

AREAS OF MORE INTENSIVE RURAL DEVELOPMENT
ISSUE PAPER

Preliminary
Draft

JANUARY 30, 1998
KITSAP COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

- Introduction
- I. Defining Rural Character
 - 1. Kitsap County Context
 - a. Prior Rural Planning Efforts
 - b. Rural Character
- II. Limited Areas of More Intensive Development
 - 1. Types of Areas Characterized by More Intensive Development
 - a. Predominantly Residential Areas
 - b. Mixed-Use Areas
 - c. Commercial/Industrial Areas
 - 2. Potential Candidate Areas
- III. Potential Criteria for Areas of More Intense Development
- IV. Attachments

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this paper is to identify candidate rural areas within Kitsap County that meet the requirements of Engrossed Senate Bill (ESB) 6094, an amendment to the Growth Management Act. Candidate rural areas may, in some cases, recognize existing rural development patterns in Kitsap County and permit more intensive development within defined boundaries. The County wishes to solicit public input on potential criteria for defining these limited areas of more intensive rural development that are consistent with Kitsap County rural character. To that end, this paper is being coordinated with a number of presentations and workshops to discuss how the provisions of ESB 6094 could work in Kitsap County.

THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT HEARINGS BOARD DECISION

The Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board (GMHB) determined that Kitsap County’s 1996 Comprehensive Plan violated the Growth Management Act (GMA) in regard to allowed development, land use patterns, and densities in rural areas. The GMHB found that the Rural Element of the Plan, as adopted, perpetuated historical patterns of sprawl development in rural areas by allowing densities that were not considered “rural.” In essence, the Hearings Board concluded that the Plan permitted urban development to occur in rural areas contrary to the intent of the GMA.

The GMHB found specific provisions of the County’s Rural Element did not comply with the requirements of the Act. These provisions included plan and zoning designations that permitted 2.5-acre and 1-acre lots, and the “Grandfathering Clause” that permitted the subdivision of existing lots into parcels smaller than current zoning allowed. The decision of the GMHB found that these provisions were perpetuating urban sprawl, and would substantially interfere with the fulfillment of the GMA’s planning goals.

RURAL PROVISIONS OF ENGROSSED SENATE BILL 6094

On April 27, 1997 the Washington State Legislature enacted ESB 6094 as an Amendment to the Growth Management Act. ESB 6094 directs counties to adopt a Rural Element as a component of a Comprehensive Land Use Plan. The Amendment requires that the Rural Element address rural development and densities, and include lands that are not designated for urban growth, agriculture, forest, or mineral resources. It permits appropriate land uses that are compatible with the rural character of such lands, and provides for a variety of rural densities and uses. The Amendment also allows innovative techniques such as clustering and Transfer of Development Rights (TDRs), as long as they are in keeping with locally defined rural character. Counties should foster land use patterns and develop a local vision of rural character that will:

- X preserve rural-based economies and traditional rural lifestyles;
- X encourage the economic prosperity of rural residents;
- X foster opportunities for small scale, rural-based employment and self-employment;
- X permit the operation of rural-based agricultural, commercial, recreational, and tourist businesses that are consistent with existing and planned land use patterns;
- X foster the private stewardship of the land and the preservation of open space; and

RURAL ISSUE PAPER APPENDIX

enhance the rural sense of community and quality of life.

These and other rural provisions of the Act are summarized in Attachment A to this Issue Paper. The attachment contains information presented at a CTED-sponsored workshop in Silverdale on January 15, 1998. The Workshop was presented by the two members of the Land Use Study Commission who drafted the ESB 6094 amendments. These amendments have been codified in various sections of the GMA (RCW 36.70A).

ESB 6094 also permits counties to define “limited areas of more intensive development” subject to a number of guidelines and criteria (RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d)). In essence, these limited areas are exceptions to the types of development that are generally permitted in rural areas. The exceptions allow identification, recognition, and designation of existing areas with established (non-urban) development patterns. These existing areas may be permitted to accommodate limited additional growth through infill, new development or redevelopment. The types of growth permitted include intensification or new development of small-scale recreational or tourist uses that rely on a rural setting or location, and intensification of isolated small-scale businesses. The areas may contain public facilities and services, which must be limited to what is necessary to serve the limited area and which does not permit low-density sprawl.

“Limited areas of more intensive development” must have been in existence as of July 1, 1990. Each area must be defined and contained by a logical outer boundary that limits and contains the extent of more intensive development. The boundary must be delineated predominantly by the built environment (ie: existing development) but may include limited undeveloped land. Establishment of the boundary must address: the need to preserve the character of existing natural neighborhoods and communities; physical boundaries; prevention of abnormally irregular boundaries; and the ability to provide public facilities and services. Counties must adopt measures to ensure that these areas are limited and contained.

These requirements of the law will be used, along with local citizens’ definitions of rural character, to develop criteria for designating and controlling limited areas of more intensive development within Kitsap County’s rural areas. The information in this Issue Paper will be used by the public, at a series of workshops and at public hearings, and by elected officials to help identify and define these areas. Kitsap County will be one of the first jurisdictions in the state to apply the provisions of ESB 6094. It is felt that these provisions provide an opportunity to help reconcile the County’s historical land use pattern with the requirements of the GMA.

I. DEFINING RURAL CHARACTER

KITSAP COUNTY CONTEXT

The ‘70s ushered in a long period of rapid growth in Kitsap County, Washington. Between 1970 and 1990, the County absorbed an 87% increase in population, or more than twice the state’s growth rate of 42.6%. Protecting the rural character of Kitsap County quickly jumped to the forefront of land use issues, and the development of the 1977 Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan officially started the process. In the ensuing five years, the County continued to grow at a rate of 16% a year. Today, with a population of 229,400, Kitsap County is still considered predominantly rural by some people (suburban by others). It is the second-most-dense county in the state.

The term “rural” is difficult to define. Rural lands under the Growth Management Act (GMA) are “those areas not intended for urban-level development nor those lands that are set aside for their importance to the protection of agriculture, forest, and mining industries and resources.” Kitsap County’s “rural character” is defined by large areas of undeveloped land

and open space; scattered low-density, single-family homes; many acres of pasture and forest land; small part-time farms; and limited, low-intensity commercial uses.

Rural characteristics include the abundance of trees, access to recreation, views of water and mountains, and a quiet, unregimented atmosphere. The elements of rural character also include the dynamic natural systems abundant in Kitsap County which are vulnerable to human and natural change. This evolving landscape provides the framework for a rural vision in the Comprehensive Plan.

Kitsap County's rural character has been expressed in terms of landscape, visual qualities, and environmental and land use features. However, the term "rural" is more than a description of character of development or the area outside our urban growth areas. For the residents of Kitsap County, the term "rural" is also defined as a philosophy of living and a quality of life. It is this multifaceted character and lifestyle that residents of the county hope to maintain and enhance through the Comprehensive Plan.

Prior Rural Planning Efforts

Rural development must be guided by a larger vision of what needs to be preserved as well as what is permitted by the GMA. In Kitsap County, many visions have been expressed in numerous studies and public participation sessions on rural issues over the past eight years. These vision statements and definitions are summarized below.

Basic rural themes, first articulated in October of 1990 at the County-Wide Growth Management Act Symposium "The Next 100,000," include:

- X Preserve the rural character and moderate income lifestyle of Kitsap County -- farming, forestry, "unkempt charm," and individuality.

- X Actively protect the County's natural features and systems -- open space, water-related resources, and wildlife habitat.

RURAL ROUNDTABLE (JANUARY 26, 1993)

The Rural Roundtable Committee was created by the Board of County Commissioners to make recommendations on rural land-use issues. The committee recognized the natural environment and rural resources as the basis of rural character. They found that protecting the rural landscape was central to the vision of Kitsap County residents. Design standards were recommended to visually maintain "rural character" in Kitsap County. Recommendations also emphasized the need to maintain rural lifestyles and rural activities such as agriculture, farming, forestry, and self-sufficiency living. The Rural Roundtable Committee developed a set of value statements and objectives which included the following:

1. Natural systems shall be the primary determinant of all planning activity.
2. The rural quality of Kitsap County shall be maintained and enhanced. Appropriate infrastructure shall be provided to ensure environmental quality.
3. Kitsap County shall provide for the managed absorption of its share of projected Puget Sound growth, and shall provide housing which meets the full range of economic situations and needs.

SOUTH KITSAP RURAL COMMUNITY DESIGN STUDY (JULY, 1993)

The South Kitsap Rural Community Design Study was based upon the concept of retaining rural character in the context of permitted development. Ideas included incentives for the clustering of communities, villages, and hamlets to maintain large, continuous open spaces and critical areas; clearly-defined urban centers with boundaries influenced by natural systems; and infill of existing centers to provide an efficient use of public services. Rural character would be maintained by use of strict design standards. Areas with a strong sense of rural character included: pastures and meadows; shorelines; ridge lines and valley walls; and rural highways and public roadways.

SUQUAMISH COMMUNITY PLAN (MAY 17, 1993)

RURAL ISSUE PAPER APPENDIX

The plan created policies that would retain rural character and preserve the natural setting of this historic, waterfront community. The community was to remain compact; protected by its natural borders of water, streams, hills and forests.

KINGSTON COMMUNITY PLAN (SPRING 1993)

The plan addressed ways to maintain the old-town character and living environment of Kingston. The Plan featured a rural overlay zone in which a Planned Unit Development permit was required to develop three or more lots. All PUD applicants within this zone then had to meet regulations and design guidelines of the rural overlay zone. The proposed design guidelines would maintain rural character through screening, retention of open space, and maintaining scenic corridors and vistas.

HANSVILLE COMMUNITY PLAN (1993)

The plan addressed rural design guidelines. The main emphasis was to preserve rural character while meeting the needs of humans and wildlife. The plan listed four principal Community Goals:

- X Establish open space corridors to support diversity and continuity of natural systems;
- X Balance the creation of open space with the preservation of private property rights;
- X Establish mechanisms which preserve rural character; and
- X Interconnect the Hansville community with a network of both on-road and off-road pathways.

VOICES OF KITSAP (JANUARY, 1996)

The League of Women voters (LOWV) and the Bremerton Sun sponsored a series of community meetings to help generate public participation in the Growth Management Process. This effort addressed each of the 13 goals of the Growth Management Act. Each participant was asked to indicate the three top concerns for each goal. The results from these meetings were then summarized and presented to the Department of Community Development, Kitsap County Planning Commission and the Board of County Commissioners for consideration in the process for revising the Comprehensive Plan.

THE COUNTY GREENWAYS PLAN (JUNE, 1996)

The Kitsap County Greenways Plan committee included County staff and local citizens. The Greenways Plan addressed the following four elements:

- The Kitsap County Bicycle Facilities Plan;
- The Kitsap County Off-Road Trails Plan;
- The Roadside Scenic Resource Corridors Plan; and
- The Wildlife Corridors Plan.

The Plan links recreational trails, commuter bikeways, and heritage and wildlife corridors with parks, schools, places of employment, shopping areas, transit facilities, and a variety of scenic, educational, and interpretive resources, and identifies these corridors as "Greenways." Greenways will also include other undeveloped scenic and natural resource corridors. Once identified as a Greenway, these corridors are then protected from future development.

While the above documents pertain to differing geographic areas and have been implemented to varying degrees, they express several common themes, including preserving open space, and recognizing and preserving significant features of the rural landscape through planning and design.

Rural Character

We perceive rural character as we walk through our communities, drive along our public roadways and look across different

landscapes. Rural character is created by the way in which we use the land, and the relationship of uses to natural features and the landscape. It perhaps becomes most obvious when it is interrupted. The rural character of Kitsap County is the primary reason many residents decide to make their homes here. Defining this character is a necessary first step in deciding how to preserve it.

Kitsap County's rural lands are characterized by large parcels of undeveloped land and open space, scattered low-density, single-family homes, acres of pasture and forest land, small part-time farms, and limited low-intensity commercial uses. These areas are not generally supplied with, nor intended to be supplied with, urban level services; development is generally served by individual wells and septic tanks. Commercial development generally consists of scattered pockets of small-scale grocery/convenience stores, and limited light industrial, forestry, or mineral extraction activities. The County's rural areas also include extensive wetland areas and some of the region's most productive salmon streams.

The natural components of rural character encompass: stream corridors including flood plains, wetlands and habitat area; critical areas; visually important areas; rolling fields and meadows; occasional vistas of the Olympics or Puget Sound; steep slopes; shorelines, ridge lines and valley walls; and stands of trees as a backdrop to open fields and meadows. Human-related components of rural character provide more than just scenic or visual value; they are reminders of the pioneer heritage of Kitsap County. These include:

- X Two-lane roadways with densely wooded edges;
- X Homes hidden in the woods with driveways disappearing into the forest;
- X Agricultural lands;
- X Farm buildings and equipment (including original farmhouses);
- X Rural fences (split rail, or steel post with field fence wire or barbed wire);
- X Clusters of houses along beaches or shorelines; and
- X Dense single-family home developments in community clusters (such as Hansville Village, Driftwood Key, Lake Symington, or Parkwood Estates.)

It is a fundamental objective of the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan to maintain the character of designated rural areas. The challenge for the Comprehensive Plan is to weave together these various elements in a manner that complies with GMA and preserves the functions, appearance and lifestyle of the rural area.

II. LIMITED AREAS OF MORE INTENSIVE DEVELOPMENT

This section of the issue paper is intended to describe some existing rural areas in Kitsap County that are currently characterized by "more intensive development" either in terms of the types of land uses or density/intensity of activities. Areas of more intensive development may, for example, be developed at urban densities, possess urban services, and contain a mix of uses that are traditionally considered more urban than rural. Identification of these existing areas and agreement on their major characteristics is a first step in discussing where in Kitsap County it may be appropriate to recognize areas that are already developed in a pattern or for uses that are not "rural" as that term has been defined in GMA (prior to the amendments in ESB 6094). The hierarchy of rural places and the candidate areas described below reflect an initial attempt to identify these areas in Kitsap County. The examples provided are not intended to be definitive; additional locations or types of areas may be suggested in subsequent discussions, workshops and public hearings.

These characteristics of existing rural areas will also be used to help develop criteria for designating appropriate areas of more intensive development in the Comprehensive Plan, and to draft regulations, design guidelines and other appropriate

RURAL ISSUE PAPER APPENDIX

programs in the future to ensure that

the types and level of growth permitted is limited and contained consistent with the requirements of GMA. Geographical boundaries would also be defined for each area, again using the existing characteristics of these places.

TYPES OF EXISTING AREAS OF MORE INTENSIVE DEVELOPMENT

Existing areas in rural Kitsap County that may be considered to be characterized by urban patterns of development include the following:

Predominantly Residential Areas

These occur in different sizes and scales, with relatively small lots and a dense land-use pattern. These areas typically have a strong sense of identity and are commonly thought of as a distinct neighborhood or community. Some small-scale commercial and community services may be present. Most of these existing residential areas are located along the shores of Puget Sound or Hood Canal, surrounding lakes, or adjacent to ferry terminals. Many were originally platted as vacation or recreational subdivisions and, over time, developed into permanent residences and defined communities. Smaller residential/neighborhood areas may have community water systems and individual septic systems, while larger areas may be served by public or community water and/or water systems. Larger areas of this type may have a broader range of local commercial services, institutional facilities (schools, churches, meeting halls), and recreational services such as parks, boat launches and playgrounds.

Mixed-Use Areas

These unincorporated areas are characterized by a relatively broad mix of residential, commercial, community, recreational and often industrial activities. Land uses and densities are essentially urban in character and are typically served by public water and sewer. They are generally larger and more diverse than the predominantly residential areas described above. While these areas could also be considered for inclusion in Urban Growth Areas (based on existing densities and the presence of urban services), they are located some distance from the urbanized portion of the County and from existing development, and may have constraints to growth, eg., sewer facility limitations.

Commercial/Industrial Areas

These areas are dispersed throughout Kitsap County and include sites devoted to relative small-scale commercial or industrial uses. Examples include: crossroads commercial development (gas station, mini-mart or grocery store); neighborhood shopping centers; isolated commercial or industrial businesses; and small industrial parks. The uses are not typically "rural" in character (ie., supporting agriculture or other "traditional" rural activities), and may be served by public or on-site sewer and water.

For purposes of discussion, the areas described above may be categorized as follows:

- X Rural Neighborhood - small scale, predominately residential with limited services;
- X Rural Community - larger scale, predominately residential with some commercial and community services;
- X Rural Village - a mixed-use community with a broad mix of land use; and
- X Rural Commercial/Industrial - dispersed areas or small clusters of retail, commercial or industrial development, including isolated business activities in freestanding buildings or small industrial parks.

POTENTIAL CANDIDATE AREAS

Potential candidate areas meeting the categories of types of rural places are described below. The following descriptions are also

intended to suggest potential criteria for designation and for future development that is limited and contained.

Rural Neighborhood

Examples/Candidate Areas: Gamblewood, President Point Estates, Edgewater Estates, Lake Tahuya, and Lake Symington.

Gamblewood is located at the southern end of Port Gamble Bay at the road junction of Bond Road and SR-104. The community is a result of historical platting prior to zoning which resulted in a defined cluster of approximately 370 parcels with an average density of 3.5 units per acre. The majority of the lots are less than 10,000 s.f. in area. A convenience store/fuel station is located nearby.

President Point Estates is located along the Puget Sound shoreline in an isolated setting south of Kingston. The community is the result of a series of plats and land subdivisions created prior to zoning in Kitsap County, which resulted in a dense cluster of approximately 360 parcels with an average density of 1.5 units per acre. The majority of these lots are less than 10,000 s.f. in area. A number of the parcels are presently undeveloped, due to on-site septic constraints and a limited water supply. Recent upgrades to this area by P.U.D. No. 1 now provide water availability for additional development. The road network in this area is limited.

Edgewater Estates is located along the shores of Hood Canal just north of Poulsbo. The community is a rural PUD, which resulted in a dense cluster of 460 parcels with an average density of 3.3 units per acre.

Lake Tahuya is a dense area of shoreline development centered around a freshwater lake. The community results from many years of platting based on historic provisions. It contains a dense cluster of approximately 270 parcels with an average density of 2 units per acre.

Lake Symington is another dense area of shoreline development centered around a freshwater lake. The community contains approximately 540 parcels with an average density of 2.9 units per acre.

Rural Community

Examples/Candidate Areas: Indianola, Hansville, Driftwood Keys, Southworth, and Sunnyslope.

Indianola/Miller Bay Estates is characterized by a cluster of home sites averaging approximately 2.3 units per acre in Miller Bay Estates, to 3.5 units per acre in Indianola. Originally popular as a recreation destination, the area grew in response to its proximity to the "Mosquito Fleet" ferry system. The greater Indianola area is the location of approximately 700 homes with a population of approximately 2,000 residents. Located within the community center are a small grocery store, post office, club house, public dock, and private community beach. Residents desire to retain the community's unique identity without extensive commercial development. Public utilities include water; the area does not have a sewer system.

The approximate boundaries of what may be considered the Indianola community are the eastern shoreline of Miller Bay on the west; a line roughly equivalent to the tribal reservation line running from the head of Miller Bay to the 90 degree turn on South Kingston Road on the north; the tribal lands east of the church camp on the east, and the shoreline of Madison Bay on the south.

Hansville is located on the northern tip of the Kitsap Peninsula and is bounded by the waters of Puget Sound, Admiralty Inlet, and Hood Canal. The area is characterized by a cluster of single-family residences and a few vacation homes. There are approximately 213 parcels with an average density of 1.7 units per acre. The greater Hansville area includes a Post Office, general store, automotive repair shop, beauty salon, antique craft shop, recreational resorts, RV facilities, and two boat launching facilities. The area is serviced by Public Utilities District No. 1 with an 18-inch water main that

RURAL ISSUE PAPER APPENDIX

runs from Kingston to a reservoir. Hansville is bounded by Puget Sound to the north, and a ring of wetlands and uplands slopes to the south.

Driftwood Keys is a retirement community located on the northwestern tip of the Kitsap Peninsula. It extends along the shoreline of Hood Canal and has a view of the Olympic Mountain range. This community has approximately 1,051 parcels with an average density of 1.6 units per acre.

Southworth is located at the eastern terminus of Sedgwick Road on the shores of Puget Sound. The community is clustered around the Southworth Ferry Terminal which provides service to Seattle and Vashon Island. The community is predominantly single-family residential on lots created under previous three units per acre zoning. Public water is provided to the area by Manchester Water District. Manchester recently upgraded the water system to meet Department of Ecology requirements; however it has no sewer system.

Sunnyslope is located west of Port Orchard near the Bremerton Airport. The community is bordered by Sunnyslope Road to the west, SR-3 to the north, Victory Drive to the east, and a grouping of lots clustered around Old Clifton Road to the south. The area has approximately 370 parcels with an average density of 1.7 units per acre. It is currently serviced by Sunnyslope Water District; however it has no sewer system.

Rural Village

Examples/Candidate Areas: Manchester, McCormick Woods, Suquamish, Port Gamble, and Keyport.

Manchester is located along the shores of Puget Sound, affording residents views of the Seattle skyline. The community is delineated by boundaries of historical small lot subdivisions extending from the waterfront to the west, Mile Hill Drive to the south, and the Navy fuel depot along the north boundary. The community supports several small commercial establishments including a grocery store, post office, library, boat rental storage yard, contractor's yard, and restaurants. Most of the commercial activity is clustered along Colchester Drive and Main Street. Using the Manchester ULID boundary, the average density is approximately 2.8 units per acre with 2,370 predominantly developed lots. Manchester Water District has recently upgraded their system capabilities with a newly constructed water reservoir and water system plan. Sewer is provided by Kitsap County; it was recently upgraded but still has limited capacity.

McCormick Woods is a residential golf course community. The original Rural Planned Unit Development, approved in 1981, proposed 1,298 residential dwelling units. The PUD allows a mix of lot sizes and housing types and includes a small commercial center, golf course and clubhouse. The project is only partially constructed with approximately 425 residences and an average density of 3.25 units per acre. McCormick Woods is currently on public water provided by the City of Port Orchard.

McCormick Woods was initially approved to be served by a community drain field, which recently was converted to City of Port Orchard public sewer. The sewer extension was approved to include Campus Station to the north, and 620 acres of land to the west, known as Utility Local Improvement District (U.L.I.D.) No. 6. Campus Station was approved as a Rural Planned Unit Development for 440 dwelling units, with 32 acres allocated as a community campus site. Public sewer and water were approved to serve the development. No dwelling units have been constructed to date.

Suquamish is located east of the City of Poulsbo along the shores of Port Madison Bay and lies within the Suquamish Tribe reservation boundary. This area has both public water and sewer service. There are approximately 1,000 parcels, with an average density of 4 units per acre.

Port Gamble was established as a mill town in 1853 by Pope and Talbot. The community consists of a cluster of historical homes

owned by the mill, and includes a post office, general store/deli, fire station, cemetery, rail service, and marine facilities. An old sewer and public water system provides service to the community. The lumber mill, which until recently employed approximately 300 workers, is no longer in operation. It was closed in 1995 in response to ongoing operating losses; and was subsequently destroyed during the process of closing the plant. Currently, the mill site is being leased for log staging prior to shipping. The community is bounded by Gamble Bay on the east.

Keyport is located near the mouth of Dyes Inlet on the west. This village contains 186 parcels with an average density of 4.7 units per acre. Dominated by older, single-family housing on small, platted lots, Keyport also includes a Naval Base and Museum, a motel, a marina, post office, tavern, fire station, deli/general store, service station and auto repair shop. Public water and fire flow are provided by Public Utility District No. 1, and public sewer service is provided by Kitsap County. The community is defined by the naval base to the south, Dyes Inlet to the east, and Dogfish Bay to the north and west.

Rural Commercial/Industrial Areas

Commercial uses in the rural areas typically cater to the daily needs of the residents. These include uses such as small grocery or convenience stores, gas stations, open space recreational uses, nurseries, feed-and-seed operations, small rental operations, and other small commercial and light industrial uses. In smaller rural areas, commercial activities sometimes include tourist amenities, such as eating and drinking establishments and specialty shops.

The following areas are found inside of potential areas of more intensive rural development: Sunnyslope - .5 acres, Parkwood - .25 acres, Long Lake - .5 acres, Manchester - 2 acres, Keyport - .5 acres, Hansville - .5 acres, Indianola - .25 acres, and Suquamish - 10 acres. Other rural areas of existing commercial or industrial development outside the areas of more intensive development include: Dickey Road- 20 acres, Luoto Court - 1 acre, Pioneer Way - 48 acres, Streibles Corner (Bond Rd) - 14 acres, Lemolo - 30 acres, and Georges Corner - 22 acres.

Examples/Candidate Areas: Streibles Corner, Georges Corner, and Pioneer Way

Streibles Corner (14 acres) is located at the intersection of Bond Road and Highway 104 in North Kitsap. There is currently a gas station/convenience store, fire station, and an industrial park with several businesses.

Georges Corner (22 acres) is located at the intersection of Highway 104 and Hansville Highway. This area contains a gas station/convenience store and a regional Albertson's grocery store.

Pioneer Way (48 acres) is located north of Poulsbo and is adjacent to the Edgewater Estates neighborhood. Pioneer Way is primarily an industrial park with several businesses currently in operation. The area is surrounded by an active mining extraction operation.

Small, existing industrial uses/developments are also dispersed throughout rural portions of the county. In north Kitsap, for example, there are approximately 28 sites developed for industrial activities. These range in size from .5 acres to 20 acres. Uses include light manufacturing, construction, storage yards, and machinery rebuilding and repair.

III. POTENTIAL CRITERIA FOR AREAS OF MORE INTENSIVE DEVELOPMENT

The following potential criteria have been identified based on the characteristics of Kitsap County’s existing areas of more intensive development. The criteria would be used to help interested citizens, the Planning Commission, and elected officials identify, designate and regulate areas selected rural consistent with GMA. These criteria are preliminary and for purposes of discussion.

Table 1 - Potential Criteria

	Rural Neighborhood	Rural Community	Rural Village	Commercial & Industrial Areas
Sense of Place	Strong sense of neighborhood; seen as a distinct “place”	Strong sense of community; seen as a distinct “place”	Strong sense of community; seen as a distinct “place”	Clearly defined boundaries; seen as a distinct “place”
Land uses	Predominantly residential Limited commercial services	Predominantly residential Some commercial and community uses	Mix of residential, commercial, industrial, community and/or recreational uses	Freestanding or small cluster of retail, heavy commercial, industrial use, or industrial park
Average #DU’s/Density	212.5/1.65	375/1.61	602.2/2.9	N/A
Services & Facilities	On-site or community water	On-site	Public sewer and water	On-site or public sewer and water
Average Area	142 acres	238 acres	432.6 acres	1.875/22.5 acres*
Implementation Issues	Design standards Conflicts with adjacent rural areas	Design standards Conflicts with adjacent rural areas	Design standards Conflicts with adjacent rural areas	Design standards Conflicts with adjacent rural areas

*The 1.875 figure represents commercial areas inside proposed rural areas of more intensive development. The 22.5 acres represents existing commercial/industrial areas outside proposed rural areas of more intensive development.

COMPACT RURAL AREAS AS IDENTIFIED ON THE MAP

Rural Neighborhood

4. Gamblewood
5. Edgewater Estates
8. President Point Estates
11. Lake Symington
12. Lake Tahuya
16. South Sunnyslope
18. Glanwood Station
19. Fairview Lake
20. Bear Lake

21. Wye Lake
22. Parkview
23. Horizon Hills
24. Strawberry Park
25. North Long Lake
26. Clover Valley
27. South East Long Lake
28. Long Lake View Estates
31. Peacock Hill
32. Crescent Valley
33. Misery Point
34. Wildcat Lake
35. Tiger Lake
36. Mission Lake

Rural Community

1. Hansville
2. Driftwood Keys
6. Miller Bay Estates
7. Indianola
14. Rocky Point
15. Sunnyslope
30. Southworth

Rural Village

3. Port Gamble
9. Suquamish
10. Keyport
17. McCormick Woods
29. Manchester