

Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan Update – Planning Commission Deliberation Matrix – October 1, 2025

Topic	Summary of Issue	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation
Kitsap County Code – Title 16			
Boundary Line Adjustments (16.04.050.G)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public comment – Delay BLA code: There needs to be more public engagement and vetted properly. Consider a BLA purpose statement and task force. Public comment – consider model ordinance. 	<p>Recommend deferral of the BLA code requirements to a future date with a broader community discussion. The County could address BLA issue during 2025 “year of the rural” as many BLA concerns relate to rural lots.</p> <p>Recommend retaining change to the definition of BLA and Building Site (KCC 16.10).</p>	
Land Division – location of recreation area - (KCC 16.24.040.I.3.c)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public comment concerned with addition of adding “centrally”. 	No change recommended. Intended to ensure the open space is not remotely located in the fringes of the plat.	
Land Division – non-conforming lots for public purpose (16.04.050.J)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public comment concerned that this addition would preclude non-conforming lots be created for a public purpose (for example, sectioning off one acre in a RR lot for a sewer pump station). 	No change. The example pump station would be acquired by a public entity thus covered by the language.	
Kitsap County Code – Title 17			
Tree Canopy Code	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public comment throughout process has been in favor of retaining trees, and strengthening tree code, especially in favor of retaining larger (24”+ diameter) trees. Some public comment request that tree ordinance is deferred to be considered at a later date. Codes being considered are complex and many at once (CAO, PREP Program, etc.). Tree code has possibility hamper infill development and impact staff capacity. Another reason to delay is conflict with WUI Code. 	Current drafts include tree canopy retention requirements that were promoted in concept by the Board.	
Tree Canopy Code (17.495.050)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public comment that street trees planted along newly designed ROW internal to a new plat should count as replacement trees. 	Recommend allowing trees to count within ROW of local roads as classified by the Road Standards to count towards the requirements. Not on collectors or arterials.	
Tree Canopy Code (17.495.030.F)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Tree units for existing trees are not adequate to act as an incentive based on the impact their preservation will have on development. Should be increased. 	Recommend creating a 36” and above category worth 5.5 units. Update 24” category to 24-35” and increase to 4.5 units. Increase grove category to 6.5 units.	
Tree Canopy Code (17.495.030.F)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Deciduous replacement trees should count for 1 credit similar to a conifer replacement tree. 	Recommend increasing replacement deciduous trees to 1 (deciduous generally have larger canopies than evergreen and can assist with heat effects).	

Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan Update – Planning Commission Deliberation Matrix – October 1, 2025

Topic	Summary of Issue	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation
Tree Canopy Code (17.495.030.E)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is not a complete sentence 	Recommend change to <u>Diameter at breast-height (DBH) means the diameter of a tree trunk measured at 4.5 feet above average grade of the tree trunk. DBH is used in determining the diameter of existing trees.</u>	
Tree Canopy Code (17.495.050.C.4.b.)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The % of trees that must be in private tracts is too high at 50%. Should be reduced. 	Recommend reducing the percentage to 25% consistent with Pierce County’s requirement.	
Multifamily Open Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multifamily design standards do not have a prescriptive open space standard. The design standards discuss “usable” open space but usable is not defined. 	Recommended addition to the multi-family design standards to discuss the usability of open space in projects <u>Recreational open space tracts shall:</u> <u>a. Be of a grade and surface suitable for recreation improvements and generally have a maximum grade of five percent, unless a steeper grade is acceptable for the activities associated with the amenity;</u> <u>b. Be located on the site of the proposed project;</u> <u>c. Be located within the project in a manner that affords good visibility of the tract from roads, sidewalks and the majority of dwellings;</u> <u>d. Have no dimensions less than thirty feet, except the width of trail segments;</u> <u>e. Be at least five hundred square feet in size;</u> <u>f. Be located in one designated area, unless it is determined that recreational opportunities would be better served by multiple areas developed with recreation or play facilities; and</u> <u>g. Be accessible and convenient for year-round use to all residents within the project.</u> <u>4. Play equipment, paved sports courts, exercise fitness trails, community gardens with water service, age-appropriate facilities or similar amenities shall be provided within the recreational open space tract. Construction of amenities shall meet the latest industry safety standards.</u>	

Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan Update – Planning Commission Deliberation Matrix – October 1, 2025

Topic	Summary of Issue	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation
Park and Ride Impact Fee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Kitsap Transit concerned with \$2,500/space impact fee for Park and Rides 	Recommend consideration of the fee in 2025 when impact fee schedule is updated.	
Zoning and Urban Growth Area Boundaries			
Skokomish Tribe Land Use Reclass Request	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant initial request was to go from RP to Commercial. This was <i>not included</i> in the preferred alternative. Applicant updated request to Industrial and provided additional supporting materials. 	Recommend no change. The Industrial proposal was not reviewed in the Preferred Alternative. The property does not have a support letter from the urban services provider (Bremerton). Additionally, it currently in process to potentially become federal Indian lands which, if approved, would remove County requirements in future uses.	
Goldberg Land Use Request (UGA Amendment #79)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Applicant initial request was to go from RR to UL. This was in Alt. 2 and Alt 3. But <i>not included</i> in preferred alternative. Applicant updated request from UL to UM. Both UL and UM zoning is supported by the City of Port Orchard. 	<p>Recommend no change. The UM proposal was not reviewed in the DEIS or Preferred Alternative. The proposal would require a Developers Agreement to ensure the benefits described in the testimony. With the Plan due in December, this proposal would have an impact of scope, schedule and budget of the update.</p> <p>Could be recommended for future consideration.</p>	
Capital Facilities Plan			
Sewer Map	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New data available 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Add current sewer inventory map to Appendix ‘A’ 	
Transportation Revenue Tables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> New data available - Update of estimated future (2030-2044) funding by revenue source. No change in 2024 – 2029 revenue numbers. 	<p>Update CFP as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Exhibit 3-7. Projected Transportation Grant Revenues for Capital Projects (2024 – 2044 in YOES) Exhibit 3-8. Projected Total Transportation Revenues Allocation for Capital (2024 – 2044 in YOES) Exhibit 4-9287 Transportation Capital Improvement Revenue Sources (All numbers are in 2024 \$1000s) 	

Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan Update – Planning Commission Deliberation Matrix – October 1, 2025

Topic	Summary of Issue	Staff Recommendation	Planning Commission Recommendation
Comprehensive Plan			
Port Gamble Heritage Park Framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comments that PGHP should not be approved until an EIS is approved • PGHP is a reference document, which is different from “adopted by reference”. 	No change. The Plan does not adopt the Port Gamble Forest Heritage Park Framework. It does include the impacts within the FEIS and includes a specific policy about additional wildlife and environmental review prior to planning new major projects. Any <i>adoption</i> of the Framework would be considered separately at a later date.	