

CODE UPDATE: REASONABLE MEASURES

Verbal and Written Testimony for August 8, 2016 Public Hearing

Issue	Numerical Total per Issue	Number of Testimony
Dry Sewer	1	4
Commitment to Incentives	6	4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 14
Rural Legacy Lots: Property rights issue, challenge Growth Hearings Board	14	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14
Rural Legacy Lots: Kitsap county needs to analyze further and notify specific property owners affected after analysis	11	3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 12, 13, 14
Maximum Urban Lot Size	5	5, 6, 7, 8, 9
Stormwater regulations inconsistent with reasonable measures intent	2	6, 10

#	Time	Name	Comments	Response to Comment:
1.	6:17	Frank Tower	County removed value of the land via comprehensive plan Plat plan created but not able to submit for permits in time available Stopping growth in rural areas not appropriate, Seattle residents will move here	Comments noted. Thank you.
2.	6:23	Dean Jenniges	Seafair: Selling lots in Manchester Zone changes is the problem, stop gerrymandering the Urban Growth Areas What about the empty buildings (wheaton way – redevelopment can occur)?	Comments noted. Thank you.
3.	6:25	Roger Gay	Olympia should do something about the legacy lot requirements PC and BoCC should pass it back to the state This is a property rights issue Planning Commissioner response (J. Sommerhauser): potential comprehensive plan invalidity - building will stop unless issues are addressed. Upcoming committee meetings at State Level.	Comments Noted. An option for consideration is to perform additional analysis relative to our first year of monitoring moving forward. (e.g. Which size lots in rural areas obtained construction permits during certain time period.)
4.	6:28	Alan Beam	Looked at Buildable Lands Report, flawed process because it is not parcel specific Reasonable measures should be based upon monitoring, good that we have started that process Incentives needed to get buyers to the area, not just the developers, low interest loans should be explored as an incentive	Comments Noted. An option for consideration is to perform additional analysis relative to our first year of monitoring moving forward. (e.g. Which size lots in rural areas obtained construction permits during certain time period.)

CODE UPDATE: REASONABLE MEASURES

Verbal and Written Testimony for August 8, 2016 Public Hearing

#	Time	Name	Comments	Response to Comment:
5.	6:31	Teresa Osinski	<p>KBA: Struggling with how to get development that you want, incentives are the key Punitive measures are not the key Measures 2, 3, 5 should be looked at now, not put off until later</p> <p>Legacy Lots: Property owners should be discovered, found, and communicated with them</p> <p>Questions whether Rural Legacy Lots is a mandate or a suggestion</p>	Staff recommends a formal commitment with specified language that will be addressed during the 2016-2017 budget cycle.
6.	6:35	<p>Bill Palmer</p>  <p>Adobe Acrobat Document</p>	<p>Materials Provided: Representing KAPO Object to lack of citizen participation in the process (RCW 36.70A.040) Opposed to any legacy lot restrictions Opposed to maximum lot size Opposed to transfer of development rights because it is ill-defined Property rights issue for three items above Incentives are not defined well enough Stormwater regulations will make urban area development unaffordable and counter the intended effect of reasonable measures</p>	<p>Comments noted. Thank you.</p> <p>A resolution to address the Transfer of Development Rights ratios will be available shortly. The resolution process allows for future modifications to the ratios based upon market driving factors.</p> <p>Staff recommends a formal commitment with specified language that will be addressed during the 2016-2017 budget cycle.</p>
7.	6:39	Richard Brown	<p>Rural legacy lot provisions are the equivalent of stealing property Kitsap County doesn't control water or sewer, not enough money available to provide sewer to the Urban Areas, 1 billion dollar cost to county Where will typical house be built? Why only cater to the appellants who only want urban development?</p>	Comments noted. Thank you.
8.	6:42	Vivian Henderson	<p>Appendix E: Measures are not reasonable Just another attempt of PSRC to commit criminal acts against people of Kitsap County. PSRC already requires Vision 2040, pie in the sky plan developed by elite planners. Most people want to live in rural areas, this is not what people want Reasonable measures represent "I have mine, don't let anyone else build"</p>	Comments noted. Thank you.

CODE UPDATE: REASONABLE MEASURES

Verbal and Written Testimony for August 8, 2016 Public Hearing

#	Time	Name	Comments	Response to Comment:
9.	6:47	Jerry Harless	Issue has recurred for 15 years, but this is the best it has been. This process was different because we included the people who designed these areas Rural Legacy Lots were identified as the cause of the three inconsistencies in the BLR Need to look at whether this is the issue, analysis needed to see if it is indeed the problem Supports lot aggregation, not removal of development rights from single parcels	Comments Noted. An option for consideration is to perform additional analysis relative to our first year of monitoring moving forward. (e.g. Which size lots in rural areas obtained construction permits during certain time period.)
10.	6:50	Betsy Cooper  Adobe Acrobat Document	Materials Provided: Followed basic development in Kitsap County for a while, BLR's are getting better General Comments: Looking at incentive language but needs "shall" not "may" Legacy Lots: Didn't see any true analysis of what lots were affected Two items that hinder infill at least in Kingston UGA: Parking and Stormwater requirements Measure 7 in Capital Improvement Plan needs to be implemented Transfer of Development Rights: Can't pass over, need a date	Comments Noted. An option for consideration is to perform additional analysis relative to our first year of monitoring moving forward. (e.g. Which size lots in rural areas obtained construction permits during certain time period.)
11.	6:55	Marcus Carter	Purpose of government is to protect and maintain individual rights. This supercedes the Growth Management Act. Asks that the commissioners stand against the Growth Management Act based upon the protection of its citizens individual rights.	Comments noted. Thank you.
12.	6:57	Mike Eliason	Kitsap County Association of Realtors: Materials provided Legacy lots: lot aggregation is different from prohibiting building permits Severe housing shortage: rental vacancy at 3.44%, one month of home supply Washington heavy immigration state, not emigration state Not enough notification to property owners who are potentially affected Have the opportunity to challenge the Growth Hearings Board and do what is right	Comments Noted. An option for consideration is to perform additional analysis relative to our first year of monitoring moving forward. (e.g. Which size lots in rural areas obtained construction permits during certain time period.)

CODE UPDATE: REASONABLE MEASURES

Verbal and Written Testimony for August 8, 2016 Public Hearing

#	Time	Name	Comments	Response to Comment:
13.	7:01	Jack Stanfil	Were the owners contacted? The people should be notified.	Comments Noted. An option for consideration is to perform additional analysis relative to our first year of monitoring moving forward. (e.g. Which size lots in rural areas obtained construction permits during certain time period.)
14.	7:02	John Taylor	Regulation burden placed on citizens. Started short plats in 1997 and still hasn't sold all of the lots because of regulation changes. Still not fully compensated for 19 years of work and paying the taxes on those lots.	Comments noted. Thank you.