



DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT 2011 Annual Report

Larry Keeton, Director

DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

2011 Annual Report

Table of Contents

<i>Department Accomplishments</i>	2
<i>Staffing</i>	2
<i>Summit 2011</i>	2
<i>Permit Statistics</i>	
<i>Submittals</i>	3
<i>Turn Around Time</i>	4
<i>Objective Processing Times</i>	6
<i>Inspections</i>	7
<i>Code Compliance</i>	7
<i>Budget</i>	7
<i>Appeals / Mediation</i>	8
<i>Director's Assessment</i>	8
<i>Appendix 1 - 4</i>	10

Community Development
614 DIVISION STREET MS-36
PORT ORCHARD WASHINGTON
98366-4682
Phone: (360) 337-5777
FAX: (360) 337-4415
www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/

Purpose

Provide Citizens, Board of Commissioners, Stakeholders and Interested Parties an annual report on the permit/land use activities of Kitsap County's Department of Community Development for the year 2011.

Department's Mission

Enable the development of quality, affordable, structurally safe and environmentally sound communities.

Overview

The Department of Community Development (DCD) has the following major functions:

Develops and implements the County's Comprehensive Plans, subarea plans, Shoreline Master Plan, and subsequent codes that manage land use, environmental protection, and storm water in the unincorporated areas of Kitsap County (mandated).

Performs the public safety and health functions related to safe structures, fire protection, code compliance, environmental compliance, etc. through its permitting and inspections processes (mandated).

Coordinates the County's requirements under the State/Federal Salmon Recovery Plan and provides technical and policy assistance to the Board on Hood Canal, Puget Sound, Surface and Stormwater and related environmental mandates (mandated).

Department Accomplishments

- Awarded Governor's Smart Vision Award for Rural Element of Comprehensive Plan
- Established Comprehensive Plan policies for agriculture and amended transfer development rights policies
- Continued to work the Shoreline Master Plan Update by completing initial drafts of proposed code and vetting through the Shoreline Master Plan Task Force
- Worked with Hood Canal Coordinating Council on Navy's In Lieu Fee for mitigation of the proposed explosives handling wharf
- Awarded five grants that focus on watershed planning, stream typing and mapping, forests preservation, etc.
- Completed a major legislative update of Title 16, Land Segregation
- Implemented a cross training program of building and fire plans reviewers for commercial buildings so one reviewer could review the plans vice two
- Implemented an electronic file database for fire inspections that could be shared between the Fire Marshal's office and the fire districts
- Facilitated approval and construction of Silverdale YMCA site development activity permit using innovative and contemporary low impact development techniques
- Updated department's forms, applications, and checklists to make them usable in the implementation of Smart Gov and complete for applicants
- Worked with contractor to enhance the Land Information System Permitting module – new system is Smart Gov and has required significant staff time to ensure the program is an effective tool that improves service delivery

Staffing

In 2011, staff operated at .85 full time equivalents with several exceptions. The Fire Marshal office and selected Environmental Programs staff worked 1.0 FTE which were funded by either the General Fund or grants. During the year four individuals left the department and their positions remained vacant.

Summit 2011

On August 31, 2011, the Board of Commissioners conducted a summit of department personnel, stakeholders, and interested citizens to review DCD's operations. It was recognized that the Department had made improvements over the previous five years and had endured significant economic conditions that impacted service delivery since 2008.

Several key issues were raised that the Department was asked to focus on over the next year. They are:

- Improve permit processing time to include increasing the number of over the counter permits available to applicants
- Improve the communications between the department and its users
- Improve the methodology for a code development process
- Improve customer service by using email less and the phones more

Appendix 1 has key points for the aforementioned concerns.

Permit Statistics: Submittals

Permit Submittals: A major factor in the county's economic health is land development and construction. Permit activity can demonstrate this economic health. The following table shows the overall number of land use and building permits as well as two **selected** categories that can be used to analyze current and future work.

All Permits

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Total Land Use/ Building Type Permits	4,143	4,063	3,229	2,638	2,402	2,519

Category 1: Current Activity Type Permits

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Commercial Office/Multi Fam/Retail	16	24	9	9	7	12
Commercial Tenant Improvement	122	163	156	161	143	183
Residential Single Family Residence	1,001	869	484	392	263	242
Residential Remodels/Additions	216	196	131	129	287	232
Site Development Activity Permit Commercial	23	19	23	14	12	10

Category 2: Long Term Land Use Permits

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Preliminary Plats	7	11	5	5	3	1
Preliminary Plats - Large Lots	32	18	18	4	5	3
Preliminary Plats - Short Plats	42	28	20	8	11	5

Summary: Though there was an increase in permit activity, which is primarily attributed to a change in the energy code, it would appear that permit submittal activity is leveling out. Additionally, the interest in creating new residential lots continues to decline which reflects the current housing market within the region.

Permit Statistics: Turn Around Time

Turn Around Time: A common criticism is that once a permit application is submitted, it takes forever to get them approved and issued. This report introduces a new performance measurement - turnaround times. The Land Information System reports the percentage of permits issued within 7, 14, 21, 28, 60, 90, and 90 plus days after submittal. *Over the counter permits, permit issued the same day as submitted, issued in 2011 was 38%.*

**Table 1 – All Permits
Cumulative % of All Permits Approved
Days after Submittal**

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
# of Permits Approved	2,612	2,819	2,415	1,847	1,819	1,967
Within 7 Days	33%	45%	46%	44%	40%	43%
Within 14 Days	46%	58%	60%	57%	53%	56%
Within 28 Days	66%	72%	79%	77%	76%	76%
Within 60 Days	84%	87%	90%	93%	92%	93%
Within 90 Days	89%	89%	93%	96%	96%	96%

**Table 2 – Building Permits
Cumulative % of All Building Permits Approved
Days after Submittal**

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
# of Permits Approved	1,886	1,854	1,618	1,371	1,346	1,466
Within 7 Days	30%	38%	41%	41%	41%	44%
Within 14 Days	46%	46%	59%	53%	53%	57%
Within 28 Days	70%	73%	82%	77%	76%	78%
Within 60 Days	89%	91%	95%	96%	94%	96%
Within 90 Days	94%	93%	98%	98%	98%	98%

Permit Statistics: Turn Around Time (continued)

**Table 3 – Fire Marshal Permits
Cumulative % of All Fire Marshal Permits Approved
Days after Submittal**

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
# of Permits Approved	162	159	185	135	168	194
Within 7 Days	17%	35%	51%	47%	50%	51%
Within 14 Days	31%	64%	73%	76%	73%	72%
Within 28 Days	55%	86%	91%	93%	94%	88%
Within 60 Days	86%	101%	99%	97%	98%	100%
Within 90 Days	89%	103%	100%	98%	99%	100%

**Table 4 – Site Development Activity Permits
Cumulative % of Site Development Activity Permits Approved
Days after Submittal**

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
# of Permits Approved	100	106	93	53	56	59
Within 7 Days	3%	1%	2%	2%	0%	2%
Within 14 Days	3%	5%	3%	11%	0%	2%
Within 28 Days	9%	10%	10%	13%	2%	6%
Within 60 Days	24%	18%	21%	30%	23%	23%
Within 90 Days	57%	26%	33%	45%	46%	55%

Summary: The previous charts show the Department has improved its turnaround times over the past five years despite a 47% reduction in staffing.

Permit Statistics: Permit Application Meeting Objective Processing Times

Permit Application Meeting Objective Processing Times: The Department identified eight permit types to track permit performance: automatic fire extinguisher systems, fire alarm and detection systems, commercial tenant improvements, conditional use permits requiring hearing examiner approval – commercial, and site development activity permit – residential. In 2010, two additional permit types were added: single family residence remodel – major and single family residence remodel – minor. Appendix 2 is a detailed breakdown of these permit types identifying the number issued, the average processing days as compared to the objective processing times, and the percentage of permits that met the processing times. Processing times reflect the total time (other than “Stop Clock Time” when staff is waiting for the applicant to respond) that the application is in the department from the application date to the issued date.

Type of Permit	Objective Processing Time	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
		%	%	%	%	%	%
Auto Fire Extinguisher Systems	10 days	0%	19%	49%	41%	37%	53%
	30 days	39%	84%	97%	100%	83%	79%
Fire Alarm & Detection Systems	10 days	10%	13%	70%	60%	46%	46%
	30 days	59%	54%	96%	95%	95%	85%
Commercial Tenant Improvement	30 days	64%	62%	79%	72%	85%	65%
Conditional Use Permit	106 days	0%	0%	8%	16%	0%	0%
Preliminary Plat	106 days	0%	24%	0%	0%	None Submitted	0%
Single Family Residence (SFR)	14 days	30%	45%	45%	49%	21%	33%
	30 days	57%	69%	69%	77%	59%	66%
SFR Remodel - Major	14 days	Not Evaluated				38%	34%
	30 days	Not Evaluated				74%	74%
SFR Remodel – Minor	14 days	Not Evaluated				81%	87%
	30 days	Not Evaluated				94%	95%
SDAP Commercial	106 days	11%	0%	5%	9%	100%	63%
SDAP Residential	106 days	23%	14%	44%	9%	54%	100%

Inspections

With the loss of a plans reviewer, one inspector spends part of their time doing plans review. A major complaint was the unavailability of inspectors on Friday. In August, the department implemented a five day inspection schedule by managing staff time. There was no increase in inspection capacity, just a shift in workload to cover five days than the previous four. Inspection activity is shown in the following table.

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
Number of Structure Inspections	25,059	24,913	21,247	17,411	14,140	13,603
Average Number of Daily Inspections	101	100	86	73	66	64
Daily Rollover Average	Not Evaluated	8	4	6	5	2

Code Compliance

New cases are declining; however case closure rates have also decreased due to staff hour reductions from full time to .85 FTE.

	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
New Cases	1454	1247	985	891	719	320
% Cases Closed within 1 year	57%	68%	68%	59%	95%	85%

Budget

The Department completed its fourth year as a Special Revenue Fund. Though staff hours were increased from .80 to .85 FTE, the budget continues to be tight. However, the departure of four staff members and the decision to not fill their positions helped improve the fund balance by \$9,000.

Revenues: \$5,846,501
Expenditures: \$5,836,661

Appeals / Mediation Report

In 2010, the Board of Commissioners adopted land use mediation procedures and removed the Board from the land use appeals process. Appendix 3 provides a detailed list of appeals since 2009.

Closed Record Appeals	2009	2010	2011
Hearing Examiner to Board Appeals	8	0	0
Board to Superior Court Appeals	1	0	0
Board to Shoreline Hearings Board Appeals	1	1	0
Hearing Examiner to Superior Court Appeals	NA	0	0
Hearing Examiner to Shoreline Hearing Board Appeals	NA	0	0

There were five mediations conducted since the adoption of mediation for land use issues. Four of the issues were resolved through mediation. Appendix 4 provides more detail regarding the mediation types, efforts, and staff costs.

Director's Assessment

2011 proved be another challenging year for the organization. Individuals continued to take salary reductions at the 15 percent level. However, staff morale was reasonably high.

Process improvements were resumed with a major focus on the development of the next generation of the Land Use Permit System. Known as Smart Gov, this system will enhance project tracking and processing, provide better statuses on the web, and opens the way for on line permitting.

The August 31 Summit continues to highlight perceptions about the Department's ability to process permits. Many of the issues raised were from previous years. However, the department's permit turnaround time is respectable. 44% of the permits are approved and readied to be issued within a week; 96% are ready within 60 days. There continues to be issues with select land use permit applications and their processing times. They are well over the 120 objective, even though they've declined over the years.

Title 16, Land Segregation, was a major update for the department and community. The staff excelled in this significant update.

Finally, the Board of Commissioners and stakeholder groups continued to demonstrate support for the Department's activities. Many citizens have volunteered numerous hours to help create comprehensive plan updates or code amendments that improve the economic environment within the county's jurisdiction. The Department's leadership is truly appreciative of these contributions by individual and organizations.

Appendices

- 1 – Summit Issues
- 2 – Performance Measures Final Report 2011
- 3 – Appeals Report
- 4 – Mediation Report

Appendix 1: Recap of Summit Issues

On August 31, 2011, the Board of Commissioners hosted a workshop regarding Department of Community Development operations, issues, etc. The Summit provided opportunity to address and develop solutions to several issues. This report identifies key issues and a proposed time line to develop and implement solutions to these issues.

Key Issues:

Issue: Permit Processing

- Accountability of time/process handling
- Code based conditions
- Usable checklists that determine completion of an application, etc.
- Over the counter permits should be the norm/not the exception
- Predictability of approvals in terms of time, cost, work priority
- Transparency of process and expedited review
- Can SEPA be done earlier in the process versus later
- Requirements for health district review for all permits – necessary?
- Water/sewer availability letters for all permits – necessary?

Issue: Communications

- Responsiveness to applicant's questions/queries
- Answering general public questions
- Educational outreach
 - Public
 - Fire Districts on Code
- Consistency
- Transparency
- Developing trust
- Improve relationship building efforts
- Use phone more internal/external communications

Issue: Code Development

- Establish standard methodology
- Engage stakeholders earlier in setting up the process
- Disconnects between code requirements/conditions and "department" requirements/conditions – what's the basis

Issue: Customer Service

- "Level of service" defined
- Phone calls not being returned
- Use of email rather than picking up the phone

Appendix 2: Performance Measures Final Report

Automatic Fire Extinguishing System
(Objective Processing Time: 10/30 Days)

	2006	2007	2008	2009	Pre 2010 Submittal*	2010 Submittal	2011
# of Permits Issued	47	43	49	29	9	30	47
Average Processing Time-Days	38.8	17.7	13.1	10.3	12	18.7	16.4
% Met Objective Target - 10 days	0%	19%	49%	41%	11%	37%	53%
% Met Objective Target - 30 days	39%	84%	97%	100%	100%	83%	79%

Fire Alarm and Detection System
(Objective Processing Time: 10/30 Days)

	2006	2007	2008	2009	Pre 2010 Submittal*	2010 Submittal	2011
# of Permits Issued	60	52	64	45	4	39	54
Average Processing Time-Days	34	54	9	10.9	17.6	13.9	15
% Met Objective Target - 10 days	10%	13%	70%	60%	25%	46%	46%
% Met Objective Target - 30 days	59%	54%	96%	96%	75%	95%	85%

Commercial Tenant Improvements
(Objective Processing Time: 30 Days)

	2006	2007	2008	2009	Pre 2010 Submittal*	2010 Submittal	2011
# of Permits Issued	74	104	129	126	16	116	132
Average Processing Time-Days	27.5	33.1	25	24.2	112	20,7	28.4
% Met Objective Target	64%	62%	79%	72%	0%	85%	65%

Conditional Use Permits (Hearing Examiner)
Objective Processing Time: 106 Days

	2006	2007	2008	2009	Pre 2010 Submittal*	2010 Submittal	2011
# of Permits Approved	8	13	13	16	8	4	3
Avg Process Time To Notice of Decision-Days	Insuff Data	329.6	315	780	293	232	196
% Met Objective Target	0%	0%	8%	0%	0%	0%	0%

Appendix 2: Performance Measures Final Report (continued)

Single Family Residence Remodel (Major) (New)

Objective Processing Time: 14/30 Days

	2006	2007	2008	2009	Pre 2010 Submittal	2010 Submittal	2011
# of Permits Issued			Not Evaluated			39	35
Average Processing Time-Days						23	21.9
% Met Objective Target - 14 days						38%	34%
% Met Objective Target - 30 days						74%	74%

Single Family Residence Remodel (Minor) (New)

Objective Processing Time: 14/30 Days

	2006	2007	2008	2009	Pre 2010 Submittal	2010 Submittal	2011
# of Permits Issued			Not Evaluated			67	55
Average Processing Time-Days						7.9	12.3
% Met Objective Target - 14 days						81%	87%
% Met Objective Target - 30 days						94%	95%

Single Family Residence with Garage

Objective Processing Time: 14/30 Days

	2006	2007	2008	2009	Pre 2010 Submittal	2010 Submittal	2011
# of Permits Issued	601	677	401	259	45	171	194
Average Processing Time-Days	38.2	35.4	25.5	25.3	54.6	31.3	38
% Met Objective Target - 14 days	30%	45%	49%	42%	24%	21%	33%
% Met Objective Target - 30 days	57%	69%	77%	52%	53.00%	59%	66%

Preliminary Plats

Objective Processing Time: 106 Days

	2006	2007	2008	2009	Pre 2010 Submittal	2010 Submittal	2011
# of Permits Issued	6	17	9	8	2	0	2
Average Processing Time-Days	Insuff Data	443.8	502	954.5	309.5		359
% Met Objective Target	0%	24%	0%	12%	0%		0%

Appendix 2: Performance Measures Final Report (continued)

Site Development Activity Permit - Commercial

Objective Processing Time: 106 Days

	2006	2007	2008	2009	Pre 2010 Submittal	2010 Submittal	2011
# of Permits Issued	19	14	17	7	9	7	8
Average Processing Time-Days	221.3	190.3	283	151.4	227.4	61	102
% Met Objective Target	11%	0%	5%	0%	0%	100%	63%

Site Development Activity Permit Single Family Residence

Objective Processing Time: 106 Days

	2006	2007	2008	2009	Pre 2010 Submittal	2010 Submittal	2011
# of Permits Issued	47	56	36	23	16	13	14
Average Processing Time-Days	93.2	186.8	151.2	116	110.3	100.6	67.6
% Met Objective Target	23%	13%	44%	53%	38%	54%	100%

Inspection Activity

	2006	2007	2008	2009	Pre 2010 Submittal	2010 Submittal	2011
# of Building Inspections Conducted	25,059	24,913	21,247	16,167	N/A	14,140	13,603
Average Daily Inspections	101.04	100.46	85.67	73	N/A	66	64
Average Daily Roll Over	Not Measured	8	4	6	N/A	5	2

Notes

*Permits submitted prior to 2010 but approved in 2010

Appendix 3: Closed Record Appeals, 2009 - 2011

This report shows the land use appeals during the period 2009-2011. In 2010, the Board of Commissioners removed the Board from the land use appeals process. The following information shows the number and nature of appeals:

How many appeals were made from the HE to the Board:

2009: Lupine Lane PP/PBD – BOCC Upheld Appeal Modified Conditions
Ridgeline PP – BOCC Denied Appeal
Ramirez Landscaping - CUP - BOCC Remanded to HE – BOCC Denied Appeal
Montessori Farmhouse School - CUP - BOCC Remanded to HE - BOCC Upheld Appeal
Timbers Edge SSDP/PP – BOCC Denied in part/upheld in part w/ Modified Conditions
Timbers Edge SSDP/PP – BOCC Upheld Appeal by Applicant
White/Conrad Joint Use Dock – SSDP - BOCC Approved with Conditions/Denied SEPA Appeal
Spruce House – CUP – BOCC Denied Appeal
2010: N/A
2011: N/A

How many appeals went from the Board to Superior Court:

2009: Timbers Edge PP – Appeal Denied
2010: Ueland Tree Farm – Appeal Denied
2011: N/A

How many appeals went from the Board to Shoreline Hearings Board:

2009: Timbers Edge PP – Settled Prior to Hearing
White/Conrad Joint Use Dock – SSDP (Heard in 2011)
2010: None
2011: None

How many appeals went from the Hearing Examiner to Superior Court:

2009: Not applicable
2010: Ueland Tree Farm – Appeal Denied
2011: None

How many appeals went from the Hearing Examiner to Shoreline Hearings Board:

2009: Not applicable
2010: None
2011: None

How many appeals were SEPA Appeals:

2009: Timbers Edge SSDP/PP – Denied
White/Conrad Joint Use Dock – SSDP - Denied
2010: Ueland Tree Farm – CUP - Withdrawn
Smith Wind Turbine – BP – Withdrawn
2011: Comprehensive Plan Amendments Fully Contained Communities & National Historic Towns – Denied

Appendix 4: Mediation Report 2010 - 2012

Appeal Issue	Appeal Fee	Staff/Hours	Process Highlights/Defects	Results
Gordon Witcher DCD Approved Critical Area Buffer Reduction LIS#10 92328	\$500.00 Paid by Adjacent Property Owners	David Greetham 16 Hrs. Mediation 4 Hrs. Karen Ashcraft 35.25 Hrs	Mediation held 8/5/10 but Appellants withdrew prior to agreement	Appealed to Hearing Examiner Remanded to Staff
Theresa Smith Wind Turbine Adjacent Property Owners Appealed Admin Decision LIS#10 93116	\$500.00 Paid by Linda Wiley Adjacent Property Owners	Scott Diener Mediation 7 Hrs. David Greetham 8 Hrs Mediations 7 Hrs. Karen Ashcraft 20.25 Hrs Ellen Tiez .75 Hr.	Mediation held 10/25/10 – Joint Agreement with Applicant & Appellant Sale of Wind Turbine within 6 months –	Appeal went to Hearing Examiner – Motion & Order to Voluntary Dismissal Issued
Mars Appealed Bridge built by Stavis Bay Homeowners Association on Mars property LIS#10 93985	\$500.00 Paid by Stanley Mars	Peggy Bakalarski .5 Hr Linda Jones 10 Hrs. Mediation 10 Hrs. Patty Charnas 5 Hrs Mediation 10 Hrs. Karen Ashcraft 5.5 Hrs	Mediation held 1/13/11 Issue Resolved	Resolved issue – HOA will remove bridge; hire engineer & submit Bldg.Permit
Schoening Appealed DCD denial Illegal Bulkhead LIS#10 94684	\$500.00 Paid by Byran Schoeni ng	Linda Jones 8 Hrs. Mediation 2 Hrs. Patty Charnas 17 Hrs Steve Heacock 10 Hrs. Mediation 2 Hrs. Karen Ashcraft 4.5 Hrs	Mediation held 2/1/11	Resolved issue – HPA from WDFW
Hurlen Appealed Address Change LIS#11 98863	\$500.00 Paid by Harald Hurlen	Linda Jones 5 Hrs. Mediation 1.25 Hrs. Karen Ashcraft 2 Hrs.	Mediation held 9/12/11	Resolved Issue Agreement & Covenant Address Waiver