

Entry No.	Name_First	Name_Last	EnterYourCommentsHere
1	Joanne	Corey	If a commercial warehousing retail sales feed/forage along with a horse boarding facility moved into a well established SFRR with numerous complaints safety issues will they be Grandfathered in? y
2	Lauren	Keehn	I oppose the proposed updates because they threaten Kitsap County's rural character. Rural lands are vital for agriculture, equestrian use, open space, and wildlife. Overdevelopment of residential housing is eroding these lands and once they are gone, they cannot be replaced. Please protect rural lands by limiting rezoning, prioritizing farming and conservation, and preventing dense housing in rural areas. The Comprehensive Plan should safeguard Kitsap's rural identity for future
3	Arick	Olson	The proposed equestrian facility code is legally vulnerable on multiple fronts: 1. Duplication of Existing Law (Unnecessary Regulation) Best Management Practices (BMPs) for manure, dust, and runoff are already required by the Kitsap Conservation District under RCW 89.08. Nuisance, odor, and noise are already governed by existing county nuisance codes (KCC Title 9). Adding duplicative permitting conditions without new standards is regulatory overreach that conflicts with established state mandates. 2. Vague and Arbitrary Standards (Due Process Violation) Requiring applicants to "prove" they will not generate nuisance conditions (odor, dust, noise) lacks measurable criteria. Washington courts have repeatedly held that zoning ordinances must contain clear, ascertainable standards to avoid arbitrary enforcement (Norco Constr. v. King County, 97 Wn.2d 680 (1982)). Vague standards expose the County to challenges under the Due Process Clauses of both the U.S. Constitution (14th Amendment) and the Washington State Constitution (Article I, Section 3). 3. Regulatory Takings (Property Rights Violation) Mandating 200-foot setbacks for paddocks and manure piles effectively prohibits equestrian use on smaller rural parcels. When regulations deprive a landowner of all reasonable economic use of property, it constitutes a regulatory taking (Lucas v. South Carolina Coastal Council, 505 U.S. 1003 (1992); Presbytery of Seattle v. King County, 114 Wn.2d 320 (1990)). Both the U.S. Constitution (5th Amendment, Takings Clause) and Washington Constitution (Article I, Section 16) protect against uncompensated regulatory takings. 4. Disparate and Unequal Treatment The distinction between boarding-only facilities (Type II CUP) and facilities offering lessons/training (Type III CUP) is arbitrary. These are substantially similar land uses but are treated with drastically different permitting burdens, raising equal protection concerns under the U.S. Constitution (14th Amendment) and Washington State Constitution (Article I, Section 12). 5. Growth Management Act Conflict The Growth Management Act requires counties to conserve and encourage agricultural uses (RCW 36.70A.170 and RCW 36.70A.177). By making small-scale equestrian operations unworkable through excessive setbacks, CUP requirements, and operational limits, this ordinance directly undermines agricultural viability. This exposes Kitsap County to a Growth Management Hearings Board appeal for failure to comply with the GMA. 6. Procedural Overreach The requirement that any expansion of a facility triggers new CUP review — even without intensification of impacts — creates a perpetual permitting trap. Washington courts disfavor land-use codes that impose open-ended discretionary review without objective criteria (Anderson v. Issaquah, 70 Wn. App. 64 (1993)). This ordinance does not create new protections for neighbors or the environment. Those protections already exist under Washington law. What it does is pile on redundant, vague, and exclusionary regulation that disproportionately
4	Mariah	Fair	These changes would poorly affect my family and many others. Horses provide therapeutic, emotional support, they teach partnership, and build strength as well as endurance. These proposed changes would make almost all equestrian facilities in our area extinct, it would make take away tremendously from our community.
5	Samarra	McBreairty	I keep my own horse at home. I chose that because I will not compromise on welfare. Still, I recognize that boarding barns are essential in this county. Many horse owners don't have the land, and without boarding facilities, horses would lose their homes. What I've seen in the Pacific Northwest is very different from the equestrian standards I grew up with elsewhere. Here, many barns operate on small parcels, with horses confined to tiny dry lots, and very little real turnout. That may be common practice, but it does not reflect what most people would call humane care. I understand why boarding businesses are worried. The proposed ordinance, as written, sets a one-horse-per-half-acre limit, large setbacks, and strict permitting. If enforced all at once, this will put a lot of barns out of business. And that isn't a real solution either, because horse owners still need places to go. I support the county's intent. Horses deserve higher standards, and the public deserves assurance that manure and runoff are managed responsibly. But there is a path to better welfare without collapsing the local industry. I'd like to suggest three compromises: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>First, phase in the density requirement. Begin with one horse per quarter acre, then move to one per half acre over five to seven years. That gives barns time to adapt.</li> <li>Second, scale the setbacks. Keep 200 feet for large facilities, but allow 100 feet for small operations that use approved manure handling or vegetative buffers.</li> <li>Third, extend operating hours slightly, to 9:30 p.m., to allow for evening lessons, while keeping restrictions on amplified sound. This way, the ordinance holds the line on</li> </ul>
6	Heidi	Elmore	I am looking to move to Kitsap County from King County. I would like to build a horse boarding facility and I am concerned about the suggested changes for equestrian facilities. Maybe a high-end facility isn't the concern that prompted these zoning changes. But I am concerned enough where I am paying attention to decide if I should

## Year of the Rural Comment Form

09/02/25-09/15/25 12:00pm

7	Sunnie	Merritt	If they take away even some of our boarding facilities the results in Kitsap County will be catastrophic. Speaking as a boarder, rates will go up and we will all scramble to find places to go. The barn owners will suffer even worse and lose their very livelihoods. A significant amount of tax money will go to other counties as boarders move to other facilities, for example I will take my several thousand dollars a month to Pierce County. Most the facilities I have boarded at have been immaculately clean and in no way both surrounding properties. They have good programs to manage urine and manure, traffic in and out, and noise etc. if there have been a few that caused issues fix those problems specifically- don't punish the majority. Do you really want to be known as a county who hates forests, hates outdoor recreation? That is what is seems you are turning into. Just when I was starting to believe you were more than "kidnap county"...that is what all the other counties call you.
8	Harrison	Boles	My name is Harrison Boles, and I'm a resident of Kitsap County. I want to highlight a conflict between the County's stated goals for preserving rural character and the proposed zoning code changes for equestrian facilities. In the Rural and Resource Lands Draft, the County defines rural character as "open spaces, working farms and forests, and traditional rural lifestyles such as farming, forestry, and horseback riding, while sustaining rural economies and community identity". The policies go further, committing to "support traditional rural lifestyles and rural-based economies, including farming [and] horseback riding". But the proposed equestrian facility code imposes rules that run directly against these goals: It requires Type II or Type III Conditional Use Permits just to board horses or teach riding lessons. These costly, bureaucratic processes create barriers for small family barns that rely on lessons and clinics to stay viable. It mandates 200-foot setbacks for paddocks and manure storage. On smaller parcels typical of family-run farms, this is effectively a ban on operating at all. It limits hours of operation to 7 a.m.-8 p.m., restricting riding and lessons during evenings—precisely when working families are available. And it requires separate permits for shows, clinics, or community events, even though these gatherings are central to rural tradition and the equestrian economy. These restrictions don't preserve rural character—they undermine it. Instead of "supporting traditional rural lifestyles and rural-based economies", they make it harder for ordinary people to sustain small equestrian operations. Instead of "protecting working lands as vital to rural identity and economic resilience", they impose urban-style regulations that will drive out family-scale barns. The County's own rural vision promises to foster horseback riding, community gathering, and sustainable small-scale economies. If these proposed equestrian regulations move forward as written,
9	Megan	Thompson	I am specifically addressing the changes in regards to any equestrian facilities. Kitsap County is mainly rural and activities that keep it rural should be encouraged and supported. These excessive operating requirements and permitting are designed to choke out the very essence of rural areas and should NOT be implemented. It will have a severely negative effect on agricultural lands and the people who enjoy them. Why are you trying to make up into a city when we're not and don't want to be?
10	Cassie	Olsen	Dear Commissioners, I am writing as a Kitsap County resident, business owner, and part of the equestrian community to express my deep concern about the proposed equestrian facility regulations currently under consideration. These restrictions would devastate small, family-run businesses like ours. Our livelihood depends on boarding, training, and caring for horses — activities that not only sustain our family but also support dozens of local jobs, farriers, veterinarians, feed stores, and youth riding programs. Limiting or eliminating horse boarding on private property will ripple far beyond our barn doors, undermining an entire ecosystem of businesses and services tied to equestrian activity. Horses are not only our livelihood — they are part of Kitsap County's heritage and rural identity. Generations of families here have grown up learning responsibility, discipline, and confidence through horses. These regulations threaten to erase that tradition and close the door on opportunities for future generations. Please understand: if these proposals move forward, they will not only force many of us out of business, they will strip Kitsap County of an industry that contributes to our economy, our culture, and our way of life. I urge you to reject these measures and instead work with the equestrian community to create fair, practical policies that protect both neighbors' concerns and the rights of responsible landowners. We want to be good community members, and we want to see Kitsap thrive — but these proposals would destroy the foundation of our businesses and our rural traditions. Thank you for listening to the voices of
11	carla	larson	Real correct physical addresses. not guessimates that are continuously wrong

## Year of the Rural Comment Form

09/02/25-09/15/25 12:00pm

12	Mark	Housmyer	<p>Key Elements that May Trend Away from Conservative Viewpoints    Focus on Urban Growth and Density: The draft policies emphasize directing the majority of growth to urban areas (Urban Growth Areas or UGAs) and promoting higher-density housing and mixed-use development within those centers. This approach is often at odds with the conservative principle of property rights and the freedom for individuals to develop their land as they see fit, regardless of location. Some conservative viewpoints on land use advocate for deregulation and allowing the free market to determine development patterns, which may lead to more dispersed growth. The policy's goal to "prevent the spread of urban infrastructure into rural areas" can be viewed as a limitation on rural property owners' ability to develop their land.</p> <p>Environmental and Resource Protection: The policies prioritize protecting forests, farms, open space, and natural systems. While environmental stewardship is a shared value, the methods to achieve it—such as land use regulations, critical area protections, and reclassification of resource lands—can be seen by some conservatives as an overreach of government authority that restricts a property owner's ability to use their land for economic purposes. The GMA's emphasis on limiting low-density sprawl and land conversion can be viewed as government interference in the market.    Mandated Planning and Regulation: The entire process is a product of the state-mandated Growth Management Act. This top-down, regulatory approach to land use planning is in contrast with a more traditional conservative view that favors local control and minimal government intervention. The GMA sets a framework that requires counties to plan for growth and implement policies to achieve specific goals, which some consider a burden on taxpayers and an erosion of local autonomy.    Points that May Align with Conservative Viewpoints    Property Rights and Rural Character: The stated intent to preserve rural character and sustain rural communities aligns with the conservative value of maintaining traditional lifestyles and local control. While the methods may be debated, the goal of protecting rural land from incompatible uses and maintaining low-density development can resonate with those who want to protect their private property from the negative impacts of nearby development.    Timely Permit Processing: One of the goals of the GMA and related county policies is to process permits in a timely and fair manner. This aligns with conservative support for efficient government and reducing bureaucratic hurdles for businesses and property owners.    Free Market Arguments for Zoning Reform: There is a growing movement within conservative circles that</p>
13	Anthony	Rose	Why are you wasting time and tax dollars punishing rural land owners by preventing them from keeping livestock on their property? We're a rural county with small urban areas, not north Tacoma or western Seattle. Strike all changes to 17.455.030 and fire the board member who has a problem with their neighbor or we'll fire all of
14	Michele	Robinson	My concern is not apparently listed. I'm concerned about the proposal having to do with horse facilities/properties. The proposals I am seeing would be crippling to most properties that now house horses. Small business farms, boarding facilities, rescues and private owners will be impacted. I hope the wellfair of those that
15	Deborah	Dolman	It would be very helpful if you would show the current policy and then the proposed change. It currently is not user friendly. Hard to figure out what is being proposed.
16	Dee	Robinson	<p>Subject: Urgent Opposition to Proposed Equestrian Code Amendment I urgently oppose the proposed amendment to the Kitsap County Code that would make it virtually impossible to operate equestrian facilities. This change is unacceptable. Equestrian and agricultural operations are essential to Kitsap's economy, culture, and rural character. They provide recreation, jobs, youth programs like 4-H, and even therapeutic riding services for veterans and individuals with disabilities. Eliminating their ability to exist would devastate families, small businesses, and our community's heritage. I strongly urge you to reject this harmful revision and work instead with stakeholders to create fair, balanced regulations that support—not destroy—our equestrian and agricultural community. Please do not let these</p>
17	Ron	Thomas	SB 5471 provides changes to allow LAMIRD zones substantial infill provisions. There is no indication of these Kitsap County Code changes in this Plan Update.
18	Trish	Strong	<p>Subject: Urgent Opposition to Proposed Equestrian Code Amendment I urgently oppose the proposed amendment to the Kitsap County Code that would make it virtually impossible to operate equestrian facilities. This change is unacceptable. Equestrian and agricultural operations are essential to Kitsap's economy, culture, and rural character. They provide recreation, jobs, youth programs like 4-H, and even therapeutic riding services for veterans and individuals with disabilities. Eliminating their ability to exist would devastate families, small businesses, and our community's heritage. I strongly urge you to reject this harmful revision and work instead with stakeholders to create fair, balanced regulations that support—not destroy—our equestrian and agricultural community. Please do not let this pass</p>
19	Jennifer	Gillies	<p>We need to stop developing the forests and farmland. This year we've had deer, coyote, and bear in our yard in Parkwood East in East Bremerton and it's because the animals are losing their habitat. They have no place to go so they're wandering into neighborhoods and creating safety concerns for both the animals and the humans. There are businesses all over Silverdale and Bremerton sitting unused while we continue to cut down more trees and develop the land. We need more green spaces for our physical and mental health. We need to preserve spaces for our salmon, bald eagles, old growth trees, etc. We aren't Seattle. The reason people live here is that it's smaller, slower-paced, less expensive, and still has some natural habitat. We are Kitsap County, not King County. Stop destroying our forests!</p>

## Year of the Rural Comment Form

09/02/25-09/15/25 12:00pm

20	Melissa	Lissy	Subject: Urgent Opposition to Proposed Equestrian Code Amendment I urgently oppose the proposed amendment to the Kitsap County Code that would make it virtually impossible to operate equestrian facilities. This change is unacceptable. Equestrian and agricultural operations are essential to Kitsap's economy, culture, and rural character. They provide recreation, jobs, youth programs like 4-H, and even therapeutic riding services for veterans and individuals with disabilities. Eliminating their ability to exist would devastate families, small businesses, and our community's heritage. I strongly urge you to reject this harmful revision and work instead with stakeholders to create fair, balanced regulations that support—not destroy—our equestrian and agricultural community. Please do not let these
21	Janet	Spears	I'm covering all of my bases here... i strongly oppose the attack on horse facilities that are being proposed in this new rural update plan. As a horse owning community member and a former 4-H club and Project leader here in Kitsap County, I cannot believe what these changes to our rural horse use and activities will do to the equestrian youth in our county. Not to mention the ability to maintain horses on the property of area land owners. The Horse Community of Kitsap County has held the largest number of horses on our side of the State. We contribute to the success of a large number of businesses in the entire State. Hay, grain, specialty feeds, pasture and forage seed, large animal veterinary services, grooming, Healthcare supplies, tack, outerwear for both horse and rider, farrier services, horse shows and other competitions, and do not forget the possibility of therapeutic equine programs for disabled people of all kinds. The property taxes paid by horse property owners, both large and small, make a sizeable contribution to the County's coffers. We need our Saddle Clubs and boarding, breeding and training facilities to enable Kitsap County's horse community to thrive. Why should our pastimes be curtailed from our current level? Most of our facilities, have been in the county for many, many years.
22	LeeAnn	Contreras	Subject: Urgent Opposition to Proposed Equestrian Code Amendment I urgently oppose the proposed amendment to the Kitsap County Code that would make it virtually impossible to operate equestrian facilities. This change is unacceptable. Equestrian and agricultural operations are essential to Kitsap's economy, culture, and rural character. They provide recreation, jobs, youth programs like 4-H, and even therapeutic riding services for veterans and individuals with disabilities. Eliminating their ability to exist would devastate families, small businesses, and our community's heritage. I strongly urge you to reject this harmful revision and work instead with stakeholders to create fair, balanced regulations that support—not destroy—our equestrian and agricultural community. Please do not let these
23	Jane	Evanson	New development destroyed spring and groundwater on my property
24	Denise	Brooks	We have a small 5 acre horse farm, just our own horses but there are a lot of pieces of equipment needed to keep it running well and looking nice. We can't possibly hide all the implements from every neighbor, that would require a huge barn. The process of getting permits alone would bankrupt us let alone the cost of building materials. And paddocks 200 feet from property lines?? Our property is only 265 feet wide! We can't just move because this is where our jobs are at, jobs we GO to.
25	Joanne	Corey	Sec 17.360.030 "owners of an easement " suggest to include the impact on Dominant Estate holders that are impacted as much as easement holders to the impact on
26	Jessica	Contreras	We need our rural spaces. We need the trees to help our air quality and weather. I came from Southern California and moved here because of the rural spaces and trees. Please don't make us like Southern California, treeless with houses as far as the eyes can see and hot, so very hot. The valley I lived in used to be cooler when there were more trees. They cut down trees and the valley got hotter. Now it's on fire all the time! Keep our rural spaces!
27	Colen	Corey	How many primary uses can 1 property have? Such as Horse Boarding , Animal Husbandry breeding horse, would it still be residential or zoned something else ?
28	Dorrie	Strader	I think that the code for ADU's in Kitsap County should be amended. Why are you limiting ADU size to only 900 sq ft and only 1 per property for large acreage parcels? Many families (Like mine) that have acreage would like to be able to help the next generation get a head start in home ownership. But it is very difficult to squeeze a young family of 4+ into a small 900 sq ft home. Give us a realistic size like 1500 sq ft for an ADU. This larger size option could fix the housing crisis in our area. Allowing more than 1 ADU on large acreage would also help. If the City is allowed larger ADU sizes and multiple ADUs on their tiny lots, why don't you allow this for large lot
29	Leigh Anne	Hardy	Subject: Urgent Opposition to Proposed Equestrian Code Amendment I urgently oppose the proposed amendment to the Kitsap County Code that would make it virtually impossible to operate equestrian facilities. This change is unacceptable. Equestrian and agricultural operations are essential to Kitsap's economy, culture, and rural character. They provide recreation, jobs, youth programs like 4-H, and even therapeutic riding services for veterans and individuals with disabilities. Eliminating their ability to exist would devastate families, small businesses, and our community's heritage. I strongly urge you to reject this harmful revision and work instead with stakeholders to create fair, balanced regulations that support—not destroy—our equestrian and agricultural community. Please do not let these
30	Karen	Korinke	I understand there is an attempt to push new equine activity restrictions in rural areas. I live near Banner Forest on small acreage. I have no immediate horse neighbors, but plenty a short ways away. I understand the issues with livestock and well water contamination, but the biggest problem with our own well is from neighbor septic tanks that aren't being maintained. I would absolutely hate the character of our area to be drastically changed by extreme limitations of horse boarding and other activities, as well as people who merely own a horse or two. This is not city or suburbia and it should be left alone and not curtail our animal housing. Keep Kitsap

## Year of the Rural Comment Form

09/02/25-09/15/25 12:00pm

31	Kerry	McConkey	2025 Horse Facilities Draft Code. I am writing to oppose the proposed draft code changes for equestrian facilities dated September 2, 2025. As a horse owner who boards at a local facility, I rely on boarding barns to keep my horse healthy and safe. Many horse owners in Kitsap County do not have the land or resources to keep horses at home, which makes boarding barns essential to maintaining equestrian activities and culture in our community. The proposed requirement that boarding-only facilities obtain conditional use permits, along with increased setbacks and restrictions, will make it extremely difficult for these facilities to remain viable. The added permitting costs and uncertainty will likely force some barns to close, leaving boarders like myself without options. Equestrian boarding is a longstanding and valued part of Kitsap's rural character. These facilities support local agriculture, recreation, youth programs, and 4-H/FFA activities. Instead of overregulation, I urge the County to recognize boarding barns as part of agricultural use and protect them as an essential service. I respectfully request that the County reconsider these provisions and work with horse owners, barn operators, and the equestrian community to create a balanced code that supports environmental stewardship without
32			How can you possibly think this is a good idea! Greedy greedy greedy proposal and you all should be ashamed!
33			Dear Commissioners, I am writing as a Kitsap County resident, horse owner, and small business operator to express my deep concern with the proposed code changes regarding horse facilities. These regulations would devastate our equestrian community and make it nearly impossible for small barns, trainers, and boarding operations to survive. Horses are not just a business — they are a way of life in our county. Families like mine have invested years of hard work and resources into creating safe, healthy environments for our animals, and these new requirements would strip away both our livelihoods and our heritage. Restricting boarding, training, and equestrian services under the guise of “regulation” will not protect the community — it will kill local business, drive horse owners away, and destroy the rural character of Kitsap County. Neighboring counties (Island, Skagit, Snohomish) do not enforce rules like these because they recognize that horses contribute to the economy, to open space preservation, and to the quality of life for families. I urge you to reconsider these changes and work with the equestrian community rather than against it. We are more than willing to collaborate on reasonable, balanced standards that ensure safety without erasing an entire industry. Please don't pass regulations that would cause irreparable harm to small farms, 4-H families, trainers, farriers, and boarding barns that are the heart of Kitsap's equestrian culture.
34	Mary	Jones	I love the childcare proposed plan. Our community needs more quality care available
35			Stop the greed!! What you are proposing will ruin the horse community here!!!! Do not make these changes!!!
36	Nicole	Carter	I urgently oppose the proposed amendment to the Kitsap County Code that would make it virtually impossible to operate equestrian facilities. This change is unacceptable. Equestrian and agricultural operations are essential to Kitsap's economy, culture, and rural character. They provide recreation, jobs, youth programs like 4-H, and even therapeutic riding services for veterans and individuals with disabilities. Eliminating their ability to exist would devastate families, small businesses, and our community's heritage. I strongly urge you to reject this harmful revision and work instead with stakeholders to create fair, balanced regulations that support—not destroy—our equestrian and agricultural community. Please do not let these amendments pass. I don't reside in Kitsap County, but I work and keep horses in Kitsap County and it would be detrimental to me and many other horse owners if we have no where to board them. It would lead to a similar houseless
37	Christopher	Pursley	Absolute horseshit. Overly restrictive to our current and future equestrian boarding community that I am a part of and attack on what makes Kitsap a rural paradise. We are not the extension of Seattle that you want us to be, and my vote will say it in the next round.
38	Luke	Chermak	Please remove any additional restrictions on our freedoms for our properties.
39	THOMAS	LUNDGREN	Who wrote this piece of trash? If I have 20 acres, I am going to use every square inch if it. Some dork in the county government telling me I can only use a small portion of is a violation of my property rights. How would you like it if someone were to tell you that you can only use the kitchen if of your house?
40	Lisa	Sater Gately	I have read how the code update will cause several to have to get rid of their horses. All existing horse owners should be grandfathered in and allowed to keep their live

41	Kristine	Goss	<p>Opposition to Proposed Restrictions on Equestrian and Agricultural Facilities Dear Commissioners and Planning Staff, I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed restrictions in the Kitsap County Code revisions related to livestock management and equestrian facilities. While I appreciate the County's stated goal of minimizing negative impacts to neighboring properties, these restrictions are overly burdensome, inequitable, and risk eliminating equestrian activity in Kitsap County. Instead of supporting small-scale agriculture and rural heritage, they create barriers that are impractical, costly, and inconsistent with the County's comprehensive plan.</p> <p>Opposition to Proposed Restrictions</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Excessive Setback Requirements The proposed 200-foot setback for paddocks and manure storage is unworkable for small and mid-sized properties. Many rural parcels in Kitsap are under 5 acres; this requirement effectively bans equestrian facilities on them, contradicting the County's intent to allow small-parcel agriculture.</li> <li>2. Disproportionate Permitting Burden Requiring a Type III Conditional Use Permit for training, lessons, or clinics treats small-scale facilities the same as large commercial event venues. This process is prohibitively costly and will drive out local equestrian services that families and youth programs rely on.</li> <li>3. Contradictions with County Goals The Comprehensive Plan emphasizes preserving rural character, agriculture, and recreation. These restrictions undermine those goals by making equestrian operations nearly impossible to maintain.</li> <li>4. Economic &amp; Community Impact Equestrian facilities provide jobs, support local businesses, offer therapeutic riding, 4-H, and youth opportunities, and draw tourism. These rules risk eliminating a sector that contributes significantly to Kitsap's rural economy and culture.</li> <li>5. Additional Restrictions (Horse Limits, Hours, Screening, Expansions) A flat "one horse per half-acre" density limit ignores site-specific management practices and unfairly penalizes small landowners. Restricting hours of operation to 7:00 a.m.–8:00 p.m. disregards the reality of horse care, which requires flexibility around feeding, vet care, and training schedules. Mandatory screening for parking, manure, and equipment is costly and unnecessary in many cases where impacts are minimal. Requiring new permits for every small expansion or minor ancillary activity (e.g., tack sales, clinics) creates red tape and discourages equestrian entrepreneurship.</li> </ol> <p>Alternative Solutions Rather than rigid prohibitions, the County should adopt performance-based, flexible standards that protect neighbors and the environment while allowing equestrian facilities to operate responsibly:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Scaled Setbacks by Parcel Size Tier setbacks according to acreage (e.g., 50–75 feet for &lt;5 acres, 100 feet for 5–10 acres, 200 feet for &gt;10 acres).</li> <li>2. Horse Density Based on Farm Plan, Not Acreage Alone Let horse numbers be determined through an approved Kitsap Conservation District farm plan, which considers pasture quality, rotational grazing, and manure systems.</li> <li>3. Operational Flexibility with Impact Mitigation Instead of rigid hours, require facilities to mitigate noise, lighting, and traffic if activities extend beyond daytime hours. Routine care and small lessons should remain unrestricted.</li> <li>4. Contextual Screening Requirements Require screening only where visual impacts exist, using cost-effective vegetation buffers or fencing rather than blanket mandates.</li> <li>5. Streamlined Permitting for Ancillary Uses Allow lessons, clinics, tack sales, and small-scale community activities under the same permit, reserving separate review only for large-scale commercial events.</li> <li>6. Farm Plan as the Compliance Cornerstone Keep Kitsap Conservation District farm plan approval as the key requirement, with periodic review to ensure best management practices for manure, runoff, and dust control.</li> <li>7. Proportional Review for Expansions Minor facility expansions should require only administrative review, not a new CUP. Only major expansions or event-level operations should trigger new</li> </ol>
42	Samantha	Reed	The changes to equestrian facilities would decimate the equine community in kitsap county. As an up and coming theraputic riding center this would make it nearly impossible for me to build a riding arena, host events, and help the community.
43	Janet	O'Connell	This is a horrible plan! That will negatively affect the community amd home owners and those who own and board horses, trainers, farriers, vets, show and clinic facilities. We live here for the rural amenities and the opportunity to own horses. It will be devastating to suppliers of rural,livestock, property owners, and all those businesses connected to out community. I am vehemently opposed to these changes. Horse ownership in the kitsap community is huge. Its a healthy sport enjoyed by 4H kids and FFA. Boarding facilities that have been around for years and private property owners will be negatively affected. The livelihood hood of those who's business are supported by us will be devastated. We chose Kitsap county because of its rural setting and the opportunities here to own and board our horses. For the opportunity for one day owning a little piece of property to enjoy our beloved horses, chicken and goats. If we had wanted City live we would have moved to Pierce County with all its crime. We enjoy the trail systems here and the friendship of the huge horse community. I ask you to consider the negative impact on the thousands
44	Patricia	Tougas	These revisions and updates would destroy the equestrian facility I have worked so hard to create. I have worked closely with the Kitsap Conservation District to develop a farm plan that is environmentally friendly and considers the rights of my neighboring properties. We have over 40 people who use our Stables for lessons and other educational opportunities. Many are young people who rely on these activities to keep them out of trouble. This farm has been in existence for over 40 years and it makes no sense that these new regulations could destroy what we have worked so hard to create. Please remember the positive impact that the equestrian community
45	Misty	Ashbrook	This proposal will destroy the equestrian community in Kitsap county. Few boarding and training barns have the room or the money to comply with these guidelines. What will happen is that barns will be forced to close. The county conservation district is already overwhelmed. I bought my property in 2019 and tried for 6 months to contact someone from the conservation district before I finally gave up. And suddenly they are going to have enough staffing to make a plan for every equestrian facility in the county? Maybe we should talk about the specific problem these new zoning rules are supposed to address. Tell us what you're trying to accomplish, and

46			<p>I'm not sure this is a necessary element in the rural area. This seems more important in the urban areas, specifically about encouraging gathering spaces. It seems that rural becomes synonymous with quiet, nature and independent. Perhaps the activities that lend themselves to connection should be limited to urban areas. "Provide opportunities for community gathering spaces, encourage social connection, and sustain a shared sense of rural lifestyle, while respecting individual independence." It becomes much more difficult to sustain meaningful transportation, and other services when having to focus on both urban and rural areas. Independent is a great description for rural lifestyle. Both the ag and childcare code proposed in draft seem reasonable. The horse facilities code seems to need more work. It seems that work should be done and not drowned out by the few voices in the community. Kitsap only became more equestrian oriented in the 1850s with the arrival of European settlers. This caused a change that one could argue is similar to the changes we are undergoing today. Since then lands have been "developed" to allow for horse facility needs, including the removal of trees for riding and pasture. The code should consider professional knowledge such as horse welfare groups for proper density and should work with the community on reasonable means to meet the BMPs. Parcels are of different sizes and a 200' setback on a long parcel shouldn't eliminate their ability to retain a horse operation. As mentioned above, these facilities should operate under the rules that most businesses need to be including permits for events, etc. Even more so since these operations are occurring in rural lands. It is even more important for all who live in rural lands that these businesses are set up</p>
47	Jessica	Light	<p>I urge you not to adopt the proposed code change that would cripple area equestrian facilities and impact private horse owner properties. This change is not only unnecessary, it is harmful—economically, socially, and culturally. It is a step toward over-regulating, curtailing, and ultimately shutting down rural farm operations, one sector at a time. I want to speak to you not just as a taxpayer and resident, but as a woman who was once that horse-crazy little girl. Like so many others, I grew up dreaming of horses before I could even read chapter books. My first exposure to horses came not through ownership, but through small, family-run farms that offered lessons, camps, and little local shows. Those stables gave me the chance to be around horses, to ride, and to learn. Without them, my passion would have remained a daydream. The barn has always been more than a place to ride. It is where young people learn discipline, responsibility, confidence, and compassion. Horses teach lessons no classroom can replicate: how to show up, how to care for another living being, how to work hard, and how to fall—and then get back up again. For many children, particularly girls, stables are safe havens during a critical stage of development. They are places where resilience is built, independence is fostered, and lifelong friendships are formed. At a time when self-esteem and belonging can be especially fragile, the barn provides a sense of stability and community that is both grounding and transformative for young girls. The value of these facilities extends far beyond the individuals who ride. Local barns function as community anchors. They foster youth development, preserve open space, and support local economies—contributing directly to feed suppliers, veterinarians, farriers, and small farms. Unlike public sports fields or taxpayer-funded recreational facilities, riding stables operate independently, sustained by private investment from families who choose to participate. The return, however, benefits the entire community. That is why these spaces matter. Riding stables are not only places of recreation; they are places of growth, healing, and connection. They raise strong individuals, support local economies, and enrich our communities—all without imposing a burden on taxpayers. Restricting or over-regulating these facilities would rob future generations of those same opportunities. The little girls of today deserve the same chance I had—to walk into a dusty barn aisle, braid a horse's mane, and step into the saddle with butterflies in their stomachs and stars in their eyes. But the importance of equestrian facilities is not just emotional—it is economic. The 2022 American Horse Council study found that the equine industry contributes over \$72 billion annually to the U.S. economy. More than 90% of horse enthusiasts are female, meaning this industry directly supports women in sports, recreation, and business. Horses are not a niche hobby—they are a powerhouse economic driver. Sonoma State University once studied the agricultural impact of Sonoma County, and they found that the equine industry ranked second only to wine grapes in its economic contribution. That is extraordinary. And it shows that the impact of horses goes far beyond the barn. The horse industry sustains: Hay farmers, who diversify their crops and incomes by producing feed. Truck and trailer dealerships. Barn and fence builders. Feed and tack stores. Veterinarians and farriers. Local show facilities, venues, and suppliers. Unlike a bicycle, whether or not a horse is ridden on any given day, it still requires ongoing care, feed, vet and farrier services, and equipment—all purchased locally. That means constant and reliable revenue streams for small businesses and steady tax income for the county. Now let's talk about fairness. Little League baseball, soccer, and other youth sports are rightly celebrated for the role they play in children's lives. But they also rely on taxpayer-funded facilities—fields, parking, maintenance, utilities. In contrast, equestrian "little leagues" take place at privately-owned stables, maintained at private expense. They cost the taxpayer nothing. To penalize stables for the parking or noise that comes with children's sports is hypocritical. Would you consider banning Little League games because parents park on the street or kids make noise during practice? Of course not. Then why is the same activity,</p>

## Year of the Rural Comment Form

09/02/25-09/15/25 12:00pm

48	LESLIE	YUENGER	Child Care Facilities Code Update: KCC 17.415.106 C. allowed from 9am-7pm. Most Child Care Facilities operate between 6am - 6pm. Expecting young children to be kept quiet until 9am is unfathomable. Request code revision = Outdoor noise from 7am - 7pm. KCC 17.415.145 A 4. Family Day Care Provider Outdoor noise allowed from 9am - 7pm to be revised to 7am-7pm. Horse Facilities 17.455.075 F 2.0 Horse focused activities take place through out the day, and the year. Horse activities occur under lights a greater portion of the year. With working families, these activities usually begin at 6pm and conclude between 9 and 10pm. County quiet hours begin at 10pm. Recommend revision of this to permit horse facility activities to take place between 7am - 10pm.// Reclassification Request Recommendation. A. RW to RC/RI SW Lake Flora Road. Approve change use from RW to RC. Nearest retail is located on Sedgewick & Sidney = 3.6 miles/7 minutes. Heading the other direction, the nearest retail is 8 miles/12 minutes at the intersection of Hwy 302 and Wright Bliss Rd NW. B. Proposed RR to RI at 25893 State Hwy 3. I support this revision with the following condition that a maximum offset from the property line is achieved and maintained with full screening by trees/shrubs on all sides. C. Proposal to develop land on the West side of Hwy 16 at Mullenix Road. From RP to RC. I do not support this. This area has multiple environmental challenges as noted, and in
49	Tatiana	Tubberville	The equestrian facility code change extremely limits the abilities of someone to have an equine due to the outrageous setback requirements, fencing requirements, etc being proposed in this code update. It will ruin facilities abilities to care for equines and will lead to the death of many horses who will no longer be able to be rescued
50	Court	Krumvieda	Has anyone critically examined the proposed changes to the Equestrian facility regulations? In a 5-acre square parcel, only a 66-foot square section in the center would be usable for its intended purpose. This translates to less than 2% of the area available for pasture, which seems impractical. Considering that not all lots are perfectly square, a lot that is only 400 feet wide would be entirely unsuitable for equine facilities, leaving no room for manure management areas or pastures. Is the true intention to eliminate equine facilities altogether? Small facilities rely on the ability to train and host equestrian shows to remain viable. These facilities are crucial for new and beginner riders, much like little league baseball, but predominantly for young women and girls. The economics of the equestrian world support small farms
51	Steve	Brown	Reading these comments: Your proposed language is underlined. My comments are in italics. Regarding the Horse Facilities Draft Code: 17.455.070 Livestock and Dairy management. Operators shall implement Best Management Practices for runoff, dust control, and manure handling in a farm plan as reviewed and approved by the Kitsap Conservation District. Best Management Practices according to who? If the Kitsap Conservation District (KCD) authors or maintains BMP's for runoff, dust control & manure handling they do not keep them publicly available on their website. Are you referring to the Stormwater Management Manual for Western Washington as published by the WA State Dept of Ecology? That contains BMP's on those subjects. You just need to be clear about who's BMP's the operators must adhere to. Just for continuity's sake, what you refer to as a "farm plan" the KCD calls a "farm conservation plan" on their website. KCD doesn't just review and approve farm conservation plans, they actually author them. They produce the plan for the farmer. Part of that authoring process might involve review and approval, but it's a little deceptive to suggest that they are critically reviewing and approving something that another individual or organization authored. They write those farm conservation plans. I'd be very careful about relying on the Kitsap Conservation District if your goal is environmental health, animal welfare, or neighboring property owners rights. The KCD is a farming advocacy organization. They are first and foremost about advocating for farmers rights. Not animal welfare, not environmental health, and not neighbor's rights. 1. A limit on the number of horses kept at the facility based on acreage and site conditions (e.g., one horse per one-half acre); I'm happy to see that you are setting a specific animal density of 1 horse per half acre of land. That seems reasonable. But is that 1 horse per half acre of the total area of the tax parcel? Or is it the total area available to the horse to roam (corrals and paddocks)? I assume it's the former, but it's something to think about. 17.455.075 Equestrian facilities. E. Applicants shall demonstrate that odor, dust, noise (including amplified sound) and drainage shall not constitute a nuisance, hazard, or health problem to adjoining property or uses. Best Management Practices for runoff and dust control shall be implemented. Same comment as above, who's BMP's are we talking about here? G. Farm plan approval shall be obtained from the Kitsap Conservation District. Same comment as above. KCD doesn't approve farm plans, they write them for the
52	Kimberly	McClure	The equestrian facilities code updates would unreasonably limit the use of land and impact a large amount of owners who have a positive impact on the lives of youth and animals. It would put numerous trainers out of business and therefore negatively impact the economy and leave both riders and horses without proper training and care. The setbacks and requirements are absolutely unreasonable and a gross overreach on use of land. Any new codes related to equestrian properties/facilities need



## Year of the Rural Comment Form

09/02/25-09/15/25 12:00pm

53	Debra	Rogers	Hello, My name is Debra Rogers. We have been residents of Kitsap county for the last 11 years. During our time, we have enjoyed the sense of community, rural lifestyle, and the diversity of activities that our county has to offer. With the passing of the code update, I worry that the above will be acutely impacted. While I am not a horse owner, my family and I will be impacted by the passing of this change in code since we will be losing an important piece of our community and moving further away from the rural feeling that Kitsap is able to offer. Because of the accessibility to horses, my daughter has been able to develop a deep passion for them. Since age 5, she has been able to ride horses at several locations around Kitsap County. When she was young, she would write stories and act out her horse dreams with her toys. In middle school, life was turbulent, as it is for many young girls, but horses kept her grounded and gave her a sense of confidence when little else did. Now we are in high school. She is working with her trainer to move into a career in which she wants to use horses to help people who struggle with physical or mental challenges. We are still working to develop this path. Without the access to horses, none of this would be possible. ALL of the facilities she has attended would cease to exist under this bill (she has attended at least 5). She would not have been able to find this passion. She would not have had an escape when life was hard. She would no longer be able to continue lessons with her current trainers and we will be forced to pay outrageous prices as the market would be flooded with clients hoping to keep their passions alive. Recently, you asked the community to complete a Kitsap Community Survey, asking the residents what they value most about living in Kitsap. During that survey, there were a few recurring themes. One theme was a sense of community. If you have spent any time around “horse people”, you’d understand the community they bring; whether it be a horse show, helping a neighbor, teaching lessons, or letting neighbors watch their horses in their pastures. Another recurring theme was housing vs open spaces. Myself and many around me value seeing livestock in our community and the rural feeling is a large part of why we moved here, and why we are working to keep it to its roots. While I understand the need for development s roots. While I understand the need for development and regulations, I
54	Natalie	Fincher	I am against this proposal as it will not “enhance the rural character of Kitsap County”, but it will harm local businesses and make it much more difficult for people to keep horses in Kitsap County. A lack of training/boarding facilities already exists in the area and this will exacerbate the issue: Parts of the proposal I am specifically concerned with are as follows: - Paddocks being at least 200ft feet from property line will greatly hinder people’s abilities to properly care for their horses and give them adequate space to roam which is vital for their well being - Having to acquire a permit for something as simple as hosting a clinic is an undue burden and financial strain on small businesses - Requirement to prove that dust, noise, and odor should not constitute a nuisance to adjoining properties. This greatly concerns me as it appears to be a tool to discourage rural ways of living for a more urban lifestyle. I see this a tool to push out rural residents to make room for more urban neighborhoods to increase housing density in the area. - The requirement to visually screen what some might consider unsightly, ie tractors and parked cars, from adjoining properties is absolutely absurd. What is the rationale behind this amendment? This is a rural area, of course there will be agricultural and equestrian related things on their own property. If some neighbor on an adjoining property doesn’t like rural living, then they shouldn’t have moved to a rural area. This will affect not only new properties but
55	Pedro	Lopez	My wife, Jennifer, and I have poured our hearts and souls into maintaining an equestrian community in Port Orchard for the past 5 years. When people ask me why we own a staggering 3 stables, the answer comes straight from the depths of my being. Jennifer and I were both raised right here in Port Orchard, and she was surrounded by horses from a young age. Jennifer worked for local stables throughout her youth. As for me, my mother first introduced me to horses, by taking me to the old Triple T to help clean the stalls. Those early experiences instilled in me a deep, lifelong love and respect for these magnificent creatures. Now, as a father, I long to pass that same wonder and connection down to our children. When I embarked on this incredible journey into the equine world, I quickly realized that Kitsap County was changing and trying to move in a different direction than what I was raised in. This meant that beloved existing stables were at risk of being bought out and transformed, whether that meant bulldozing and building housing or converting them into non-equine establishments. Upon realizing this, my determination crystallized - I knew I had to act, to preserve the equestrian havens of our childhood for generations to come. My greatest hope is that our kids will have the same opportunity to learn discipline, responsibility, and forge an unbreakable bond with horses, just as we did. And so, with unwavering passion, we set out to acquire and safeguard as many of these precious facilities as possible, before they could be lost forever. For you see, the greatest charm of our beloved Kitsap County lies in its rural, lightly regulated
56	Heidi	Ayres	Please do not agree to the changes proposed for equine facilities. Making things harder for businesses, especially ones that bring in so much revenue, is a poor strategy for economic growth. It would be eise to consult actual equine owners for any changes that should be made.
57	Jim Rogers		Testing from my phone.
58	Nancy	Berg	Regarding the horse facilities draft code, the setback for paddocks is very poorly thought out. A setback of 200 feet from the property line will not allow ANY horses on anything less than a five acre parcel. This whole draft code seems to be geared to getting rid of the horse owners in Kitsap County. Between the requirements in the draft code and the additional permits that will be required, you are pricing the rural residents out of enjoying our land.

## Year of the Rural Comment Form

09/02/25-09/15/25 12:00pm

59	Teresa	Case	Dear Commissioner Rolfe, Horses and barns have been a part of rural Kitsap for generations. Please consider the importance of having equine facilities in Kitsap County. Many youth and adults have enriched lives because of a horse barn or equine therapy program that supports the emotional and physical healing through partnerships with horses. In the proposed 2025 Horse Facilities "draft code" listed standards and regulations are not reasonable for horse property owners. They may not even be obtainable. Section 17.455.75: B. Barns , stables located at least 50 feet from property line. Paddocks.....200 feet from any property line. These severely limit the use of land, may make compliance difficult. F.3. Visual screening of parking areas to include tractors, trailers .....from adjoining properties. What's the harm in seeing a John Deere tractor or a Thuro-Built horse trailer? Are these codes "best practices " for equine property use or is this a response to a complaint? What are the current presenting problems these codes are trying to solve? My humble opinion, as a landowner having set up property for horses, offering resources such as the Kitsap County Conservation District on how to be the best stewards of the land is what should be supported and encouraged. Instead what I perceive as an attempt to push out Equine facilities . These codes threaten equine services. Pushing out the equine community will change the rural landscape and harm our distinctive rural character. Supporting Kitsap County equine barns, stables, rescue and therapy programs should be what guides decisions. Reach out to them, visit
60			This is an insane attempt at controlling farmers and their livestock your proposed bill with have huge implications on livelihood and it seems you just want the money
61	Robert	Case	For the purpose of understanding the drive behind the changes being proposed, Please advise the impetus behind the revision, specifically what has dcd discovered that currently is occurring or exists in a majority of their research that needs controlling, limiting or money charged for funding (equestrian based enforcement vs general fund deposit) Is this proposal complaint based (by what number of complaints against countywide population numbers), safety problems (specifics), demonstrated health problems (specifics), injuries (specifics) something else? Please allay the concerns that a small minority of complaints by "concerned" citizens is
62	Lynn	Strezeski	Please don't adopt the overly restrictive proposals that target equine facilities. This is heavy handed and unfairly targets horses without addressing other farm animals and operations. This will set a precedent that will eventually be leveraged for private horse properties. I have owned horses in Kitsap County and paid taxes for 17 years. This code change would damage the rural nature of much of our county and give more room for the developers to take over. Please don't support this terrible code.
63	Anastasia	Bidne	I am an equestrian in the community. These changes proposed set a dangerous precedent for developing land that is currently used for equestrian facilities. These changes will put people out of jobs, reduce community, and hinder the economy. I moved here recently. A major reason I moved here was because I had better access to equestrian facikitiws and communities. You would be taking that away from thousands of people.
64	Patrick	Heye	All of the reclassification requests that the County declined to consider were residential rezones, and every residential rezone request was denied. This raises a critical policy question: why is the County refusing to evaluate any proposals that would expand the residential housing supply? The median home price in Kitsap County reached \$615,000, in July 2025, a 7% increase from the previous year alone. Average apartment rents have also risen sharply, up more than 12% year-over-year. These trends are making it increasingly difficult for residents to find affordable housing and contribute to the cost-of-live and homelessness crises. As the County revises its rezone request process, how will it ensure alignment with the Growth Management Act and the Comprehensive Plan by prioritizing single-family and multi-family
65			
66	Denise	Drevdahl	this is with respect to the changes for horse facilities...the recommendations being made seem to have the goal of eliminating all horse facilities in the county. Given that many properties are long and narrow, 200 feet from a property line is not achievable. What problem exactly are you attempting to solve? (these suggestions made it sound like somone moved to the rural part of the county and are unhappy with the conditions that come from rural living (smells, sounds, insects, etc.). No horse facility will be able to meet these requirements unless they are located on huge pieces of property...Were horse people actually involved in any of your discussions?
67	Heather	Lewis	The Horse Facility Draft Code was obviously paid for with development dollars. I ask myself, who benefits when farms have to shut down because the regulations are so unbelievably out of touch with our rural equine community? Land Developers. Well I call bullshit. We pay your salaries, too. These new rules would undermine our American Dream and whoever drafted this should be ashamed of themselves. I worked twenty years to afford my farm, specifically so I could see my beloved horse out of my kitchen window. How dare you threaten that???? I pay my taxes, I work hard for my living, and I purposely moved here to get be able to enjoy my horse(s) on my own land. Many others have inundated you with their heartfelt reasons and a lot of facts/data about how much we equine enthusiasts put into this community in terms of jobs, services, and money generated in this county, so I would encourage you to plan any future code drafts to take into consideration our community. We will fight you. You are NOT on the side of the angels, here. Please reconsider these changes and come back with something that reflects the constituents in this rural area. None of us are against clean water or reasonable modernization, but this draft is obviously written by someone who either hates horses, or someone who blithely has no clue what these new codes would mean for the small equine acreage owner in Kitsap. Please educate yourself before you try to shove this hooey down our throats. Again, we are angry. There is no wiggle room in this draft. You make us feel cornered, threatening the very reason some of us live here. Please consider doing some better

## Year of the Rural Comment Form

09/02/25-09/15/25 12:00pm

68	Anna	Van Brookhoven	I'm not going to mince words. The horse provisions are ridiculous. A 200ft setback is in the middle of a 5 acre property is so tiny that it's not even usable if you have more than a pony. This revision looks like it'll finally kill off the horse farms and riding schools for good. You say this is pro-ag? Horseshit. Go walk anyone's property and see how ridiculous this rule is. Most of the lots out here are long rectangles, not squares. Under this law, there's no way I could have my animals since the width of my nearly 5ac property barely at 200ft. Each year this county makes it harder and harder to have agriculture and is leaning more towards city planning which is going to ruin the few farms we have all for a bunch of city folks who moved out here to be closer to "the rural life"! Well guess what- taking care of animals means you deal with the horse shit. If you don't like it, don't move next to a farm. These rules are incredibly draconian towards animal welfare- horses need space to roam and with the odd shapes of many lots here and wetlands you really gotta work with what you got. 50ft setbacks means my horses would be in cubicle-like pens which is not cool. Leave
69	Julie	Toulon	This is asinine! For example, we have 15ish acres, if we wanted to board a horse or two we would not be able to as the width of our parcel is only 300ish feet. With setbacks our barn and pastures would be in violation. We have 4 horses currently as well as a couple cows. We have a farm plan w the conservation district, have a manure storage/composting structure and do a good job not overgrazing our pastures or spreading raw manure to runoff into Olalla creek. We would need to hide our tractor, and horse trailer as to not offend our neighbors as well... make it make sense! We are only ONE example hundreds with similar property limitations.
70	Laurie	Kallsen George	Please define how you dictate an existing or established equine facility. Is this based on what data? Looking to the concept of change in use ; if a barn has existed for 20 years and has historically had boarders and occasionally has lessons, who determines that it is a boarding or lesson facility
71	Kaleena	Pluff	I don't think any barns or riding facilities should be shut down. A lot of these have a good impact on kids and achieving goals out of this world. Especially the riding pony
72	Carrie	Guthrie-Whitlow	As 32-year residents of South Kitsap county, we are deeply troubled by the proposed changes to the agricultural code would significantly alter the landscape and negatively impact the deeply rooted equine culture that exists within our community. The earliest recorded written history related to horsemanship is from 400B C by General Xenophon, some 2400 years ago. General Xenophon references books even older than this by Simon and Plinius. Alois Podhajsky, former director of the Spanish Riding School in Vienna , Austria, speaks the culture in his book, The Complete Training of Horse and Rider In the Principles of Classical Horsemanship: 'The historical development of riding reveals that the art is not confined to any special country. It flourishes whenever human beings dedicate themselves to horsemanship and know how to cultivate and develop its practice, wherever there are experts, and wherever such skill brings pleasure to those who love beauty. The art of riding is indeed international; it belongs to the civilized world, and it is the duty of every nation to preserve and foster it in the interest of culture'. The proposed changes are certainly not fostering the equine culture, and in fact are seen by most within the community as an attack on the culture. Some have suggested that the proposed changes is a money grab on the part of the county due to the funds that would be generated from permits required for boarding and training facilities along with one time permits for shows and other events. However, we believe that this goes much deeper, as it seems the cost of oversight required to oversee these regulations could well exceed any revenues brought in. If the Equine Center Standards and Regulations are adopted, many if not most of the existing facilities (large and small) will be lost. Proposed changes such as the requirement that 'paddocks and manure storage or disposal area shall be located at least two hundred feet from any property line' is not physically possible for many, if not most facilities, within the County. For example, a 200' set back is impossible on a rectangular shaped 5-acre parcel, measuring 330' wide by 660' wide, and would therefore prevent a facility from being permitted. The 'requirement for visual screening of parking areas, manure storage or disposal areas, and storage area for mechanical and transportation equipment (e.g. tractors, trailers, storage pods) from adjoining properties' – What does this even mean? Are you suggesting we build privacy fences around our properties, so people don't have to see us? We are concerned that there is a vision of South Kitsap County that is not being shared with it's citizens. It is clear from the recent development of apartment complexes along Sedgwick, Bethel and Mile Hill, and housing developments west of 16 that the untold vision does not align with what many if not most of your long-term residents had imagined for the future of our county. While allowing this building to occur, the county has failed to upgrade the infrastructure (ie. Roads) that are needed to withstand the increased population. Are you simply

## Year of the Rural Comment Form

09/02/25-09/15/25 12:00pm

73	Catherine	Schwartz	I attended the 9/11/25 Year of the Rural Project Presentation and Open House. I agree with others that it was offensive and in poor taste to schedule a public meeting on 9/11. My other observations. That the entire horse facilities code changes were concocted without input from anyone with any fundamental understanding of equestrian operations or its economic, health and social impacts. The 200 ft setback requirement for paddocks is a complete fabrication. Horses are livestock and are a vital and vibrant part of a healthy rural economy. The economic impact of the horse industry has been proven to be substantial nationally with its greatest impact in local rural areas. The draconian code changes affecting horse facilities were driven by one situation involving one horse facility. And that problem has less to do with the horse facility than it does private road issues for which the horse facility is being blamed. The code changes would forever and dramatically change Kitsap's rural landscape and economy while not even fix the precipitating problem. The planning and permitting process in this county is broken and dysfunctional. This isn't the USSR. It should not take years to get building permits or Conditional Use Permits approved. County employees have no business capriciously demanding studies and other obstacles not based on a real need. They're running roughshod over taxpayers treating rural residents like the enemy. Staff should be held accountable for timely permit processing or fired. An immediate audit of all pending permits should be conducted and those over a year old should be approved without further delay. My husband and I have lived in rural areas in 3 different states besides WA. Few permits were required at all, and a 2 week turn around was the norm. Something is very wrong in Kitsap County. All the proposed code changes affecting equestrian operations need to be discarded. A working group of experienced knowledgeable horse facility owners, trainers and horse owners needs to be involved to draft only those code changes proven necessary. Code changes protecting equestrian operations need to be adopted. It's impossible at this time for anyone to know how long that will take. But it needs to be done right and not rushed. A working group of rural & farm businesses needs to begin work on guidelines for the county to follow to support agri business and agri tourism, of which equestrian facilities are a part. Guidelines
74		Coreys	ACUP or CUPs should be applied to horse boarding facilities on Private shared roads. Facilities directly off public access roads would have minimal to no impact on
75	Stefanie	Olson	I attended the meeting last night regarding equine proposals and was amazed that there has been no input from the equine community and that a member from the conservation district were not invited into this discussion before it exploded to the community. Dianne Fish is a great resource and is very informatinve as well as several in our equine community. I feel as though the speaker learned a lot last night and at times was a deer in the headlights. There is so much more to this then sitting around a table. Have you considered visitng some equine facilities, do you know how big horses are and have you researched the space a horse needs and how much space is needed to store supplies for an animal farm?? I believe there is a lot more work to be done and that your timeframe will need to be expanded. In no way has anybody I talked to heard of Year of the Rural. Do you know that horse people are not spending time in front of their computer they are outside and to assume everyone checks the county website is absurd and I believe if it is only 10k to notify the residents that you should consider that instead of taking peoples rights away and making more money for the county. You cannot tell me that you are not raking in the money, look at all the building going on and it is NOT affordable housing, it is thousands apartmentts going up off farms on Clear Creek that have been there from the time began until the last couple years and then the projects in wetlands off Hwy 303 and all the building of Apex and Dickey road and more. this also shows the lack of knowledge in the horse community. They are not video gamers and glued to electronics all the time. These are hardworking people who can be known to put in 16 hour days and are on call all day every day. My son was a well respected horse trainer in the area who ran an equine facility in Kingston and has recently relocated to Texas as Washington state is not affordable and these proposals are only going to drive residents away. I am convinced you have not looked a the cost of a performance horse or the cost of upkeep of a horse and now the county wants a bite of the apple too. All of this being driven because o ONE facility and ONE foul mouthed neighbor who stands up and flips someone off and says f**k you to another participant and then is humble and says she doesnt act this way and her emotions get the best of her. the emotions get the best of her quite often as she drives down the private road screaming at people you boarders fu**ing suck! This is out of control and this is why our world is out of control because nobody can step up and deal with the problem people. The farm in question has been an equine facility for more YEARS than most of you have been alive until sold and the family moving to TEXAS. The new farm owner has commercial buisnesses running out of her farm and I dont believe it is zoned commercial. We need protection in this community not a government that cannot stand up and take charge. I am sure ther eare violations that can be dealt with but the county is so soft that when they talk to the property owner she thinks you
76	Deborah	Anne	UNplan the equestrian land use changes for Year of the Rural 2025;

## Year of the Rural Comment Form

09/02/25-09/15/25 12:00pm

77	Darby	Evans	<p>My name is Darby Evans. I have lived in Kitsap county since I was 3, which is 44 years. Kitsap County has always been beautiful country and rural. I use to ride my horse down the side of the road back in the day and still continue to ride my horse at Banner Heritage Park. I have seen how much this county has changed, and it makes me sad to see. There have been so many old farmhouses, pastures and forested areas that are now paved over shopping centers or apartments. There are housing developments on Sedgewick, Mile Hill, Bethel Rd, and in front of where I live. It use to be forest and pastureland. There is also the proposed logging of Banner forest at the same time. It seems there is a deeper agenda here, trying to drive out equestrian properties and farms so there can be more housing developments instead? I worry that the county is more concerned about money than preserving the history, rural areas, and equestrian communities here. I have read the new proposed agriculture code changes and they are absolutely ridiculous. I don't understand why we need 200 foot setbacks for paddocks and manure piles? 50 foot setbacks for barns? 1 horse per 1/2 acre (when California has 8 horse per 1/2 acre.) I attended the meeting on Sept 11 and she stated 75% of the properties are 5 acres or under. Implying it would be impossible to meet the standards of new and future horse boarding and training facilities. They would have hardly any property that is usable for horses or possibly none at all. It was also stated that this stemmed from one complaint. They stated horse barns are noisy, create traffic and smells. Well what about apartments and housing complexes? Aren't they noisy and creating more traffic when there has been no updates to the road infrastructure? I have apartments built right behind my backyard and the light pollution is awful. I had to get blackout curtains. There is constant noise and traffic driving through at all hours, but the county is more concerned with noise at horse barns? What noise do horses make? When asked how many complaints there were in the past 10 years, they didn't know and couldn't answer the question. It seems to me this one civil matter has blown up to affect all of the equestrian community, even those who are not doing anything wrong. This all could have been handled much differently. There are also permits required for training, clinics and events. Why? Permits take a long time to acquire, are costly and will discourage people from having any kind of horse events because of the added time to acquire them and costs. Do you know that horses are proven therapeutic to troubled teens and veterans with PTSD? That horse therapy helps with mental health and gives kids and adults a healthy sport and activity to do? It teaches empathy, patience, confidence and responsibility. I can't think of more healthy activity for kids and people young and old. Why would you want to make these activities harder to have and attend? I can't only think if the equestrian community is driven away how many kids will turn to other unhealthy activities and drugs instead. Please consider</p>
78	Trish	Tougas	<p>I faced a similar situation as the dispute that led to these revisions and was told that the county could do nothing about it as it was on a private road. The county told me it was a civil matter. Why is this different. In my opinion this is a civil matter that the court should decide and not something the county should be involved with by revising regulations that will make it even more difficult for farmers in the future.</p>
79	Lauren	Rogers	<p>Washington law recognizes equestrian centers as part of agriculture. RCW 7.48.310 protects routine farm activities—including livestock husbandry, animal movement, and construction/maintenance of barns and fences. Under RCW 7.48.305, compliant agricultural activities are presumed reasonable and “shall not be found to constitute a nuisance,” and they may not be restricted to certain hours simply for being farm activities. The Growth Management Act requires counties to conserve agricultural lands and discourage incompatible uses (RCW 36.70A.060, .170) while using innovative zoning to maintain farm viability, including allowing accessory uses and agriculturally-related experiences (RCW 36.70A.177). The Open Space Taxation Act treats land devoted to livestock production as farm and agricultural land (RCW 84.34.020), and state guidance allows compatible incidental uses that help farms survive. Finally, state policy assigns conflict management to buyer disclosure near farms (RCW 64.06.022), not new limits on ordinary agricultural operations. For these reasons, the proposed restrictions on boarding numbers, training/lesson frequency, equestrian events, arena hours, and routine farm infrastructure risk conflicting with state law and undermining agricultural viability. Please</p>
80	Heidi	Scott	<p>I wanted to follow-up with you regarding the draft changes to the child care section of the document you shared. I'm hoping that there will be consideration to change the language of “Family Day Care”. We in the early education field are trying to move away from “daycare” as it historically (incorrectly) connotes a perceived lower level of provider education and quality care. Also, in the interest of maintaining continuity with DCYF licensing and Child Care Aware of WA, it might be best to use existing terminology, which currently is: From DCYF WACs: "Family home early learning program" means an early learning program licensed by the department where a family home licensee provides child care or education services for 12 or fewer children in the family living quarters where the licensee resides as provided in RCW 43.216.010 (1)(c). Our program, Early Achievers, uses “Family Child Care” or “FCC”, which is a term also used by DCYF Licensors in conversation. I think either one would be acceptable Please let me know if you have any questions about this. Thanks! Heidi Scott She/her pronouns Early Achievers Consultation Manager/Lead</p>

## Year of the Rural Comment Form

09/02/25-09/15/25 12:00pm

81	J	Goss	Subject: Strong Opposition to Proposed Equine Property Code Revisions Dear Commissioner, I am writing to strongly oppose the proposed code revisions affecting equine properties. This is not about a driveway dispute — it is about setting the stage for urban expansion into rural areas. The county’s own presentation made that clear, pointing to targeted development zones and long-term housing projections. With a \$20 billion shipyard expansion already underway and our power grid at capacity, it is obvious that farmland is being eyed for future development. The stated concerns about dust, noise, and environmental impacts on equine properties are inconsistent. Baseball fields, sports facilities, and new housing developments create far greater impacts, yet they are not being scrutinized. The proposed permit structure is unworkable: \$8,500 for boarding, \$8,500 for training/lessons, and \$8,500 for shows/events — on top of mandatory Conservation District site plans that many, including myself, have been unable to obtain for years. These excessive costs and delays will shut down small equine facilities like mine, where I keep seven
82	Margaret	Mittuch	The proposed code updates for Equestrian Facilities do not represent. a clear or fair understanding of the equestrian industry or facilities as they currently exist. i urge the council to slow this process down, follow through with engaging subject matter experts that are involved in and understand the many aspects of boarding and training and equine care facilities, and work to update the code in a way that fairly serves the interest of all of our constituents. There were any voices at the September 11th meeting, all with comments that were "noted". I hope 'noted' means that they will actually be considered. The balance of feedback was against the code as proposed. That proposed language was dated from 2016, when it was not passed. Prior efforts to pass similar code in the early 2000's also failed. No economic impact study has been completed that we have been made aware of, which is a critical piece of information that needs to be included in any deliberations. Shutting
83	Lisa	Pagano	This is a code change that will ruin your county and force equine stables out. If this passes no one will want to move there due to the restrictions. Dozens of stables will be forced to close. An unfair decision from an unfair person who goes not understand what rural means.
84	Amirah	Rogers	I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed zoning code revisions for equestrian facilities in Kitsap County. While I understand the County’s intent to update and clarify regulations, these changes pose serious risks to our agricultural community, our equestrian traditions, and the broader public who depend on them. Washington State law is clear: farming is a protected activity that includes the commercial production of livestock and equestrian uses. Under the Washington Right-to-Farm Act (RCW 7.48.300–.320), farms are shielded from restrictive regulations that interfere with normal and accepted farming practices. Additionally, RCW 84.34 establishes that farms do not need to meet arbitrary acreage thresholds to be recognized as legitimate agricultural operations. By imposing zoning requirements that exceed what state law defines as farming, Kitsap County risks undermining the intent of these statutes. The suggestion that current equestrian facilities will be “grandfathered in” does not resolve this issue. Grandfathering only protects the present; it blocks the future. If new farms cannot be established, our community loses the ability to grow, evolve, and pass on land-based traditions to the next generation. This means fewer opportunities for young farmers and equestrians, diminished local food and horse-related economies, and weakened resilience of our rural heritage. Equestrian facilities are not just farms. They are gathering places, youth education centers, therapy providers, and safe spaces for community connection. They contribute to mental health, recreation, and local identity. Restrictive zoning policies will make them financially unsustainable, discourage investment, and ultimately drive families out of farming and equestrian life. As a community member, I urge Kitsap County to withdraw or significantly revise these proposed changes. Instead, I encourage the County to align its zoning code with the spirit of Washington

## Year of the Rural Comment Form

09/02/25-09/15/25 12:00pm

			NOTE - MORE TIME IS NEEDED FOR THE EQUESTRIAN AND FARM COMMUNITY TO GATHER, COLLECT OPINIONS, PROVIDE DATA ON THE POTENTIAL IMPACT IF THESE AMMENDMENTS ARE APPROVED! IT TAKES TIME TO RESEARCH AND CLEARLY THE COUNTY HAS QUIETLY BEEN WORKING ON THIS FOR MONTHS OR YEARS!!!! IT IS NOT ACCEOTABLE FOR THE COMMUNITY TO FIND OUT 10 DAYS AGO ON FACEBOOK! I am writing in reference to the proposal for an amendment to the county code and zoning regarding Equestrian Center Standards and Regulations. The proposal and the impact of the changes if approved would effectively force the closure of many wonderful equestrian facilities that are part of the fabric of our rural community in Kitsap County. The proposed changes would make it almost impossible for equestrian facilities to comply as they are so restrictive and not practical, and for many the cost of even attempting to make changes so that they comply would be too great. My husband and I moved to Port Orchard over 9 years ago from Southern California where we had horse property in Norco (1 acre), to our beautiful home on 2.5 acres in Port Orchard. I volunteer and sponsor a horse at The Whole Horse Place in Port Orchard and I cannot say enough about the value of their programs to children who want to learn about horse care, horse management, and riding, to kids with special needs, to at-risk youth, and to veterans and recovering addicts as part of their therapy. My experience at The Whole Horse Place as an adult whose horses passed in 2021 and 2022 has been in many ways life-saving due to the therapeutic value of supporting and volunteering and riding at The Whole Horse Place. As a young girl growing up in England I was fortunate to have parents who somehow were able to pay for riding lessons for me at age 5. Riding and horses have been a constant in my life and as a teenager it helped me build confidence and self worth and kept me on a good path as my love of horses was so strong, all I wanted to do was ride which you can imagine keeps young people out of trouble! Horse barns and facilities are very often safe havens for young people, and I implore you to please don't underestimate the value in that. Kitsap is a wonderful community and we are so fortunate to have so many amazing equestrian facilities. It would be such a travesty to see them go if they were unable to survive. They also bring in revenue to the county not just in lesson and boarding fees from taxes but supporting local feed and tack stores, veterinarians, farriers, and trainers. The rural lifestyle we experience in Kitsap County should be highly valued and protected. There are few places left where horses and equestrians are as much a part of the community as private homes and farms. If the proposed changes were approved and implemented it would be devastating to this special community. Please consider the proposal very carefully and think about the legacy you want to leave for Kitsap County. Do you want to pass this potentially devastating proposal for change and in 10 years for Kitsap to look and feel like King
85	Tracey	Dimof	
86	Tiffany	Santinelli	Horses are a huge part of our community... They help with depression, stress, our vets, special needs and so much more...
87	Matthew	Scott	As a customer that has been going to Yoked Brewery since they oped there business and an avid supporter of small business business I would like the code updated. This include there business to serve 16 ounce pours of there product and serve food to there customers. I feel this would benefit not small businesses like Yoked
88	Terra	Scott	I would like the code updated. This would benefit small business like Yoked Brewery by letting them serve 16 ounce pours. I like to support and seek out small business like Yoked Brewing and I feel I am not the only one that does in Kitsap County. With that said it would also benefit the community as well.
89	Stephanie	Secrest	We need to preserve and protect our farms. Please be thorough in addressing these complaints and aware of when they were made. We need farmers, we need places that offer equestrian type things. Don't punish all the facilities and farms for one facilities mistake or negligence
90	Rosemary	Collins	There has not been a vote of the people. Why is the county managing land that is not owned by them? Why is the county involved in my ownership of horses and equestrian activities? I pay the taxes on my property and I pay the mortgage...the county needs to stay out of managing my property.
91	Erin	Woodell	My daughter has benefited greatly from having the opportunity to train with horses at our neighbors property. This might be at risk if this measure passes for future children. Being able to learn lessons that can not be spoken is something that can only be taught by horses.
92	Tracey	Hamilton	Tracey Hamilton check out my recent comment at the bottom. Also: HOW CAN YOU HELP??? The equine Community is trying to unite on one front to get the Horse Facilities Draft Code pulled from the Rural Zoning Code Amendment Package. The best place to start is by flooding their inbox. We are in the middle of creating a petition, which will hopefully be out by Monday. BY Commenting ( and asking EVERYONE you know to comment the SAME THING) on the county website with the following: Ask: What problem is the county trying to solve? Urge: More time Horse Facilities Draft Code is pulled from zoning code amendments package
93	Steven	Arntson	I'm not a professional in this arena, and I thank you for giving the public the opportunity to comment. My thoughts are general, because I'm not a development professional, but it does seem that such professionals sometimes have an outsized voice in developing policy. Nothing against them; everyone's got to make a living. But my stake in my own environment is that I want Kitsap County to be environmentally resilient, and a healthy place for its residents. There are lots of components to this, of course, but my comment today has to do with preserving big trees and growing more of them, especially in town and city centers. Seattle's own tree ordinance is not on track to meet its own goals. How do we in Kitsap maintain and increase the presence of large trees and the shade and other environmental benefits they confer? Some people have the erroneous impression that large trees are primarily dangerous and inconvenient. This is incorrect. Large trees are primarily beneficial, even essential to healthy living in Kitsap County. It takes 100 years to grow a big legacy Douglas fir; let's work to preserve the few we have left in our population centers,

## Year of the Rural Comment Form

09/02/25-09/15/25 12:00pm

94	Eric	Parish	Equestrian setback and County permits - NO! Hard NO! The proposed benefits for these measures are greatly outweighed by the hardship that will be imposed on the horse farms. The setbacks and licensing requirements proposals should be voided.
95	Sean	Lane	Please reconsider changing the code regarding equestrian stables. This is unrealistically restrictive as it would require stables to be built in the center of the property. Not a good place for stables on any property.
96			The proposed zoning amendments threaten accessibility to equestrian activities for children and adults who otherwise could not experience horses. Many facilities provide affordable lessons, leasing programs, and opportunities to care for and ride horses without the burden of full ownership. These services are crucial for fostering empathy, responsibility, and engagement with rural culture. Washington State statutes (RCW 36.70A.040 and RCW 7.48.300-.310) support agricultural uses and encourage counties to conserve farmland and agricultural operations. Equestrian facilities qualify under this definition, and restricting them would violate both the letter and spirit of these laws. The Rural and Resource Lands Element further emphasizes promoting rural lifestyles and ensuring that agricultural opportunities remain accessible. Removing or restricting these facilities would disproportionately impact low-income families, children, and individuals who benefit most from affordable agricultural and equestrian experiences. These barns provide a sense of community, education, and belonging that cannot be replaced by other recreational activities.
97	dianne	faletti	Please leave equestrian facilities to stay put
98	Adrienne	Denges	As someone who grew up around & worked with horses for a majority of my life, I can tell you that equestrian activity has a massive impact on local families and youth. What problem is the city trying to solve with the code updates? Kindly requesting that the Horse Facilities Draft Code is pulled from zoning code amendments year of
99	Maureen	Halligan	The draft document includes both equestrian facilities and accessory facilities. The setback requirement for barns, paddocks and manure management would make it impossible to function with anything less than 10 acres that are perfectly square. With that you would be restricted to the middle 2.5 acres or 25% of your property. If you are also needing setbacks from wells, septic fields and streams it would make most of our small farms impossible to farm. Also with this, what about donkeys. Mules, llamas and alpacas? Are they next? Finally the state RCWs are pretty clear about agricultural use, accessory use and the obligations of both owners and counties. This draft is not in alignment with the RCWs. The contribution to the Kitsap County economy from various equestrian facilities must be significant. In Clarke county the estimate is \$90M annually. We have probably 5-10 times the numbers they do. Please redraft this update or leave it as it was before. Most of us work with
100	GEORGE	CAMPBELL	These updates are not good for anyone, so many of our kids and grandkids rely on these small farms for their horses and arena's. these changes will make it so no one can afford horses. Please leave keep this county horse friendly.