

## Initial Review and Recommendation Matrix – Rural Reclassification Requests

\*The Board has discretion to determine compliance with the review criteria. Applications that cannot meet review criteria should be considered for removal from the Final Docket.

\*\*Other concerns are also identified in responses in staff report and in internal review matrix (Appendix C)

\*\*\*Staff provided additional Board considerations for a limited number of requests to be weighed against the main rationale. More detail can be found in the Initial Summary Report and applications.

Criteria #1. How circumstances related to the proposed amendment and/or the area in which the property affected by the proposed amendment is located have substantially changed since the adoption of the Comprehensive Plan or applicable development regulations;

Criteria #2. How the assumptions upon which the Comprehensive Plan is based are no longer valid, or there is new information available which was not considered during the adoption of, or during the last annual amendment to, the Comprehensive Plan or development regulations; and

Criteria #3. How the requested redesignation is in the public interest and the proposal is consistent with the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan.

APP-ID	Applicant	Request	District	Staff Initial Review and Recommendation*	If Conflicts with Criteria, Main Rationale	Other Concerns**	Other Board Considerations***
<b>Residential Requests</b>							
2 & 3	Christiansen	32 acres from RW to RR or RP (1-4 additional units)	North	Does not meet Criteria #1 Conflicts with Criteria #2 and #3	Rural growth is inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan policies and assumptions	Proposed RR zoning is not consistent with surrounding zoning.	If rezoning to RP instead of RR, this will only add one unit and would be consistent with surrounding zone. RP zoning follows a regular zoning boundary so development pressure on adjacent zoning is limited. However, the purpose of RP zoning is to protect streams and wetlands, and none are mapped on this site. Thus, the RW zoning is still appropriate.
4	Wixson	39 acres from RP to RR (4 additional units)	North	Does not meet Criteria #1 Conflicts with Criteria #2 and #3	Rural growth is inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan policies and assumptions	Creates irregular zoning boundary; Potential to impact critical areas.	
6	Skrobut-Hooker	49 acres from RW to RP (3 additional units)	South	Does not meet Criteria #1 Conflicts with Criteria #2 and #3	Rural growth is inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan policies and assumptions		Although RP zone would be an isolated zone, it is proposed as a transition between Rural Wooded to north and Rural Residential to south.
9	Zegstroo	9.5 acres from RP to RR (1 additional unit)	North	Does not meet Criteria #1 Conflicts with Criteria #2 and #3	Rural growth is inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan policies and assumptions	Creates irregular zoning boundary	

17	Axe	20.5 acres from RW to RP or RR (1-3 additional units)	South	<b>Meets</b> Criteria #1 Conflicts with Criteria #2 and #3	Rural growth is inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan policies and assumptions		In 2016 rezone several properties to the north were rezoned from RW to RP. If rezoning this to RP instead of RR, this will only add one unit. Future development pressure on vicinity is possibly mitigated by adjacent substandard lots, and existing developments, however, the 20-acre parcel to the east might also request a change from RW to RP.
25	Hubert	40.6 acres from RW to RR (6 additional units)	Central	Does not meet Criteria #1 Conflicts with Criteria #2 and #3	Rural growth is inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan policies and assumptions	Conversion of Ag. Use (tree farm)	The rezone to RR would follow a regular zoning boundary.
45	Rallis	14.8 acres from RP to RR (2 additional units)	North	Does not meet Criteria #1 Conflicts with Criteria #2 and #3	Rural growth is inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan policies and assumptions	Isolated zoning; significant critical areas on Western half	
48	Anest	41.5 acres from RW to RR (6 additional units)	North	Does not meet Criteria #1 Conflicts with Criteria #2 and #3	Rural growth is inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan policies and assumptions		The rezone to RR would follow a regular zoning boundary (all other parcels bordering east side of Hood Canal Road NE are RR)
63	SW Kitsap/North Bay	109 acres from RW to RR (16 additional units)	South	Does not meet Criteria #1 Conflicts with Criteria #2 and #3	Rural growth is inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan policies and assumptions	Creates irregular boundary, development pressure on surrounding forest lands; potential to impact critical areas.	While part of the purpose of the RW zone is to protect forestry uses, several requests from the RW zone claim that forestry is no longer viable or as viable in the past. This may be better addressed holistically rather than through individual requests.
64	SW Kitsap	38.1 acres from RW to RR (6 additional units)	South	Does not meet Criteria #1 Conflicts with Criteria #2 and #3	Rural growth is inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan policies and assumptions	Development pressure on surrounding forest lands; potential to impact critical areas.	The rezone to RR would follow a regular zoning boundary. While part of the purpose of the RW zone is to protect forestry uses, several requests from the RW zone claim that forestry is no longer viable or as viable in the past. This may be better addressed holistically rather than through individual requests.
65	Overton	82.4 acres from RW to RR (12 additional units)	South	Does not meet Criteria #1 Conflicts with Criteria #2 and #3	Rural growth is inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan policies and assumptions	Creates isolated zone; development pressure on surrounding forest lands; potential to impact critical areas.	While part of the purpose of the RW zone is to protect forestry uses, several requests from the RW zone claim that forestry is no longer viable or as viable in the past. This may be better addressed holistically rather than through individual requests.
67	Overton	91.7 acres from RW to RR (14 additional units)	South	Does not meet Criteria #1 Conflicts with Criteria #2 and #3	Rural growth is inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan policies and assumptions	Creates irregular boundary, development pressure on surrounding forest lands; potential to impact critical areas.	While part of the purpose of the RW zone is to protect forestry uses, several requests from the RW zone claim that forestry is no longer viable or as viable in the past. This may be better addressed holistically rather than through individual requests.
72	Raydient	418.9 acres from RW to RR (60 additional units)	North	<b>Meets</b> Criteria #1 Conflicts with Criteria #2 and #3	Rural growth is inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan policies and assumptions	Diminishing of RW zoning and forest lands on property and in greater area.	The Heritage Park was recently established to the West. While part of the purpose of the RW zone is to protect forestry uses, several requests from the RW zone claim that forestry is no longer viable or as viable in the past. This may be better addressed holistically rather than through individual requests.

74	Edwards	11.6 acres from RP to RR (1 additional unit)	North	Does not meet Criteria #1 Conflicts with Criteria #2 and #3	Rural growth is inconsistent with Comprehensive Plan policies and assumptions	Creates isolated zone, no additional information submitted before deadline.	
<b>Rural Commercial/Rural Industrial Requests</b>							
57	Moran et al.	5.2 acres from RR to RI	North	more analysis needed	More analysis needed to make a recommendation		
7	Skrobut	21 acres from RW to RI	South	more analysis needed	More analysis needed to make a recommendation		
66	Stokes/Campbell	7.6 acres from RW to RCO	South	more analysis needed	More analysis needed to make a recommendation		