

Kitsap County Year of the Rural Project - Deliberations Matrix

DRAFT Version 10/07/2025 - Populated after Comment Analysis

Deliverable	#	Topic	Summary of Issue	Staff Acknowledgement (Recommendation in Progress)	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
Chapter	1	Wildlife Corridors and Habitat Connectivity	Add wildlife corridor and habitat connectivity to the chapter with specificity to identify and map corridors, identify key species of concern, and link corridors to allow movement of species.	In progress - insert goal, policy(s), strategy(s). This will be part of the Rural Lands Analysis (acknowledged in the chapter) but agree that it should be explicitly mentioned.		
Chapter	2	Forestry - Advisory Council	Include community members and various interest groups.	Agree - already included		
Chapter	3	Agriculture - Advisory Council	Include community members and various interest groups.	Agree and assessing the proposal.		
Chapter	4	Rural Walkability and Bikeability	Add strategies - connections are important.	Assessment in progress.		
Chapter	5	Climate Change Element	Use best available science and avoid clear cutting.	Assessment in progress.		
Chapter	6	Tribal Lands	Acknowledge that Tribal Lands and acreage.	Agree		
Chapter	7	Cluster Development	Cluster development is an urban development tool.	The intent is not to encourage it but to explore it. Staff agrees with the concern but acknowledges its a tool for rural development described in GMA.		
Chapter	8	Water Resources	Add policy under Rural Environment "Identify and protect natural areas contributing to increased aquifer recharge."	Agree		
Code - Equestrian Facility	9	Right to Farm Act RCW 7.48.305	Regulating horse facilities violates Right to Farm.	We are actively assessing this.		
Code - Equestrian Facility	10	Legal Standing - Consistency	Kitsap County does not have legal standing to regulate horse farms because this is already regulated under state law. E.g Nuisance, odor, dust and noise are already regulated in KCC's nuisance code.	Proposed updates will be consistent with RCW and/or KCC.		
Code - Equestrian Facility	11	Conservation District	Conservation is not a regulatory agency and other entities can prepare Farm Plan.	Agree. Updates will reflect this. Reference to Conservation District will be removed.		
Code - Equestrian Facility	12	Best Management Practices	KCC should not reference best management practices without saying whose BMPs we'll review against.	Determine which BMPs we'll review against.		
Code - Equestrian Facility	13	Horse Facilities are Businesses	Respondents both recognize that horse facilities are businesses and also want them exempt from regulation like other businesses by virtue of being in rural zones.	Continue to regulate businesses in rural zones.		
Code - Equestrian Facility	14	Vesting/Retroactive	Concerns that regulations will shut down existing businesses.	Continue to follow the law and not impose code retroactively. We are hearing the need to understand how this will be determined to ensure it's clear for all.		
Code - Equestrian Facility	15	Distinguish level of impact/intensity	Regulations shouldn't apply to all horse facilities because... not all facilities have the same impact.	Use thresholds to determine what level of facility codes above and beyond the minimum (Title 9, RCW) will apply to.		
Code - Equestrian Facility	16	Private vs Public Road Access	Who maintains the road is a factor in who bears the brunt for impacts to the road.			
Code - Equestrian Facility	17	Hours of Operation	Concerns about what activities are regulated.	Commercial activities. Understand the need for clarity.		
Code - Equestrian Facility	18	Setbacks	200' setback is too restrictive, especially on legacy lots.	Update in progress. Use BMPs for manure setbacks.		
Code - Equestrian Facility	19	Screening	Screening all equipment and animals is onerous and expensive.	Limit what screening is required for, only nuisance impacts. Applicants need to show on site plan where manure storage will be kept. Guidance for requirements will be helpful.		
Code - Equestrian Facility	20	Contradictory definitions	Definition of "ag use, primary" in proposed AG Code and proposed Horse Code	Reconcile these definitions		
Code - Equestrian Facility	21	CUP vs ACUP; Cost of Permits	Significant process and expensive	Assessment in progress to remove CUP from the proposed code and identify intensity and activities for ACUP, P, and/or exemption.		
Code - Equestrian Facility	22	Animal Density	1 horse per 1/2 acre is too much land	Noted. An example was provided in the proposed code.		

Kitsap County Year of the Rural Project - Deliberations Matrix

DRAFT Version 10/07/2025 - Populated after Comment Analysis

Deliverable	#	Topic	Summary of Issue	Staff Acknowledgement (Recommendation in Progress)	Planning Commission Recommendation	Board Direction
Code - Child Care	23	Hours of Outdoor Noise	Suggest revising from "9 am to 7 pm" to "7 am to 7 pm" for outdoor noise because children can't be quiet until 9 am.	Make code consistent with nuisance code for noise.		
Code - Child Care	24	Language	Suggest revising "Family Day Care" to "Family Child Care" or "Family Home Early Learning Program" because the industry is trying to move away from "daycare" as it historically connotes a perceived lower level of provider education and quality care.	Use industry standard language.		
Code - Agriculture	25	Agriculture Building Exemption	Conflict with ICC Building Code and KCC Title 14	No change at this time.		
Code - Agriculture	26	Notice	Updating existing code as it is not in practice but uncertain if the proposal can move forward	Staff actively assessing.		
Reclass - Skrobot	29	Tentative Approval	See Staff Report Findings of Fact			
Reclass - Moran	30	No Recommendation	See Staff Report Findings of Fact			
Reclass - Stokes & Campbell	31	Tentative Approval	See Staff Report Findings of Fact			
SEPA	32	Related to Reclassification Requests	In progress			