 'Appeals'](#) regarding this Director's interpretation. This interpretation is not considered for inclusion in this code update since the project scope does not include Chapter 17.420 'Density, Dimensions, and Design'.

The Department recommends no change to the proposal regarding the removal of the special provision that requires outdoor storage to be conducted wholly within a building as part of another business. This is an existing provision 17.410.050 A.42 that applies to Business Center (BC), Industrial (I), and Rural Industrial (RI), and categorical use Lumber and bulky building material sales.

This provision was moved verbatim from its existing code location, section 17.410.050 A.42, to zone chapters 17.300.030 Business Center, 17.320.030 Industrial, and 17.330.030 Rural Industrial. Also moved to the new chapter 17.415 'Allowed Use Standards' for 17.415.300 Lumber and bulky building material sales.

The Department recommends no change to the proposal regarding Chapter 17.470 'Multifamily Design Criteria'. The proposal changes the code such that the criteria apply to any multifamily development project submitted to Kitsap County for review in all zones, instead of only selected zones. Consistent with the Draft Buildable Lands Report findings, it is expected these multi-family standards will be reviewed as part of the mandated 2024 comprehensive plan update.

The Department recommends no change to the proposal regarding the elimination of "Environmental Mitigation Agreement" as applied to Junk Motor Vehicles as found on page 177 of the proposed ordinance. This requirement is transferred from 17.410.060 B.6 directly to 17.410.050 4. An environmental mitigation agreement provides a mechanism to properly analyze potential environmental impacts and mitigation measures imposed as conditions of approval to reduce or remove those impacts related to junk motor vehicle use project proposals.

The Department recommends no change to the proposal regarding Port Gamble and 17.700 Appendix F Section F.17.110.367 'Impervious Surface' and regarding the elimination of "Environmental Mitigation Agreement" as applied to Junk Motor Vehicles as found on page 177 of the proposed ordinance, also part of Appendix F. The proposal:

				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Relocates existing and adopted Port Gamble LAMIRD related provisions to a separate appendix. This reorganization is intended not to undo development regulation amendments adopted in April 2020 that impact existing agreements with parties in regard to the Port Gamble Redevelopment Plan. Includes a “carve out” for parcels located inside the Port Gamble Redevelopment Plan area. This carve out adds Appendix F to Title 17.700 ‘Appendices’ to maintain the integrity code changes for Port Gamble adopted in April 2020. Definitions, allowed uses, and additional regulations for parcels located within the boundary of the Port Gamble Redevelopment Plan approved pursuant to Section 17.360C.030 shall comply with the regulations as they exist before the adoption of the Zoning Use Table Update. Each of the sections below include language that refer a customer to Appendix F if the property is located within the Port Gamble Redevelopment Plan. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Rural Residential - 17.130.020 Uses permitted and design standards. Rural Wooded - 17.150.020 Uses permitted and design standards. Port Gamble Rural Historic Town - 17.360C.025 Uses permitted and design standards. Use Tables: 17.410.042, “Rural, resource, urban residential zones use table,” Footnote 2 in the RR and RW columns direct the customer to KCC 17.700 Appendix F. Use Tables: 17.410.046, “Limited areas of more intensive rural development (LAMIRD) zones use table.” Cells in the table direct the customer to KCC 17.700 Appendix F. 17.410.050 2. “Footnotes for zoning use tables” directs the customer to KCC 17.700 Appendix F. Multi-family design criteria: 17.470.020, “Applicability – How to use design criteria” directs the customer to KCC 17.700 Appendix F.
PC 49	Kristen McKie	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Only allow single family residences in Manchester, not multiple family dwelling units or commercial uses. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Please see Response # 39.</p>
PC 50	Bob Lindgren	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not allow multiple family dwelling units in Manchester. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p>
PC 51	Margaret Warren	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What exactly are the proposed changes for the Pomeroy Park area (Manchester)? Do not allow high density housing in Manchester. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Please see Response # 39.</p>

PC 52	Joseph Stubbs	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to the proposed changes in Manchester. • Do not allow high density housing in Manchester. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Please see Responses # 39 and 41</p>
PC 53	Rita McKendrick	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to the proposed changes in Manchester. • Do not allow high density housing in Manchester. • Existing regulations need to be better enforced. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Please see Responses # 14, 39, and 41</p>
PC 54	Greg Piper	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opposed to the proposed changes in Manchester. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p>
PC 55	Robin Williams	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extend the Planning Commission public review period and conduct additional outreach. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Please see Response # 10</p>
PC 56	Sonia Shaw	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not allow multiple family dwelling units in Manchester. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Please see Responses # 39 and 41</p>
PC 57	Hannah Keim	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extend the Planning Commission public review period and conduct additional outreach. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Please see Response # 10</p>
PC 58	Shelly Olson	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extend the Planning Commission public review period and conduct additional outreach for the Manchester community. • Do not allow multiple family dwelling units or multiple level homes in Manchester. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Please see Responses # 10 and 39</p>
PC 59	William Shaw	Online	For the Manchester Village area, I would like to favor keeping the 1/2 acre per family density but allow for a duplex 2 family density.	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Please see Responses # 39</p>
PC 60	Josh Guynn	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wants Manchester to stay as it is, does not support proposed changes • Do not allow high density housing in Manchester. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Please see Response # 39</p>
PC 61	Jon Rothe	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extend the Planning Commission public review period and conduct additional outreach for the Manchester community. • Do not allow multiple family dwelling units in Manchester. • Concerned about impact to the environment. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Please see Responses # 39 and 41</p>

PC 62	Melanie Bronov	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend the Planning Commission public review period and conduct additional outreach for the Manchester community. Do not allow apartments or multiple family dwelling units in Manchester. thinks proposed use changes would allow multifamily residential to be built without any limits would cause impacts to infrastructure, services, etc 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Please see Responses # 10, 39 and 41</p>
PC 63	Terence Simons	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend the Planning Commission public review period and conduct additional outreach for the Manchester community. Do not allow multiple family dwelling units in Manchester. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Please see Response # 10</p>
PC 64	Sheila Spiker	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not allow condos or multiple family dwelling units in Manchester. would change character of neighborhood 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Please see Responses # 39 and 41</p>
PC 65	Michelle Guynn	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not allow high density housing in Manchester. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Please see Response # 39</p>
PC 66	Leeann McCulley	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not allow high density housing in Manchester. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Please see Response # 39</p>
PC 67	Anne Cisney	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend the Planning Commission public review period and conduct additional outreach for the Manchester community. Do not allow multiple family dwelling units in Manchester. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Please see Responses # 14, 39 and 41</p>
PC 68	Denise Burbridge	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Extend the Planning Commission public review period and conduct additional outreach for the Manchester community. Opposed to the proposed changes in Manchester. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Please see Responses # 10 and 39</p>
PC 69	Mary Dalyrmples	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Do not allow condos or multiple family dwelling units in Manchester. 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p> <p>Please see Response # 39</p>
PC 70	Claire Jackson	Online	As a citizen of this state I'm for abolishing zoning use restrictions without a majority consent from we citizens. Majority. Explicit consent. Not implied consent. Assumptions. A direct one to one vote. Per the Constitution. And with elections being fixed no time like the present to rectify 'mistakes'.	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.</p>

PC 71	Patricia Norwood	Online	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Opposed to the proposed changes in Manchester.	<u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> -Thank you for your comments.
----------	---------------------	--------	--	---

Zoning Use Table Update

Summary of MCAC Outreach & Public Meetings

Month	Task
May 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board of County Commissioners briefing - 5/13/2019 Planning Commission briefing – 5/21/2019
June 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board of County Commissioners briefing – 6/3/2019 MCAC presentation – 6/4/2019 GovDelivery announcement for community-wide survey – 6/11/2019 NextDoor announcement for community-wide survey – 6/11/2019 Facebook announcement for community-wide survey - 6/11/2019
July 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning Commission work study – 7/30/2019
Aug 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board of County Commissioners briefing – 7/19/2019 Planning Commission work study – 7/20/2019
Sept 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board of County Commissioners briefing – 9/17/2019 Planning Commission work study – 9/24/2019 Board of County Commissioners briefing – 9/25/2019
Oct 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Board of County Commissioners briefing – 10/14/2019 GovDelivery announcement about Open Houses – 10/18/2019 Workshop invite sent to CAC members & information on upcoming open houses – 10/25/2019 GovDelivery announcement about Open Houses – 10/31/2019
Nov 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Open House at Poulsbo Library – 11/4/2019 MCAC Presentation – 11/5/2019 GovDelivery Announcement about Open House – 11/14/2019 Open House at County Admin Building – 11/14/2019 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 5 participants indicated they were from Manchester – Jerry Clark, Frank Tweten, Shannon Wells, Jeff Wells, and Hella Johnson.
Dec 2019	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Workshop #1 – 12/10/2019 – Kari Kaltenborn-Corey attended on behalf of MCAC Workshop #2 – 12/11/2019 – Carrilu Thompson attended on behalf of MCAC
March 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Email workshop participates about upcoming Planning Commission work studies – 3/11/2020 & 3/17/2020 Manchester Community Open House – 3/3/2020 Planning Commission work study – 3/3/2020 Planning Commission work study – 3/17/2020
April 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Email workshop participates about upcoming Planning Commission work studies – 4/1/2020 Planning Commission work study – 4/21/2020
June 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Planning Commission work study – 6/2/2020 GovDelivery announcement about Planning Commission work studies – 6/12/2020 Planning Commission work study (initial draft changes available) – 6/16/2020

Aug 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Commission work study (initial draft changes available) – 8/18/2020
Jan 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Board of County Commissioners briefing – 1/25/2021
May 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Commission briefing – 5/4/2021 • Board of County Commissioners briefing - 5/10/2021
June 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning Commission briefing - 6/15/2021 • Board of County Commissioners briefing - 6/21/2021
July 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • MCAC presentation - 7/6/2021 • Notification letters to Policy team staff for distribution to CACs • Board of County Commissioners briefing – 7/26/2021 • Planning Commission Briefing – 7/20/2021 • GovDelivery Project announcement – 7/30/2021 • Department recommendation released – 7/30/2021
Aug 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GovDelivery Project Announcement – 8/12/2021 • GovDelivery Project Announcement – 8/30/2021 • Planning Commission briefing - 8/3/2021 • Board of County Commissioners briefing - 8/16/2021 • Planning Commission work study - 8/17/2021 • Virtual meeting for public with questions & answers – 8/19/2021 • Public Hearing legal notice in Kitsap Sun - 8/31/2021
Sep 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • GovDelivery Project announcement – 9/13/2021 • Planning Commission work study – 9/7/2021 • Virtual meeting for public with questions & answers – 9/16/2021 • Planning Commission public hearing - 9/21/2021

Comparison of Proposed Changes to Manchester Zones

Zoning Classification (1)(3)(4) →		MVC	MVC	MVL R	MVL R	MVR	MVR
Categorical Use (1)(3)(4) ↓		(6/16/2020 Version)	(7/30/2021 Version)	(6/16/2020 Version)	(7/30/2021 Version)	(6/16/2020 Version)	(7/30/2021 Version)
RESIDENTIAL USES							
100	Accessory dwelling unit, attached	– ACUP	ACUP	P	P		P
102	Accessory dwelling unit, detached	– ACUP	ACUP	€ ACUP	ACUP		ACUP
104	Caretaker dwelling	--	--	--	--		--
106	Guest house	Was proposed to be removed in initial draft	-- (No change from existing code)	Was proposed to be removed in initial draft	P (No change from existing code)	Was proposed to be removed in initial draft	P (No change from existing code)
Dwelling, family living							
108	Cottage housing development	-- C	C	– ACUP	ACUP	– ACUP	ACUP
110	Duplex	--	--	P	P	P	P
112	Manufactured/mobile/RV/park-model/tiny home park	--	--	C	C	C	C
114	Mobile home	Was proposed to be combined with Single Family detached in initial draft	-- (No change from existing code)	Was proposed to be combined with Single Family detached in initial draft	-- (No change from existing code)	Was proposed to be combined with Single Family detached in initial draft	-- (No change from existing code)
116	Multiple family	--	--	– ACUP	ACUP	– ACUP	ACUP
118	Single-family attached	Was proposed to be combined with Multiple Family in initial draft	--	Was proposed to be combined with Multiple Family in initial draft	P	Was proposed to be combined with Multiple Family in initial draft	P
120	Single-family detached (includes manufactured homes)	– P	P	P	P	P	P
Dwelling, group living							
122	Adult family home	ACUP P	ACUP P	€ P	€ P	€ P	€ P
124	Group Living (1 to 6 rooms)	ACUP	ACUP	C	C	C	C
126	Group Living (7 or more rooms)	C	C	C	ACUP	C	ACUP

128	Permanent transitory accommodations, small, large, safe parks, and indoor	ACUP	ACUP	ACUP	ACUP	ACUP	ACUP
Other Residential Uses							
130	Bed and breakfast house, 1-4 rooms	--	--		ACUP		ACUP
132	Bed and breakfast house, 5 or more rooms or serves meals to non-overnight guests	--	--		C		C
134	Home business, incidental	--	--	ACUP <u>P</u>	P	ACUP <u>P</u>	P
136	Home business, minor	--	--	ACUP	P	ACUP	P
138	Home business, moderate	--	--	--	ACUP	--	ACUP
140	Vacation rentals, 1-4 rooms	--	--	ACUP	ACUP	ACUP	ACUP
142	Vacation rentals, 5 or more rooms	--	--	C	C	C	C
COMMERCIAL USES							
Hotels or Hospitality							
200	Adult entertainment	--	--	--	--	--	--
202	Conference center	-- <u>ACUP</u>	ACUP	--	--	--	--
204	Drinking establishments	€ <u>ACUP</u>	ACUP	--	--	--	--
206	Espresso stands	P	P	--	--	--	--
208	Event facility	<u>C</u>	C	--	--	--	--
210	Hotel/motel	€ <u>ACUP</u>	ACUP	--	--	--	--
212	Resort	--	--	--	--	--	--
214	Restaurants, with drive-thru service	ACUP	ACUP		--		--
216	Restaurants, without drive-thru service	P	P		--		--
Retail							
218	Auction house	--	--	--	--	--	--
220	Automobile, recreational vehicle, or boat sales	--	--	--	--	--	--
222	Automobile, recreational vehicle or boat rentals	--	--	--	--	--	--

224	Equipment sales, rentals and repair, heavy	C	C	--	--	--	--
226	Equipment sales, rentals and repair, light	ACUP	ACUP	--	--	--	--
228	Equipment sales, rentals and repair, recreational	-- ACUP	ACUP	--	--	--	--
230	Fuel or charging station, with convenience store	C	C	--	--	--	--
232	Fuel or charging station, without convenience store	ACUP	ACUP	--	--	--	--
234	General retail merchandise stores – less than 4,000 s.f.	P	P	--	--	--	--
236	General retail merchandise stores – 4,000 to 9,999 s.f.	ACUP P	P	--	--	--	--
238	General retail merchandise stores – 10,000 to 15,000 s.f.	-- C	C	--	--	--	--
240	General retail merchandise stores – 15,001 to 24,999 s.f.	-- C	C	--	--	--	--
242	General retail merchandise stores – 25,000 s.f. or greater	--	--	--	--	--	--
244	Lumber and bulky building material sales	--	--	--	--	--	--
246	Marijuana retailer	--	--	--	--	--	--
248	Nursery, retail	ACUP P	P	--	--	--	--
250	Nursery, wholesale	--	--	C	C	C	C
Offices and Services							
254	Automobile or recreational vehicle repair	ACUP	ACUP	--	--	--	--
256	Car washes	P	P	--	--	--	--
258	Clinic		P		--		--
260	Day-care center	ACUP P	P	C	C	C	C
262	Day-care center, home-based	ACUP	ACUP	ACUP P	P	ACUP P	P
264	Dispatch facility	--	--	--	--	--	--
266	Fitness center	ACUP	P	--	--	--	--

		<u>P</u>					
268	General office and management services – less than 4,000 s.f.	P	P	--	--	--	--
270	General office and management services – 4,000 to 9,999 s.f.	ACUP	ACUP	--	--	--	--
272	General office and management services – 10,000 s.f. or greater	-- <u>C</u>	C	--	--	--	--
274	Kennels or pet day-cares	-- <u>ACUP</u>	ACUP	C	C	C	C
276	Kennels, hobby	--	--	P	P	P	P
278	Off-street parking facilities	C	C	--	--	--	--
280	Off-street parking facilities, structured	ACUP	ACUP	--	--	--	--
282	Personal services	P	P	--	--	--	--
284	Research laboratory, less than 4,000 s.f.	P	P	--	--	--	--
286	Research laboratory, 4,000 to 9,999 s.f.	ACUP	ACUP	--	--	--	--
288	Research laboratory, 10,000 s.f. or greater	--	--	--	--	--	--
290	Tourism facilities, including outfitter and guide facilities	P	P	--	--	--	--
292	Tourism facilities, including seaplane and tour boat terminals	--	--	--	--	--	--
294	Veterinary clinics/animal hospitals/wildlife shelters	ACUP	ACUP	--	--	--	--
Other Commercial Uses							
296	Shared work/maker space	P	P	--	--	--	--
RECREATIONAL/ CULTURAL USES							
300	Arboreta, botanical garden	ACUP	ACUP	--	--	--	--
302	Campground	--	--	--	--	--	--
304	Club	ACUP <u>P</u>	P	-- <u>ACUP</u>	ACUP	-- <u>ACUP</u>	ACUP
306	Entertainment facility, indoor	ACUP P	P	--	--	--	--
308	Entertainment facility, outdoor	€ <u>ACUP</u>	ACUP	--	--	--	--

310	Golf courses	--	--	--	--	--	--
312	Marinas	ACUP	C	--	--	--	--
314	Marina support services	P	ACUP	--	--	--	--
316	Parks and open space	P	P	P	P	P	P
318	Race track	--	--	--	--	--	--
320	Recreational facilities, indoor	C ACUP	ACUP	C	C	C	C
322	Recreational facilities, outdoor	C	C	C	C	C	C
324	Shooting/gun facility, indoor	--	--	--	--	--	--
326	Shooting/gun facility, outdoor	--	--	--	--	--	--
328	Zoo, aquarium	--	--	--	--	--	--
INSTITUTIONAL USES							
400	Government/public structures	ACUP P	P	C	C	C	C
402	High-risk secured facility	--	--	--	--	--	--
404	Hospital	--	--	--	--	--	--
406	Places of worship	ACUP	ACUP	C	C	C	C
408	Public facilities (greater than 300 square feet).	ACUP	ACUP	C	ACUP	C	ACUP
409	Public facilities (300 square feet or less).	Was not proposed in initial draft	P	Was not proposed in initial draft	P	Was not proposed in initial draft	P
410	School, elementary and middle school/junior high	ACUP	ACUP	C	C	C	C
412	School, high school	ACUP	ACUP	--	--	--	--
414	School, college/vocational – less than 8,000 s.f.	ACUP	ACUP	--	--	--	--
416	School, college/vocational school – 8,000 s.f. or greater	--	--	--	--	--	--
418	Secure community transition facility	--	--	--	--	--	--
420	Transportation terminals, marine	C	C	--	--	--	--
422	Transportation terminals, non-marine	ACUP	ACUP	--	--	--	--
424	Wireless communications facilities	P	P	P	P	P	P
INDUSTRIAL USES							
500	Airports	--	--	--	--	--	--
502	Boat yard	--	--	--	--	--	--

504	Cemeteries	--	--	€	--	€	--
506	Contractor's storage yard	--	--	C	C	C	C
508	Food and beverage production, less than 4,000 s.f.	--	--	--	--	--	--
510	Food and beverage production, 4,000 to 9,999 s.f.	--	--	--	--	--	--
512	Food and beverage production, 10,000 s.f. or greater	--	--	--	--	--	--
514	Fuel distributors	--	--	--	--	--	--
516	Funeral homes	C	C	---	C	---	C
518	Helicopter pads	--	--	--	--	--	--
520	Manufactured home, mobile home, park model, tiny home - sales	--	--	--	--	--	--
522	Manufacturing and fabrication, hazardous	--	--	--	--	--	--
524	Manufacturing and fabrication, heavy	--	--	--	--	--	--
526	Manufacturing and fabrication, light	--	--	--	--	--	--
528	Manufacturing and fabrication, medium	--	--	--	--	--	--
530	Marijuana processor	--	--	--	--	--	--
532	Marijuana producer, Tier 1	--	--	--	--	--	--
534	Marijuana producer, Tier 2	--	--	--	--	--	--
536	Marijuana producer, Tier 3	--	--	--	--	--	--
538	Recycling centers	--	--	--	--	--	--
540	Rock crushing	--	--	--	--	--	--
542	Slaughterhouse or animal processing	--	--	--	--	--	--
544	Storage, hazardous materials	--	--	--	--	--	--
546	Storage, indoor	-- C	C	--	--	--	--
548	Storage, outdoor	--	--	--	--	--	--
550	Top soil production, stump grinding, firewood cutting, and composting	--	--	--	--	--	--

552	Transshipment facilities, including docks, wharves, marine rails, cranes, and barge facilities	--	--	--	--	--	--
554	Warehousing and distribution	--	--	--	--	--	--
556	Wrecking yards and junk yards	--	--	--	--	--	--
RESOURCE							
600	Aggregate extractions sites	--	--	--	--	--	--
602	Agricultural use, primary	--	--	P	P	P	P
604	Aquaculture practices	--	--	€ ACUP	ACUP	€ ACUP	ACUP
606	Forestry	--	--	--	--	--	--
608	Shellfish/fish hatcheries and processing facilities	--	--	--	--	--	--
ACCESSORY USES							
700	Accessory use or structure	P	P	P	P	P	P
TEMPORARY USES							
800	Special care units residence	--	--	P	P	P	P
802	Temporary offices and model homes	--	--	ACUP	ACUP	ACUP	ACUP
804	Transitory accommodations, single family residence	P	P	P	P	P	P
806	Transitory accommodations, small, large, safe parks, and indoor	P	P	P	P	P	P