



2019
Kitsap County Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendments
Public Outreach, Engagement, and Comments



Introduction

The Department of Community Development (DCD) believes this Comprehensive Plan amendment process must meet the following goals:

- Transparency** – Anyone can easily become informed about the process and access materials
- Predictability** – Processes are clearly and consistently communicated so everyone knows what to expect
- Opportunity** – Everyone can participate without significant barriers

DCD’s outreach and engagement efforts strive to inform and engage interested parties through a variety of methods that exceed legally-mandate requirements, including the following:

- Online Open House (project webpage)
- Kitsap County GovDelivery announcements (via email, SMS text, Facebook, Twitter)
- Nextdoor.com posts
- Open Houses (held in North Kitsap, Central Kitsap, South Kitsap)
- Public hearings
- Legal notice in the Kitsap Sun newspaper
- Formal letters to 6 Tribes & 2 tribal organizations
- Letters/Postcards to landowners for geographically specific amendments
- Signs posted on site-specific amendment parcels
- Surveys and interviews (for certain amendments only)
- Meetings with community groups (as requested)
- Formal consultations with the US Navy, tribes, airports, and other agencies (as required)

Preliminary Tally of Outreach and Engagement

Annual Amendment	2018		2019	
	Outreach	Engagement	Outreach	Engagement
Phase 1 - Scoping	27,895	51	33,270	57
Phase 2 - Development	54,603	222	33,465	43
Phase 3 - Analysis	<i>n/a</i>	<i>n/a</i>	9	85
Phase 4 - Consideration	98,804	292	67,242*	69*
Appeal	0	2		
Remand	83,335*	11*		
Overall	181,302	565	133,986	254

* Reflects tally to-date. Phase not yet complete.

Comments

Public comments received to-date are attached.

2019 Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan Amendment - Public Comments to the Planning Commission

#	Name	Organization	Location of Residence	Comment
General				
1.1	Wulf Pittman			Please help keep Kitsap rural. We cannot continue with this unchecked growth. We fought it off once before with the comprehensive plan. Large development companies are capitalizing on us and the citizens of Kitsap are paying for it. Again I plead: KEEP KITSAP RURAL. Only our <u>elected commissioners can stop this encroachment.</u>
1.2	Kevin Tisdell		Central Kitsap	Summary of public hearing testimony: Our quality of life will be affected by the increase in density, which will ruin the county. Traffic and the speed of development are big concerns. Will be submitting more specific written comments.
Dickey Pit Site-specific (CPA 18-00495)				
2.1	Robert W Hartman Jr		Central Kitsap	I support this amendment. We are in desperate need for housing in the central Kitsap area and the infrastructure is already in place to <u>connect to county utilities along this corridor.</u>
2.2	Scott Dickey		Central Kitsap	how will all these houses enter and exit without congesting dickey rd or willamette meridian?The two sterling hill complex's are a mess already without their third phase even started.also the dickey pit has tons of wet lands that should halt any building? most of willamette meridian joining properties are industrial zoned. Is it possible to build an entrance or exit that serves residential that has to pass through <u>industrial zoned property thats private?</u>
2.3	Brett Caswell		Central Kitsap	Which neighbors have been notified of the proposed zoning changes and by what form of communication? I am an immediate neighbor and the first I have heard of this was by mailer mid-December. With a project of this magnitude I would assume that there would be adequate <u>time given to allow any potentially affected citizens to voice their concerns.</u>
2.4	Crag Coons		Central Kitsap	This proposal to develop Dickey Pit has such a huge impact on all the residents of Willamette Meridian and surrounding county roads a through discussion should be entertained by the county to all the residents, school district, police, environmental groups prior to authorizing approval. Bigger is not always better. This size development would rival developments in Lynnwood, something this county does not need at this time. This would add approximately 3500 additional individuals with 4,000 automobiles having 2 trips/day resulting in 8,000 added car traffic on rural roads in this area, already becoming inadequate with this increased traffic from Seabeck and Sterling Hills development. It seems the county is advocating the extinction a rural areas in Kitsap county for monetary greed by the county for additional tax revenue and developers monetary gain .
Downtown Kingston (Phase 2)				
3.1	Teresa Root		North Kitsap	See attached email.
3.2	Betsy Cooper		North Kitsap	Attached is a comment memo on the 2019 Annual Comp Plan Amendments stemming from the proposal now in front of you for review and one comment generated during conversation with Peter Best at the 12/19 Open House in Kingston. <u>Thank you for the outreach to the community on these proposals. I hope you will consider my comments.</u>
3.3	Dave Wetter		North Kitsap	See attached email.
3.4	Steve Smaaladen		North Kitsap	Summary of public hearing testimony: Support the amendment to allow detached single-family residences in the UVC zone. Is a real estate broker who represents a parcel that has been very difficult to sell or develop because of its very small size and the amendment will remove the barriers to developing the property.
3.5	Cynthia McCurdy		North Kitsap	Summary of public hearing testimony: Lives in Kingston and would like to downsize and move downtown. There are similarly lots of folks waiting to move into downtown Kingston, but several projects are delayed or lots remain empty because of existing restrictions that make development impractical. Opposed to forced mixed-use, but would understand if required only on Main St. Support proposed building height increase.
Silverdale/Kingston UUGA Association & Future Incorporation				

2019 Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan Amendment - Public Comments to the Planning Commission

#	Name	Organization	Location of Residence	Comment
4.1	Nicholas Bond	City of Port Orchard		City of Port Orchard supports the amendment. This is consistent with the discussions between Kitsap jurisdictions concerning VISION 2050 allocations, and our request to PSRC to shift population allocations as part of VISION 2050 and to reclassify Kingston as a High Capacity Transit Community.
Unrelated (included for completeness)				
x.1	Barbara Culbert		North Kitsap	This certainly isn't user friendly. I wasted an hour and discovered nothing. Clicking on options took me no where. Isn't there a way of getting us update highlights so we don't need to wade thru every single issue and document just to find out there is nothing relevant to us at this time?
x.2	Frank Tweten		South Kitsap	Online comment (also provided as public hearing testimony): I Have a piece of Property on the corner of Spring and Main. Currently it's zoned for a Drinking Establishment "Tavern". That is the worst thing you could put on a residential street. I'm Trying to get residential density on the site. I had a 9 unit condominium mixed use project. After the market crash the project concept is not supported. During the process the zoning stripped the residential density from the MVC zone.
x.3	Mike Liebert		Central Kitsap	<p>I am writing to express my concerns about the 2016-2036 Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan as it pertains to the classifications within North Kitsap Heritage Park (NKHP). The NKHP is unique from the standpoint that Kitsap County possesses both the land interest and the future timber rights within the park. This is in contrast to the Pope-Talbot (P-T) tracts near Port Gamble where the swap between P-T and Kitsap County preserved the timber rights with P-T for the next 20 years. As anyone who is a frequent hiker in the Port Gamble tracts can tell you, P-T is making good use of its timber rights to clear cut large swaths of land in this area. The unsightliness of the area is shocking in comparison to the natural beauty which predated the clear-cutting. Furthermore, the machinery used for this purpose leaves virtually no stands of tree, as that machinery cannot distinguish between yearlings and fully harvestable trees. I can understand that P-T is running a business, however there should be some restrictions on the extent of timber that can be extracted from this North Kitsap area.</p> <p>But I have digressed from the purpose of my comments. The current environment of the NKHP consists of hilly land full of springs and wetlands, geared toward active recreation defined as trail uses. The current collaboration between the volunteer stewardship group and Kitsap County Parks classifies land use within NKHP to achieve long term resources protection and describe compatible public uses including recreation. As stated in the 2011 North Kitsap String of Pearls Trail Plan: "The beauty of simple walking trails is that they can be built and maintained by volunteers, have minimal environmental impact and provide people of all ages the opportunity to get outside and enjoy nature." As I understand the proposal that is coming before the Board of Commissioners in the near future, a permanent road surface traversing the park from the north (Norman Road Entrance) to the south and to the White Horse Golf Course entrances, is planned. This road surface requires county standards for width, (I was informed the distance will be 12 feet) not including culverts and shoulders.</p> <p>Although supposition on my part, it would appear the primary beneficiary of a diagonal access route across NKHP for the purpose of expediting traffic from the Kingston ferry terminal, would be the White Horse Golf Course.</p> <p>I oppose the request for a permanent road access route (whether paved or gravel surface) that interferes with the current environment of the NKHP.</p> <p>Mike Liebert -- Silverdale</p>

2019 Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan Amendment - Public Comments to the Planning Commission

#	Name	Organization	Location of Residence	Comment
x.4	Dan O'Shaughnessy		South Kitsap	Summary of public hearing testimony: Chair of the Southworth Coalition, which is very concerned with traffic speeds on Sedgwick and Southworth Drive. Seeking Kitsap County support for transportation planning and fixes to the speeding issues.

Peter Best

From: Peter Best
Sent: Wednesday, January 15, 2020 3:43 PM
To: jjohn136@centurytel.net
Subject: 2019 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Comment - Answers to Questions

Dear Teresa,

Thank you for submitting the below online comment regarding the Downtown Kingston (Phase 2) Comprehensive Plan amendment currently being considered by the Kitsap County Planning Commission. You asked a number of questions and I wanted to provide you with direct responses below in red. This email will be entered into the formal record as a public comment.

I own 2 pieces of property on Pennsylvania Ave NE in Kingston. They are 26180 and 26160 Pennsylvania Ave NE. I received notice of the proposed changes. After reading through most of this I have a few questions.

Parking

I see that my 2 properties are included within the new proposed high capacity transit station area. I am very concerned that my on street parking will be compromised by this. The ferry commuters already park on the street at the bottom of Pennsylvania. What will prevent them from moving up the hill and blocking my parking? I don't see any provisions for making sure the existing property owners retain the parking they currently have. Over in Seattle in some areas they provide home owners with parking credentials to make sure that they retain their parking. I have friends near the UW and I know this is possible. I may have missed this in the report. Can you explain how you will protect current home owners and their parking on the streets?

The policies and design guidelines anticipate future area-wide parking management to address on-street parking and public parking.

ADU's etc

I know that my 2 lots are each zoned for more than one residence. When I looked at the matrix to see how or if any changes applied to my properties, I couldn't find a key to the abbreviations. I have no idea what ACUP means, etc. Maybe you can tell me please if my 2 lots would be able to have ADU's or other dwelling units built on them under this new proposal.

Yes, the proposed changes would make ADUs an allowed use on each of your lots. ACUP means "administrative conditional use permit."

Height changes

35 to 45 ft. Does this apply to my properties or just to the area called Old Town Waterfront on the map?

Your properties currently have an allowed maximum height of 45'. This amendment will not change the allowed maximum height on your properties.

Alleys

If I am able to put an ADU onto one or both properties, can I use the alley to access the parking? Can the parking be in the setback?

Your parcels are not on a designated alley, but there does appear to be an existing alley right-of-way and some sort of existing access drive behind your parcels. You should be able to use this access since it is in the right-of-way, but you would need to consult with Kitsap County Public Works for more details. Parking cannot be in a setback, but there are no required setbacks in your zone (see [KCC 17.420.054](#)).

Streets

4th St has never been paved although it is in use from Pennsylvania to the alley. (From the alley to Illinois it is just a walking trail.)

4th St is in use by the large condominium complex whose main entrance is off Illinois, and by the property owner at 26190 Pennsylvania.

I propose that 4th St be paved from Pennsylvania to the alley as part of the general improvements to Kingston both aesthetically and functionally.

You would need to discuss such an improvement with the Kitsap County Public Works department since it is in the right-of-way.

Thank you for your time and consideration on this. I appreciate it.

Cheers,
Peter

Peter Best | Senior Planner
Kitsap County Department of Community Development
[Planning and Environmental Programs](#)
619 Division St, MS 36
Port Orchard, WA 98366
(360) 337-7098 | pbest@co.kitsap.wa.us

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this e-mail, in whole or in part, may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

To: Kitsap County Staff, Planning Commission Members and County Commissioners

From: Betsy Cooper

I am writing today to respond to the Request for comments on the Phase II process of the 2019 Comprehensive Plan Amendments. As some of those that will review these comments may not know me, here is a bit of background on my involvement in Kingston and planning in the County to preface the comments.

I live in the Kingston UGA. I have a Land Use and regulatory background from my prior work for New York City and King County. I have been an active member of several County Land Use Advisory Committees since 2000 including the Kingston Citizen's Advisory Committee, 3 of the UGA steering committees, a Kitsap Co. public works advisory comment in the late 2000's and most recently the UVC Advisory Committee of 2019. I was part of the conversation when the County initially applied the UVC designation to a portion of downtown Kingston to promote residential density and enhanced commercial opportunity in the downtown core. However we all have watched the lack of infill development materialized.

I have two topics for which I offer comments:

1) Staff Recommendation of Pedestrian Oriented Commercial Street Frontage

When Commissioner Gelder and DCD Initiated the 2019 Advisory Committee to look at the barriers to develop and infill progress in the Kingston UVC, the major barrier unanimously identified was the requirement of commercial development requirements implemented simultaneously with multi-story development. While this concept was originally proposed in Kingston and one other place in the county, now I believe only Kingston has retained it. It is a common planning concept in developing areas where residential density is encouraged and those densities are expected to support an influx of commercial. However it appears there needs to be a certain residential density first, before the commercial component can be expected to thrive.

The current Staff recommendation of Pedestrian Oriented Commercial Street Frontage proposes that the ground floor commercial requirement remain on Rt104 (Main street) between W. Kingston Road and Washington, and segments between Central and First on cross streets of Ohio and Iowa, W. Kingston and Washington. This proposal would retain this current barrier to development of the properties. This proposal is not moving us in a direction that will support the infill we so dearly need and it continues the pressure felt on areas outside of the UGA to develop which is counter to the principles of the UGA.

While I understand the concern of Staff that this area is nominally the 'downtown' and should not be allowed to develop in way that would preclude a walkable town center, retaining the current UVC requirements will just thwart any development, not encourage a town center.

It is possible that perhaps the Main Street Corridor could be singled out (not the side streets proposed) as an area where the preference for commercial on the first floor could continue to be nurtured. I would propose that be done but a provision requiring ONLY that the floor height on the First floor of any multistory building to be required to be that which would accommodate a commercial retrofit in the future. That would allow that corridor to be retained for commercial if and when it is economically feasible for the market to bring it in. To require a full build out of all commercial requirements on the first floor of these buildings now, OR to require such commercial requirements to all those side streets is NOT an action that is in the best interest of County's goal to encourage residential building in its newly designated County-wide Regional Transportation centers.

Let's face it; the key is to get the residential population in the UGAs. The staff's recommendation will continue to stifle that.

Therefore I request you reject the Staff's proposal as presented and either retain the Advisory Committee's recommendations in whole or revise the Staff's recommendation to scale it aerial extent and require only a commercial floor height requirement and no other commercial requirements on the first floor so that residential development can move forward now with Commercial to follow when feasible.

2) Design Standards – Page 31 of Design in the Staff Report I believe it is noted in Attachment A 2 – Parking H

As part of the discussion in the 2019 Advisory Committee Discussions about barriers to infill development in Kingston's UVC one of the other major issues identified and unanimously agreed upon as critical to address to spur development was parking requirements. The committee discussed this at length and many ideas were shared and revisions were proposed to the staff. To my knowledge many or most of the ideas discussed are under consideration now. However at the Open House in Kingston on 12/19, in conversation with Peter Best several of us realized that there is one aspect of the current Design Standards that apply to the Kingston UVC that we did not discuss but that seems to be a major problem for Kingston. That is the current standards do not appear to allow for a standalone parking structure to be built in the Kingston UVC.

During the 2019 Advisory Committee meetings many of us were surprised when we learned that the "Kingston Design Standards" had been adopted as standards rather than the 'guidelines' they had been for many years. While that is not necessarily a negative thing, through our discussions this year it clear that some revisions to those standards should be considered. Taking on that task was clearly out of our Committee's preview so we just commented on some things for the County to consider BUT, we did not discuss the specific provisions about parking structure other than we all acknowledge that a structure may be the solution to parking needs in Kingston. There were conversations about how the Port might want to do some kind of joint venture with other land owners and that perhaps one structure could address parking requirements for many smaller properties in Kingston. However if the Design Standards current prohibit such a structure unless it is multi-use facility there appears to again be a fatal flaw in the code that could be a significant barrier to addressing development in Kingston.

Therefore I request that the County look at the current provisions in Kingston for Parking Structures and specifically in the UVC Design Standards and revise them to allow for ways to site a thoughtfully designed and strategically place parking structure.

I hope you will consider these comments in your deliberations.

Sincerely,

Betsy Cooper

Peter Best

From: Dave Wetter <dwetter@mindspring.com>
Sent: Saturday, December 28, 2019 3:40 PM
To: Peter Best; almostcandid@me.com; Betsycooper1@gmail.com; jetw@windermere.com; jon@orminc.com; kacchair@gmail.com; Langwithn52@gmail.com; mike@fphconstruction.com; Rlanning360@gmail.com
Cc: Angie Silva; Dave Ward; Liz Williams
Subject: RE: Downtown Kingston (Phase 2) Draft Amendments

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Completed

Peter,

A few more comments:

- 1) At the Open House, there were some comments about a pedestrian mall on the main street after 104 has been relocated to 1st street. The comments were about 20 foot wide sidewalks in that area. I don't know the origin of that comment because the proposed amendment clearly states a 12 foot wide preferred width and an 8 foot wide minimum. Could you please clarify?
- 2) Page 29, B On-Site circulation and parking 1(c): limits driveways on secondary roads to no more than one per 150 feet. Please note that there are several narrower properties on Illinois, Iowa and Ohio Avenues that have no alley and, consequently, under this rule would be denied a driveway. Is that the intention?
- 3) Page 31, Parking 2(h): "Line structured parking garages with a perimeter of tenant commercial spaces or mixed uses...". As you may recall from our working group discussions, one of the options to address parking requirements on small commercial lots was the development of a consolidated parking garage. The most likely current locations based on land availability would be on Port property on the WSF site at Iowa and 1st street.

Both of these sites are outside of the proposed Pedestrian-Oriented Commercial Street Frontage plan on Appendix B. Consequently, they are less likely to be commercially viable. If the objective is to obscure the visual impact of a parking garage, the more practical solution might be to address the architectural treatment on the exterior of the first floor.

Please advise and let me know if these comments and the ones on my earlier e-mail below adequate or if I need to re-enter them on the website.

Thanks,
Dave

From: Dave Wetter [mailto:dwetter@mindspring.com]
Sent: Friday, December 27, 2019 2:50 PM
To: 'Peter Best' <pbest@co.kitsap.wa.us>; 'almostcandid@me.com' <almostcandid@me.com>; 'Betsycooper1@gmail.com' <Betsycooper1@gmail.com>; 'jetw@windermere.com' <jetw@windermere.com>; 'jon@orminc.com' <jon@orminc.com>; 'kacchair@gmail.com' <kacchair@gmail.com>; 'Langwithn52@gmail.com'

<Langwithn52@gmail.com>; 'mike@fphconstruction.com' <mike@fphconstruction.com>; 'Rlanning360@gmail.com' <Rlanning360@gmail.com>

Cc: 'Angie Silva' <ASilva@co.kitsap.wa.us>; 'Dave Ward' <dward@co.kitsap.wa.us>; 'Liz Williams' <lawilliams@co.kitsap.wa.us>

Subject: RE: Downtown Kingston (Phase 2) Draft Amendments

Peter,

This “slightly revised version” included the added clause (below) by the staff on page 40 under design character:

“The ground floor of Buildings along pedestrian oriented commercial street frontages (see appendix B) shall be built for the commercial use or eventual conversion to commercial occupancy along the street frontage. These commercial spaces may be initially used for residential use.”

This clause caused quite a discussion between you and some of the above committee members who were at the 12-19-19 Kingston Open House. Some of the angst was around three points:

- 1) This particular issue was discussed in our working group as a barrier to development because cost of building to the commercial code for initial residential use was too high to make a project feasible. An example was discussed of a UVC project that was shelved after all the A & E work was completed, partially due to the fact of these commercial requirements.
- 2) The area of “pedestrian oriented commercial street frontages” (appendix B) appeared to all to be way in excess of what would be market driven. Particularly, on the side streets of Highway 104).
- 3) The clause is vague and needs to be more specific regarding the requirements to be commercial. For example, does that mean the initial development will require a:
 - a) Commercial grade fire sprinkler system?
 - b) Commercial grade HVAC?
 - c) 10 foot ceiling on the ground floor?
 - d) 5/8 “ drywall?

Does “...or eventual conversion to commercial occupancy...” mean that all of the above could be implemented at that later conversion date, even if that did not appear to be practical to the DCD staff?

Similar to a binding agreement to defer sidewalk construction until a later date, could a binding agreement concept or note to the title be considered for commercial upgrade when, and if, that commercial use becomes a reality?

Peter, the devil is always in the details. For this concept not to continue as a barrier to development, it needs to be more specific.

Thanks,
Dave

From: Peter Best [<mailto:pbest@co.kitsap.wa.us>]

Sent: Wednesday, November 27, 2019 2:03 PM

To: almostcandid@me.com; Betsycooper1@gmail.com; Dwetter@mindspring.com; jetw@windermere.com; jon@orminc.com; kcacchair@gmail.com; Langwithn52@gmail.com; mike@fphconstruction.com; Rlanning360@gmail.com

Cc: Angie Silva <ASilva@co.kitsap.wa.us>; Dave Ward <dward@co.kitsap.wa.us>; Liz Williams <lawilliams@co.kitsap.wa.us>

Subject: RE: Downtown Kingston (Phase 2) Draft Amendments

All:

Attached is a slightly revised version of the proposed amendment. There was one new provision (Section IV.A.1.c in this draft) that did not get transferred into the version sent to you on Monday. My apologies for any inconvenience this may cause. The rest of the document is unchanged.

I hope you all have a wonderful Thanksgiving.

Sincerely,
Peter

Peter Best | Senior Planner
Kitsap County Department of Community Development
[Planning and Environmental Programs](#)
619 Division St, MS 36
Port Orchard, WA 98366
(360) 337-7098 | pbest@co.kitsap.wa.us

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this e-mail, in whole or in part, may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

From: Peter Best
Sent: Monday, November 25, 2019 1:31 PM
To: almostcandid@me.com; Betsycooper1@gmail.com; Dwetter@mindspring.com; jetw@windermere.com; jon@orminc.com; kcacchair@gmail.com; Langwithn52@gmail.com; mike@fphconstruction.com; Rlanning360@gmail.com
Cc: Angie Silva (asilva@co.kitsap.wa.us) <asilva@co.kitsap.wa.us>; Dave Ward (dward@co.kitsap.wa.us) <dward@co.kitsap.wa.us>; Liz Williams <lawilliams@co.kitsap.wa.us>
Subject: Downtown Kingston (Phase 2) Draft Amendments
Importance: High

Dear Kingston UVC Workgroup Members:

As promised to the Workgroup, attached please find the Phase 2 draft amendments for Downtown Kingston. These will be publicly released with a full staff report on 12/10 when the public comment period begins. Please do not distribute the attached document beyond workgroup members until 12/10.

This document includes everything you recommended (in blue text) and additional Department recommendations (in red text). Department recommendations were developed using feedback from a variety of staff in the Departments of Community Development and Public Works and are intended to:

- Further clarify code and design standards.
- Improve administration.
- Improve consistency with other parts of Kitsap County Code and other recent planning activities for Kingston (i.e. Complete Streets Plan).
- Improve consistency with changes to the regional growth management plan (VISION 2050).
- Achieve the long-term vision for a pedestrian-oriented downtown Kingston.

Comment 3.3

In a few cases, the Department has provided an alternative recommendation to a workgroup recommendation. These are mostly a re-phrasing of the recommendation intended to achieve the same outcome or to expand the idea to an area larger than the UVC zone.

In a few cases, the Department has proposed additional provisions, including the following:

- Designated pedestrian-oriented commercial street frontages (Design Standards - Appendix B)
- Alley plan (Design Standards - Appendix C)
- Increasing building height in the Lindvog Commercial district from 35' to 45' for the same reasons as in the UVC portion of the other design districts.

Let me know if you have any questions. If you would like to get together as a group to discuss the Department recommendations, please let me know.

Sincerely,
Peter

Peter Best | Senior Planner
Kitsap County Department of Community Development
[Planning and Environmental Programs](#)
619 Division St, MS 36
Port Orchard, WA 98366
(360) 337-7098 | pbest@co.kitsap.wa.us

NOTICE OF PUBLIC DISCLOSURE: This e-mail account is public domain. Any correspondence from or to this e-mail account may be a public record. Accordingly, this e-mail, in whole or in part, may be subject to disclosure pursuant to RCW 42.56, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.