

Summary of Public Comment Submitted 5/27/26 – 6/8/26

The public comments on the proposed Boundary Line Adjustment (BLA) and Property Aggregation Ordinance display an overall divide. A few conditional or supportive comments were submitted though a majority of commenters are in opposition.

Summary of Opposition

Many commenters opposed the proposed BLA not for technical reasons or reasons that have to do with managing parcel boundaries, but because it would simply introduce more regulations. Other commenters, including residents and members of the realty community, opposed the ordinance on the basis that it would:

- Introduce unnecessary process, cost, and delays to the permitting system
- Unnecessarily increase County authority
- Negatively impact minor boundary issues such as encroachments or fence adjustments
- Potentially harm housing affordability and sale of property
- Fail to address existing staffing and funding concerns to support a review process

Many of the comments received were nearly identical, submitted by realtors and property owners. These comments repeatedly emphasized messaging of “vote no,” “keep the current process,” and raised concerns regarding delay and affordability.

Comments also included procedural critiques, including:

- Argument that the ordinance exceeds legislative intent and should remain ministerial and minimal
- Concern that the proposal introduces discretionary review where only verification for zoning compliance is needed
- Concern that increased regulation would add an administrative burden without clear public benefit

Summary of Support

A few commenters supported a shift toward more transparent standards arguing that:

- A dedicated BLA code would provide consistency and prevent property owner confusion or lot-size issues
- Lack of standards can contribute to boundary problems (e.g., in areas like Manchester)

- Some level of regulation is necessary to avoid misuse of BLAs to circumvent subdivision regulations

Summary of Technical Suggestions

Several comments were technical or conditional in nature with specific suggestions to improve the ordinance, including:

- Comment from a professional land surveyor generally supporting the ordinance with recommendations to simplify or replace a provision to avoid unintended barriers
- Statement from a Kitsap Builders Association (KBA) representative that most of concerns were addressed, with the caveat that potential staffing/fiscal workload impacts should be addressed
- Proposal from a Title professional suggesting a detailed pathway for minor adjustments
- Minor editorial suggestions on specific ordinance language for clarity

Overall

In summary, the public comment received is heavily weighted toward opposition based on concerns of increased regulations (in general) and additional burden of adjusting parcel lines, with a small group supporting clearer standards or offering technical refinements.