



Introduction to the Board of Commissioners Public Comment Response Matrix:

This Comment Response Matrix includes a summary of public comments received during the Kitsap County Board of Commissioners comment period of January 24, 2022 – February 14, 2022 and extended to February 21, 2022 by the Board of Commissioners on February 14, 2022. The comments are organized by commenter, summary of comment, and Department response. The first column is the number of the comment and the second indicates the name and organization, if applicable, of the commenter. The Summary of Comment column includes a summary of each public comment. The Department Response column indicates whether a change to the proposed code amendment is recommended and associated rationale. The full written comment letters were transmitted to the Board of Commissioners on February 23, 2022 in advance of the March 9, 2022 deliberations meeting and are available on the Zoning Use Table Update website.

Ref #	Name (Org)	Summary of Comment	Staff Response
1	Ron Gillespie	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Definitions of attached and detached dwellings are the same Wetland mitigation bank definition should have “created” removed Concerned about accuracy of population projections and development for development’s sake Infrastructure not up to capacity Document is difficult to read 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>The definitions of attached and detached dwellings are repealed by the ordinance, and the definitions of attached and detached accessory dwelling units are different.</p> <p>The definition of wetland mitigation bank is the same one used by the Department of Ecology.</p> <p>Population projections are calculated by the State Office of Financial Management and the County is required to select a population within OFM’s range. This will occur during the next Countywide Planning Policy Update and Comprehensive Plan Update kicking off soon and is not a consideration for the Zoning Use Table update. We encourage you to get involved.</p>
2	Morgan Johnson, Silverdale Water District	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public facilities definition should include recycled water systems 	<p><u>The Department recommends changing the proposal as suggested.</u></p> <p>Department Proposed Revision Revise definition 17.110.640 Public facilities. “Public facilities” means streets, roads, highways, sidewalks, street and road lighting systems, traffic signals, domestic water systems, <u>recycled water systems</u>, <u>stormwater infrastructure</u>, and sanitary sewer systems, <u>pump houses</u>, waste handling facilities designated as public facilities in the comprehensive solid waste management plan, parks and recreational facilities, schools, public works storage facilities and road sheds, and utilities</p>

			such as power, <u>fiberoptic</u> , gas, phone, and cable television. <u>This does not include wireless communication facilities as defined in Title 17.</u>
3	Carol Malmquist	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transitory accommodations should be a conditional use 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>The Zoning Use Table update is not proposing to change any of the standards or permissibility for transitory accommodations found in KCC 17.505. Since 2017 when that chapter was adopted, the level of review has been the same for each type of transitory accommodation regardless of where in the county it is located and they have been allowed throughout unincorporated Kitsap County. The purpose of the Zoning Use Table update is to show in the table what is already in effect through chapter 17.505. If you would like to submit a code update idea for future consideration, please go to https://www.kitsapgov.com/dcd/Pages/Code_Updates_Main.aspx and click on Submit a Code Update Idea. Additionally, nothing in Kitsap County Code, including chapter 17.505, or the Zoning Use Table update requires property owners to allow transitory accommodations on their property, nor does it restrict owners from pursuing legal options for removing trespassers.</p>
4	Anne Presson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transitory accommodations in Manchester Transitory accommodations should be near services Concerns about oversight, trash, crime, behavior standards, liability regarding transitory accommodations Concerns about noticing for transitory accommodations Concerns about density impacts of transitory accommodations Transitory accommodations should be a conditional use 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
5	Mary Williams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transitory accommodations in Manchester need a conditional use permit Transitory accommodations should be near services, need to have oversight 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
6	Lauri Campbell	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transitory accommodations in Manchester need a conditional use permit 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
7	Susan Shaw	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Review of requirements in transitory accommodation 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p>

		<p>chapter</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> States that transitory accommodations were not part of Manchester zoning until the ZUT update Transitory accommodations in Manchester need a conditional use permit 	See Response 3.
8	Susan McNary	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns with transitory accommodations and services, garbage collection, rules enforcement Focus on families trying to find affordable rentals 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
9	Gloria Edwards	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes to zoning designation for Mountain View Meadows limiting development 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>The Zoning Use Table update does not change any zoning designations or any of the standards in KCC 17.420 Density, Dimensions, and Design. This update only changes and addresses the uses allowed in each zone.</p>
10	Sheila Spiker	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transitory accommodations in Manchester need a conditional use permit 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
11	Judi Montfort Holley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transitory accommodations in Manchester need a conditional use permit 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
12	Shirlie Dike	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transitory accommodations in Manchester Transitory accommodations should be near services Concerns about oversight, trash, crime, behavior standards, liability regarding transitory accommodations Concerns about noticing for transitory accommodations Concerns about density impacts of transitory accommodations Transitory accommodations should be a conditional use 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
13	Annette Holmstrom	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transitory accommodations in Manchester need a conditional use permit 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
14	Laura Warner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transitory accommodations in Manchester Transitory accommodations should be near services Concerns about oversight, trash, crime, behavior 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>

		<p>standards, liability regarding transitory accommodations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerns about noticing for transitory accommodations • Concerns about density impacts of transitory accommodations • Transitory accommodations should be a conditional use 	
15	Frank Tweten	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wants to start implementation • Wants residential density in the MVC zone 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>The proposed ordinance has a 90-day effective date from the time of adoption. Single-family detached units are proposed as an allowed use.</p>
16	Healani Jacobs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitory accommodations in Manchester need a conditional use permit 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
17	Anonymous	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitory accommodations in Manchester • Transitory accommodations should be near services • Concerns about oversight, trash, crime, behavior standards, liability regarding transitory accommodations • Concerns about noticing for transitory accommodations • Concerns about density impacts of transitory accommodations • Transitory accommodations should be a conditional use 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
18	Sue Adams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitory accommodations in Manchester need a conditional use permit 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
19	Sarah Benjamin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitory accommodations all should have conditional use permits 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
20	Denise Burbidge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitory accommodations should all have a conditional use permit • Transitory accommodations should be located near services, no services in Manchester 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No guideline for enforcement for temporary occupants without permit, sewage issues, dumping issues • County has no honored Manchester community plan 	
21	Kimberly Kilpatrick	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitory accommodations in Manchester • Transitory accommodations should be near services • Concerns about oversight, trash, crime, behavior standards, liability regarding transitory accommodations • Concerns about noticing for transitory accommodations • Concerns about density impacts of transitory accommodations • Transitory accommodations should be a conditional use 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
22	Judi Holley	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitory accommodations all should have conditional use permits 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
23	Hannah Keim	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitory accommodations in Manchester • Transitory accommodations should be near services • Concerns about oversight, trash, crime, behavior standards, liability regarding transitory accommodations • Concerns about noticing for transitory accommodations • Concerns about density impacts of transitory accommodations • Transitory accommodations should be a conditional use 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
24	Scott Power	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not want homeless encampment on his property, crime, trash issues 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>Nothing in Kitsap County Code, including chapter 17.505, or the Zoning Use Table update requires property owners to allow transitory accommodations on their property, nor does it restrict owners from pursuing all available legal options for removing those who are not welcome on their property.</p>

25	Terence Simons	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitory accommodations in Manchester • Leaseholder is the “controller” of the property and can invite additional people onto the property – happened to him, septic system was overwhelmed, expensive cleanup costs • Transitory accommodations should be conditional use permits 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>Under KCC 21.04.160(B), all applications are required to have permission from the property owner. See also Response 3.</p>
26	Patricia Norwood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitory accommodations in Manchester • Transitory accommodations should be near services • Concerns about oversight, trash, crime, behavior standards, liability regarding transitory accommodations • Concerns about noticing for transitory accommodations • Concerns about density impacts of transitory accommodations • Transitory accommodations should be a conditional use 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
27	Karlie Gaskins	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitory accommodations in Manchester need a conditional use permit 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
28	Danel Ann Heimer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitory accommodations in Manchester • Transitory accommodations should be near services • Concerns about oversight, trash, crime, behavior standards, liability regarding transitory accommodations • Concerns about noticing for transitory accommodations • Concerns about density impacts of transitory accommodations • Transitory accommodations should be a conditional use 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
29	Cody Martin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concerned about crime and homelessness • Doesn't want a homeless shelter near residential homes or elementary schools 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>

30	Dave Kimble	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitory accommodations in Manchester • Transitory accommodations not a fix to homelessness • Crime, sanitary, environmental concerns 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
31	J. and Janelle Overton	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wants only 1 ADU or 1 guest house per parcel in Manchester • Wants single family detached to not be allowed in MVC zone • Wants home based day-care to be a conditional use permit in Manchester • Wants transitory accommodations in Manchester to be a conditional use permit 	<p><u>The Department recommends changing the proposal</u> regarding ADUs and Guest Houses.</p> <p>Department proposed revision: 17.415.260 Guest house G. No guest house is allowed on a parcel with an existing accessory dwelling unit, detached;</p> <p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> regarding single family detached in the MVC zone because LAMIRDs are to reconcile historic development patterns and the MVC has existing single family detached homes.</p> <p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> regarding home based day-cares as per RCW 36.70A.450 they may not be more restrictive than single family homes in the same zone.</p> <p>See Response 3 regarding transitory accommodations.</p>
32	Tonya Rothe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitory accommodations in Manchester should be a conditional use 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
33	L Thomas	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitory accommodations should all have a conditional use permit • Transitory accommodations should be located near services, no services in Manchester • No guideline for enforcement for temporary occupants without permit, sewage issues, dumping issues 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
34	Jon Rothe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitory accommodations should all have a conditional use permit • Transitory accommodations should be located near services, no services in Manchester • No guideline for enforcement for temporary 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>

		occupants without permit, sewage issues, dumping issues	
35	Jess Chandler	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarifying questions about Urban Low and Cluster Residential and how/where commercial development is allowed in those zones • Clarifying question about dates on page 153-154 of ordinance document being different from rest of dates • Clarifying question on lot size requirements for standards for duplexes vs single family homes on page 165 • Doesn't think Silverdale Design Standards are being implemented • Doesn't see mixed use being promoted in the ordinance • Concerned about amount of development that is/has been happening in Rural Residential zone, other rural zones • Concerned about minimal amounts of housing in the core of Silverdale – wants more mixed use and multi-family to help reduce vehicle trips • Wants more affordable housing via incentives or requirements, and near services/workplaces 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>Commercial development appropriate for the Urban Low and Cluster Residential Zones is only allowed at the intersection of two roads, classified as either both arterials, or one is an arterial and the other is a collector. The driveway for the establishment would not count as an intersection.</p> <p>Different dates are likely a problem with the footer, the new Appendix F hasn't had any changes made to it.</p> <p>Page 165 is part of the new Appendix F which memorializes the code at the time that the Port Gamble Development Agreement was adopted and is only applicable to the zones in Port Gamble (Rural Historic LAMIRD)</p> <p>Nothing is changing about the Silverdale Design Standards in the Zoning Use Table update.</p> <p>Mixed Use was eliminated as a use category, but mixed use as a concept that includes residential and commercial projects on the same site or in the same building are still allowed, so long as commercial and residential uses are allowed in the zone.</p> <p>There were no changes to the Rural Residential zones in the Zone Use Table update.</p> <p>The Zoning Use Table update helps make it easier to build mixed use and multi-family projects by reducing permit review levels where appropriate and clarifying requirements.</p>
36	Carrie OHora	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two zoning tables for Rural Residential with conflicting information • Uses in the first table eliminate the condition that property must be served by county right of way – this condition should be kept to prevent conflict with easement holders • One year for a variance to correct a noncompliant 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended</u> regarding the two tables. The first table (pg. 45) is the proposed table that will apply throughout the county. The second table (pg. 154) is an Appendix that applies only to property that is part of the Port Gamble Development Agreement that is zoned Rural Residential or Rural Wooded.</p>

- ADU is too long, should limit to 90 days
- Adult Family Home and Group Living should have requirement that they cannot accept patients with violent criminal offences without stricter security requirements for the facility

The Department recommends changing the proposal regarding county right of way.

Department proposed revisions:

17.290.030 Special provisions (for the Rural Commercial zone)

~~(Reserved.)~~ A. All uses shall access directly to a county right of way determined to be adequate by the county engineer and be able to provide access without causing traffic congestion on local residential streets.

17.330.030 Special provisions (for the Rural Industrial zone)

C. All uses shall access directly to a county right of way determined to be adequate by the county engineer and be able to provide access without causing traffic congestion on local residential streets.

17.415.090 Campground

Campgrounds shall access directly to a county right of way determined to be adequate by the county engineer and be able to provide access without causing traffic congestion on local residential streets, be recreational and transient in nature, and shall not allow: ...

17.415.115 Club.

In Rural Protection (RP), Rural Residential (RR), or Parks (P) zones, all buildings and activities shall be set back a minimum of fifty feet and thirty-five feet in all other zones from a side or rear lot line. In the RR, RP, UR, GB, C, RC, LIC, UVC, NC, RCO, BC, IND, P, and all LAMIRD zones, All such uses shall access directly to a county right-of-way determined to be adequate by the county engineer and be able to provide access without causing traffic congestion on local residential streets. Any such use shall not be materially detrimental to any adjacent (existing or future) residential development due to excessive traffic generation, noise, light or other circumstances. The director may increase setback, buffer and landscaping standards or impose other conditions to address potential impacts.

17.415.130 Contractor's storage yard.

B. In the Rural Protection (RP); and Rural Residential (RR); ~~or Parks (P)~~ zones, all buildings and activities shall be set back a minimum of fifty feet and

thirty-five feet in all other zones from a side or rear lot line. All such uses shall access directly to a county right-of-way determined to be adequate by the county engineer and be able to provide access without causing traffic congestion on local residential streets. Any such use shall not be materially detrimental to any adjacent (existing or future) residential development due to excessive traffic generation, noise, light or other circumstances. The director may increase setback, buffer and landscaping standards or impose other conditions to address potential impacts.

17.415.295 Kennels or pet day-cares.

B. In ~~Rural Wooded (RW)~~, Rural Protection (RP), or Rural Residential (RR), all buildings and activities shall be set back a minimum of fifty feet and thirty-five feet in all other zones from a side or rear lot line. All such uses shall access directly to a county right-of-way determined to be adequate by the county engineer and be able to provide access without causing traffic congestion on local residential streets. Any such use shall not be materially detrimental to any adjacent (existing or future) residential development due to excessive traffic generation, noise, light or other circumstances. The director may increase setback, buffer and landscaping standards or impose other conditions to address potential impacts.

17.415.395 Places of worship.

In the Rural Protection (RP) or Rural Residential (RR) zones, all buildings and activities shall be set back a minimum of fifty feet and thirty-five feet in all other zones from a side or rear lot line. In all zones, All-such uses shall access directly to a county right-of-way determined to be adequate by the county engineer and be able to provide access without causing traffic congestion on local residential streets. Any such use shall not be materially detrimental to any adjacent (existing or future) residential development due to excessive traffic generation, noise, light or other circumstances. The director may increase setback, buffer and landscaping standards or impose other conditions to address potential impacts.

17.415.410 Recreational facilities, indoor.

Use prohibited within the portion of the Gorst urban growth area between the Sinclair Inlet shoreline and State Highways 3 and 16. In the RR and RP zones, use shall access directly to a county right of way determined to be

			<p><u>adequate by the county engineer and be able to provide access without causing traffic congestion on local residential streets.</u></p> <p>17.415.415 Recreational facilities, outdoor. Use prohibited within the portion of the Gorst urban growth area between the Sinclair Inlet shoreline and State Highways 3 and 16. <u>In the RR and RP zones, use shall access directly to a county right of way determined to be adequate by the county engineer and be able to provide access without causing traffic congestion on local residential streets.</u></p> <p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended</u> regarding noncompliant ADUs or adult family homes. A year is an appropriate amount of time to remedy a noncompliant ADU. Submitting an application for approval involves multiple pieces that could take more time than expected. By state law, the County cannot treat adult family homes differently than other residential properties (RCW 36.70.990).</p>
37	Lyle Burbidge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change transitory accommodation in Manchester to conditional use • Kitsap County went further than the RCW requires with the transitory accommodation ordinance, and it should be limited to only religious organizations the way the RCW is, otherwise it affects private property owners negatively • Manchester is a bad location for transitory accommodations because of no services or transit 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
38	Susan Shaw	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Kitsap County went further than the RCW requires with the transitory accommodation ordinance • Change transitory accommodation in Manchester to conditional use • Remove Permanent Transitory Accommodations entirely from Manchester 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Responses 3 and 25.</p>
39	Fred Hubbard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wants public outreach to inform majority of property owners, in an easy to read way • Permanent transitory accommodations should be a conditional use • Single family transitory accommodations and small, 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>Kitsap County has a robust public outreach plan (available on the Zoning Use Table update webpage) and has been reaching out to the community since summer of 2019 when the Zoning Use Table project was in the early stages.</p>

		large, safe park, and indoor transitory accommodations should be removed	<p>State law recognizes that individual mailings are impracticable and often infeasible; nevertheless, we maintain an updated webpage and a very large subscriber list where information about this update is regularly issued. Please subscribe to the notifications for more information.</p> <p>See Response 3 regarding transitory accommodations.</p>
40	Julene Nikolac	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitory accommodations should be near services • Concerns about oversight, trash, crime, behavior standards, liability regarding transitory accommodations • Concerns about noticing for transitory accommodations • Concerns about density impacts of transitory accommodations • Transitory accommodations should be a conditional use 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
41	Alson Williams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitory accommodations should be near services • Concerns about oversight, trash, crime, behavior standards, liability regarding transitory accommodations • Concerns about noticing for transitory accommodations • Concerns about density impacts of transitory accommodations • Transitory accommodations should be a conditional use 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
42	Sande Fernan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitory accommodations should be near services • Concerns about oversight, trash, crime, behavior standards, liability regarding transitory accommodations • Concerns about noticing for transitory accommodations • Concerns about density impacts of transitory accommodations • Transitory accommodations should be a conditional use 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>

43	Allan Williams	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitory accommodations should be near services • Concerned about safety and crim at transitory accommodations • Transitory accommodations should be a conditional use 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
44	Wendy Stephens	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitory accommodations should be near services • Concerns about oversight, trash, crime, behavior standards, liability regarding transitory accommodations • Concerns about noticing for transitory accommodations • Concerns about density impacts of transitory accommodations • Transitory accommodations should be a conditional use 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
45	Nicholas Bond, City of Port Orchard	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Manufactured/mobile/RV/park-model/tiny home park is incompatible with rural areas, would create density levels inconsistent with rural areas • Manufactured/mobile/RV/park-model/tiny home park should remove “RVs” from the title of the use and definition as state law doesn’t allow for RVs to be used for permanent housing – suggests change to “Manufactured Home, Mobile Home, Tiny House, Tiny House with Wheels, Park-Model and Travel Trailer Park” • Suggests the county should be adopting the requirements of ESSHB 1220 regarding permanent supportive housing, transitional housing, and emergency housing and shelter and that those requirements should be paired with the Manufactured/mobile/RV/park-model/tiny home park use • Use standards for Manufactured/mobile/RV/park-model/tiny home park need to be consistent with underlying zoning – revise use standards to clarify that the conditions are supplemental to other code 	<p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> regarding Manufactured/mobile/RV/park-model/tiny home parks in the rural zones. All residential uses in the rural area must comply with the density requirements of chapter 17.420 so incompatibility for density should not be an issue. Additionally, state law prohibits the treatment of manufactured and mobile homes differently than other homes.</p> <p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> regarding the title and definition of the use Manufactured/mobile/RV/park-model/tiny home parks. RCW 36.01.225(3) prevents us from removing RVs as a potential house in these “parks.” RCW 36.01.227(3) states in full, “A county may not adopt an ordinance that has the effect, directly or indirectly, of preventing the entry or requiring the removal of a recreational vehicle used as a primary residence in manufactured/mobile home communities, as defined in RCW 59.20.030, unless the recreational vehicle fails to comply with the fire, safety, or other local ordinances or state laws related to recreational vehicles.”</p> <p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> regarding the county adopting the requirements of ESSHB 1220. Many of the requirements under HB 1220 are directed toward actions during the next comprehensive plan update, and the County intends to address HB 1220 during that process.</p>

		<p>requirements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Campground use should limit number of stays per year and length of stays, operators should be required to keep compliance records 	<p>The other requirements are directed to cities and the County declines to undertake that effort at this time, but will review the issue comprehensively during the next Comprehensive Plan update.</p> <p><u>The Department recommends no change to the proposal</u> regarding the standards for Manufactured/mobile/RV/park-model/tiny home parks. Proposed KCC 17.415.005 already requires this use (and all uses) to comply with all applicable requirements in Kitsap County Code.</p> <p><u>The Department recommends changing the proposal</u> regarding campgrounds.</p> <p>Department proposed revision: 17.415.090 Campground. Campgrounds shall be recreational and transient and shall not allow: A. Camping for more than thirty days within a forty-day time period, <u>and for not more than two (2) thirty-day camping stays in 365 days</u>. Campers must vacate the overnight park facilities for ten consecutive nights between allowed stays. The time period shall begin on the date for which the first night's fee is paid. The campground operator shall keep a log of all members of the camping party and ensure that the allowed number of days stay is not exceeded. Kitsap County may request to view the log to confirm that the campground is recreational and transient. B. The designation of the campground as a permanent or temporary address on official documents or applications submitted to public or private agencies or institutions. <u>C. The Director or Hearing Examiner may assign additional conditions in order to ensure the campground does not impact neighboring properties and to ensure the project meets the intent of recreational use.</u></p>
<p>46</p>	<p>Carrilu Thompson</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ordinance needs additional time to be vetted by the community • Public meetings did not go through the proposal line by line • Transitory accommodation code when written in 2018 was not presented to Manchester residents/no community input • Transitory accommodations will add more density 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>The Zoning Use Table has been through a long public process, as the update began in 2019, and County staff have met with multiple stakeholder groups and citizen advisory committees to explain the updates. The Q&A format was used in order to make the best and most respectful use of participant's time possible as going through line by line would take multiple hours.</p>

		<p>than what is allowed in Manchester zones</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Should not allow both ADUs and Guest Houses on the same parcel, only one 	See Response 3 regarding transitory accommodations. See Response 31 regarding Guest Houses and ADUs.
47	Travis Nation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitory accommodations in Manchester should be a conditional use • Kitsap County went further than the RCW requires with the transitory accommodation ordinance • Transitory accommodations should be near services 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
48	Gary Washington	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Doesn't want transitory accommodations in Manchester, should put them on Bainbridge Island 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
49	Paul Drotz	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requests Manchester's concerns be heard 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>The County takes citizen input very seriously and is very appreciative of the time and effort of the Manchester Citizens Advisory Committee.</p>
50	Jan Fuller	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitory accommodations in Manchester should be a conditional use 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
51	Bobbie Davis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 50% of a month for event facility operations in rural areas is too much • Concerned about noise from event facilities, impact of commercial neighbor on property value 	<p><u>The Department recommends changing the proposal</u> regarding event facilities.</p> <p>Department proposed revision: 17.415.195 Event facility In Rural Residential and Rural Protection zones, an event facility shall comply with the following standards:</p> <p>A. Number of event participants. An event participant includes, but is not limited to, participants, attendees, guests, officials, on-site staff, vendors, and other service providers involved in the set-up, operation, and take-down of an event. The event facility shall limit the number of event participants to:</p> <p>1. 200 persons per outdoor event. For open events such as fairs, markets or bazaars, participant volume shall be limited to 200 persons maximum on-site at any one time. The Director or Hearing Examiner may increase or decrease the number of persons to reduce the potential impact to neighbors. Considerations shall include site size, access and parking, hours of operation,</p>

			<p>proximity to neighbors and screening, noise, or other site-specific circumstances.</p> <p>2. Maximum building occupancy for indoor only events. Maximum building occupancy is established through a building occupancy permit with the Department of Community Development.</p> <p>B. Number and frequency of events. <u>The event facility shall:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <u>There shall be no more than Not exceed</u> one event per day; each day shall be considered its own event, regardless if the event occurs over multiple days. 2. <u>Leave ten consecutive A minimum of 14 consecutive</u> days of each month <u>shall be</u> free of events, which must begin with the same Friday each month (e.g., first Friday). <u>In no case shall the number of event days exceed 50% of the calendar month.</u> The applicant must submit the preferred schedule as part of the permit application. 3. <u>The event facility shall provide the event calendar to the owners of parcels at a distance to be determined by the hearing examiner at the beginning of each month. Notice shall include the contact information for the event manager who is available at all times during events.</u> 4. The director or hearing examiner may increase or decrease the number and frequency of events to reduce the potential impact to neighbors. <p>C. Hours of operation. The event facility shall limit all event activities to occur between the hours of operation specified below. All noise, music, amplified sound, and sound-related equipment shall be turned off or stop at the end time specified. Any alcohol sales <u>shall be regulated in accordance with state and local law and</u> shall cease half an hour before the end time. All participants shall be off the property no later than half an hour after the last time specified. The director or hearing examiner may increase or decrease the hours of operation allowed per outdoor event based on site size or conditions implemented to reduce the potential impact to neighbors. Event facility hours of operation: Monday through Saturday: 8:00 am to 8:30 pm Sunday: 8:00 am to 8:00 pm</p> <p>D. Access, parking, and traffic. The event facility shall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. access directly from a Kitsap County maintained right-of-way. 2. provide and implement a parking plan for the site. This plan must:
--	--	--	---

			<p>a. detail the types of events to occur and recommend minimum and maximum parking areas for the facility.</p> <p>b. require striping of unmarked parking areas prior to each scheduled event. Temporary striping is acceptable.</p> <p>c. clearly prohibit parking on any public rights-of-way.</p> <p>3. provide and implement a traffic management plan. This plan must include:</p> <p>a. an application for Concurrency Test as required by Chapter 20.04.030, Transportation Concurrency, of the Kitsap County Code.</p> <p>b. the road approach between the edge of existing pavement and the right-of-way line at all intersections with county rights-of-way. Approaches shall be designed in accordance with the Kitsap County Road Standards as established in Title 11 of Kitsap County Code.</p> <p>E. Landscaping and fencing. The event facility shall include a site obscuring fence, wall or landscape buffer as defined in 17.500.027(B)(1):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. around the perimeter of the entire parcel; or 2. around the proposed use area that accommodates outdoor events. 3. a facility may use supplemental plantings within an existing vegetation to accomplish a landscape buffer. Irrigation must be provided meeting the standards set forth in County codes. 4. Landscaping shall be installed and maintained in conformance with the requirements of chapter 17.500. Landscaping shall be installed and inspected prior to requesting a final inspection or guaranteed by means of an assignment of funds or bonded in the amount of 150 percent of the cost of installation. <p>F. For certain event activities, such as those using amplified sound, a noise analysis may be required consistent with Chapter 18.04 KCC. If required, the applicant will prepare a noise level assessment, which may result in noise mitigation or attenuation requirements consistent with Chapter 10.28 KCC. <u>Noise mitigation or attenuation must be installed prior to use of amplified systems.</u></p>
<p>52</p>	<p>Chad Davis</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wants no less than 14 consecutive days free of events each month for event facilities • Wants a noise level assessment if any amplified sound is used at event facilities 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments.</u></p> <p>See Response 51.</p>

53	Nick Chamberlin	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Wants event facilities to be required to clean the public roadway on a regular basis, has experienced much more trash along road after events in neighborhood 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments.</u></p> <p>All applications are required to comply with the Kitsap County Solid Waste Plan (KCC 17.100.020) and are required to provide for proper garbage disposal.</p>
54	Travis McElfresh	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerned about frequency and noise of event facilities Wants notification for event facility permits to extend at least 2 parcels away, not just adjacent Requirement that the event manager not just have contact info available but that they respond within 5 minutes End time of events needs to be enforced/incentivized Concern about noise mitigation enforcement 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments.</u></p> <p>See Response 51.</p>
55	Terry Gombos	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Limit event facilities to 100 participants Wants no fewer than 14 days free of events Concern about the increase of danger to community during periods of fire danger with increased numbers of people due to event facilities 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments.</u></p> <p>See Response 51. Number of participants maybe change during the review process based on potential impacts (see 17.415.195(A)(1)). Additionally, as proposed, access is required to be directly off a County maintained right of way.</p>
56	Lindsay Lewis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports proposed changes to event facility language 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments.</u></p>
57	Paul Roller	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports proposed changes to event facility language Would like to add requirement for event facilities that use private roads to gain approval from majority of residents sharing road 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments.</u></p> <p>See Responses 51 and 55.</p>
58	Steve and Sarah Dibert	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 200 participants for event facilities is too many Concern with noise and traffic from event facilities Agrees that landscaping barriers and sound mitigation be required 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments.</u></p> <p>See Responses 51 and 55.</p>
59	Lisa Roller	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would prefer no amplified sound be allowed for event facilities Wants notification about each event hosted by event facility Doesn't think event facilities belong in rural or residential neighborhoods at all 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments.</u></p> <p>See Responses 51 and 55.</p>

60	Bill Palmer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Objects to the entire use table update • Have been as consistent in participating through the process as they could be • Disappointed in staff’s failure to respond to the 16 questions in their public comment letters to the Planning Commission • Wants opportunity to review answers to questions before the board takes action • Object to postulation that an ordinance like this has no financial impact • Objects to regulation creep from ordinances and comp plan in last 2 years • Process is very frustrating, spent a lot of time on comments • Ordinance not ready for prime time, should go back through a vetting process 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>Staff did respond to previous comment letters, and the responses were available in packets for Planning Commission.</p> <p>The Board may choose to grant additional public input/testimony during their deliberation process or have staff spend more time on this project, but that is at their discretion. All responses to comments will be available in the packets for the Boards deliberation meetings as well as on the Zoning Use Table project website for public viewing.</p> <p>Objection regarding financial impact noted. The fiscal impact statement line on the Agenda Summary for Board meetings is specifically for defined County expenditures or revenue.</p>
61	Kathy Cocus, KEDA	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Thankful for including new uses related to tourism and entrepreneurship • Would like “assembly and packaging” use to continue to be allowed in C and RC zones as conditional use – could be a good way to use vacant office space resulting from shift to remote work, plus industrially zoned property is limited 	<p><u>The Department recommends changing the proposal</u> regarding manufacturing and fabrication, light.</p> <p>Department proposed revision: Use 526, “Manufacturing and fabrication, light” be changed from – (prohibited) in the C and RC zones to <u>C</u>.</p>
62	William Palmer, KAPO	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the proposed ordinance • Disappointed by how staff summarized comments • Disagree with and object to recommendation of Planning Commission • Staff/Planning Commission did not answer any of the questions posed in letters to Planning Commission • Want the Board to have the opportunity to read the full text of KAPO’s analysis • Requests that the Board either directly answer questions in detail or direct staff to before taking action toward approval • Overburden of regulatory measures leads to paralysis and lack of staff in DCD to process permits 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>Staff summarized all comments submitted during both public comment periods for ease of providing responses. However, all original comments, in their entirety, were submitted to both the Planning Commission and the Board. Comment responses are easiest to make with a summary but are certainly intended to be viewed together with the full comments.</p> <p>The length of the Ordinance is not intended to overburden with regulation but to reorganize for ease of use in response to many comments over the years, with clarification for and combination of existing uses and currently applied for uses that were not identified. Additionally, many uses will have their level of review or “regulation” moved to a lower level, which is intended to help both</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 3 ordinance reviews in the last 1.5 years have been used to add more regulations • No metric discussed to how the code streamlines review, no discussion of how new regulatory measures will help comply with existing code, zoning code is too long, no documentation to how ordinance will promote housing diversity, affordable housing, or economic development • KAPO be given opportunity to review answers to questions posed in comment letters and respond to those answers before Board takes action • Staff aren't qualified to assess how regulations affect citizens • Ordinances should be vetted with professionals in the community, has happened in past did not happen with this update • Of course there is a financial impact with the new regulations <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Document organization is confusing, hard to track changes • The scope was expanded beyond what was originally conveyed to the public to update the use tables • There is no way to effectively review all of the proposed changes in a summary, extensive review is required • Which definition is DCD staff using to pair "equity" with diversity? How is "Diversity" defined? • How are equity and diversity measured? How can one determine if there is a "wide array of housing product types" that are also "just, impartial or fair?" • Housing in Kitsap is much more expensive than in small town Montana • The project goals/objectives should include protecting the basic right of individuals to own and use their property. 	<p>staff and applicants with speed of review. Increasing the types of housing forms and lowering the level of review for housing forms also helps make it easier to build more housing, helping to lower the cost of new housing and existing housing stock.</p> <p>See also Response 60.</p> <hr/> <p>Unfortunately, there is no simple way to convey all the 193 pages of information in the current ordinance given how ordinances must be formatted with strikethroughs and section headings. This is especially true with the footnote relocation and the new Appendix F. The current version of the ordinance that the Board is taking action on has been available on the project site since December 2021, and staff have been available to help those members of the public who asked for assistance in understanding the ordinance with both one-on-one calls and virtual open houses. Staff also prepared Resource Guides to help understand the review. While it may not have functioned as well as intended, there was a great effort to making this undertaking easier to understand.</p> <p>The project scope has not changed since it was first brought before the Planning Commission in May 2019, where it was described as: updates to the zoning use table to modernize, streamline, and correct discrepancies for UGAs, LAMIRDs, and rural commercial and industrial zones; revisions to level of permit review to remove barriers and foster desired development outcomes consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; reorganization of the footnotes to reduce surprises and clarify development standards; updates to ancillary related sections of code (for example definitions) to ensure consistency and predictability; and NOT including updates to site design or development standards.</p> <p>Puget Sound Regional Council's Vision 2050 defines equity as "All people can attain the resources and opportunities that improve their quality of life and enable them to reach full potential. Those affected by poverty, communities of color, and historically marginalized communities are engaged in decision making processes, planning, and policy making." Diversity may also be used to mean "variety". A diversity of housing types helps achieve equitable</p>
--	--	--	--

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Two sub-objectives do not translate into achieving the goal of promoting economic development: 1) Scaling land uses to streamline the level of permit review required and 2) adding new land uses based on projects submitted to the Department and comparison of other jurisdictions. • Way more documents/submittals required than before 1995, many of them “just because” • What are “new” uses? • The proposal adds regulations, how does it make the zoning ordinance easier to use? • Section 17.415 doesn’t reference the existing code, the public can’t understand what is changing • Standards for ADUs seem to be new • What provisions of the code are subject to change? Can the provisions of the ordinance pertinent to Port Gamble change? Can the Multi-family design standards change? • Some provisions change the code in rural areas, previous planning commission meetings stated that regulations won’t change for rural areas. This is confusing. <hr/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why is 17.130.020 included in the update? • Eliminate all ordinance section numbers • Incorporate all referenced codes into the ordinance rather than expecting reviewers to look up the referenced codes online • Outdoor storage in the rural industrial zone (17.330.030(A)) and compatibility issues with neighboring residential uses • Some (new) footnotes are kept instead of being relocated • Why aren’t the footnotes for 17.420 (Density, Dimension and Design) included in this process? • Allow public review of the Director’s interpretation 	<p>outcomes by providing housing affordable to those at various income levels. A diversity of housing types is identified as a need in both the current Buildable Lands Report as well as the Affordable Housing Report issued by Kitsap County Human Services and City of Bremerton.</p> <p>Housing price differences in Montana and Kitsap have far less to do with restrictions and far more to do with desirability of location and availability of land.</p> <p>Property rights are a required consideration of every ordinance or ordinance amendment, and it would therefore be redundant to state it is a goal or objective. Consistent with RCW 36.70A.370, the County evaluates every ordinance proposed for adoption to avoid the unconstitutional takings of private property.</p> <p>Scaling permit review appropriate for the intensity of use does help promote economic development, as many of the uses have been changed from a CUP to an Administrative CUP. Administrative CUPs are slightly more than half the price of a CUP (\$3,900 vs \$6,890) and take less time to process due to not requiring a public hearing. Adding new land uses to the zoning use table helps promote economic development as it establishes a predictable level of review and standards, rather than relying on similar uses or director’s interpretations when uses are not specifically listed.</p> <p>No document or required submittal is “just because” – ensuring compliance with the critical areas ordinance, stormwater regulations, and other codes that have been adopted after 1995 are largely due to state level requirements, and those requirements balance the interests of the property owner and the whole community.</p> <p>“New” uses are those that did not appear in the use tables previous to this ordinance update, and in some instances staff have used other jurisdictions’ use standards for how these new uses are treated, and in other cases staff relied on past decisions for uses that had requested interpretations due to not being covered in the code previously.</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>from March 2020, regarding 17.420.060 Footnote number 25 and the requirement to subdivide or meet density requirements in the Urban Low Residential (UL) and Urban Cluster Residential (UCR) zoning designations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eliminate the ADU size restriction in urban designated areas. • Eliminate the separate application for rural located ADUs allowing them to be approved in the building permit process. Also eliminate, at least, the following criteria for their approval - B.2, B.5 and B.9 and modify B.3 to stipulate a maximum size of 1,200 S.F. regardless of the size of the existing house. • Why are event facilities singled out in rural residential and rural protection zones? Eliminate this section • Eliminate all proposed changes, references to and provisions of Chapter 17.470 'Multifamily Design Criteria'. If contrary to this recommendation there is somehow a need to make amendments to this chapter of the code, then a.) the scope of the "use table update" needs to be clarified and b.) the public needs to be re-involved in the process to propose and promote changes to the "whole Zoning Ordinance," not just the advertised "Use Table Update." • Environmental mitigation agreement for junk yards in F.17.410.060(B)(6). • Eliminate Section F.17.110.367 'Impervious Surface'. If it remains the definition should be revised as follows: "grasscrete, "geowebbs with soil and grass planted cells, any surface structure that allows for the propagation of grass capable also of bearing the weight of vehicles or field areas planted to grass where parking of vehicles occurs principally in the dry months of the year." Amend Title 12.08.245 if necessary to accommodate this language in the Title 17 definition. 	<p>While there are some added regulations (for new uses or clarifications for existing uses), the changes proposed are focused on actions like moving the footnotes to a new section which can be linked from the zoning use table and moving all uses into the zoning use table which had previously only been in other areas of code. This does make the code easier to use, as the applicant and reviewers will be able to find things more effectively.</p> <p>Page 75 of the draft Ordinance, lines 4-6, identify that chapter 17.415 is where special provisions for a use are located. Additionally, throughout the public participation process the Department has stated that the footnotes would be relocated to a new section. Given that starting on page 76 of the draft Ordinance and continuing through page 83, where the new chapter "17.415 Allowed Use Standards" begins, almost all of the footnotes are repealed, it should be fairly clear where what the purpose of the new chapter is.</p> <p>The ADU standards that appear in the new 17.415.010 and .015 were relocated from 17.410.060(B)(3-4).</p> <p>ADU size limitation was discussed by the Planning Commission, and the currently proposed 1000 sf or 60% of habitable area of the primary dwelling is consistent with surrounding jurisdictions.</p> <p>Changing rural ADU standards is outside the scope of this update process. Additionally, revisions to rural ADUs is already noted in the Draft Buildable Lands Report findings as a future reasonable measure consideration to align development trends with GMA, including case law, as well as regional policy frameworks and the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>For various reasons, provisions relating to Port Gamble are not changing. The Port Gamble Redevelopment is vested to the existing code and it is being moved to Appendix F for reference purposes following discussions with the property owner and the Suquamish and Port Gamble/S'Klallam Tribes.</p> <p>Multifamily development standards have always been outside the scope of this project. The only reason they are mentioned in this update is to clarify which projects they apply to. It is expected these multi-family standards will be reviewed as part of the mandated 2024 Comprehensive Plan update.</p>
--	--	--	--

			<p>The changes in 17.470 reflect changes in the applicability of the Multi-family Design Criteria, in that these now apply to all multi-family projects as a way of making the code more predictable.</p> <p>Changes to rural industrial and commercial zones have been part of the scope of the zoning use table update from the beginning of the project, as have changes to LAMIRDs. Additionally, if there was a new use added, consistent with GMA and the Comprehensive Plan, additional provisions were prepared to ensure compliance/applicability to rural areas. Relocations of existing use standards are not changes to rural uses.</p> <hr/> <p>17.130.020 is included in the update to add language about those portions of the zone that are in the boundaries of the Port Gamble Development Agreement and to direct to the new Appendix F for questions about parcels thus affected.</p> <p>As previously pointed out by KAPO, the ordinance document is already quite sizable. Only the portions of code being updated by this process were incorporated into the ordinance document. Code that is referenced but not changing would have made the ordinance unwieldy and less clear.</p> <p>17.330.030(A) is not a new standard, but a relocation of footnote 42.</p> <p>The “new” footnotes are those that do not apply to specific uses or to specific zones and are therefore more appropriate as footnotes rather than being relocated to the new use standards section or to each zone’s chapter.</p> <p>Footnotes for chapter 17.420 are not part of the use table and are therefore outside the scope of this update. Additionally, the Director’s interpretation dated March 31, 2020 (T17 - DI Applicable to Development Within Kitsap County), involved footnote number 25 in the Density, Dimensions, and Design chapter (17.420.060(A)(25)) and the requirement to subdivide or meet density requirements in the Urban Low Residential (UL) and Urban Cluster Residential (UCR) zoning designations. It was issued consistent with code requirements of KCC 21.04.040.</p>
--	--	--	---

			Event facilities and associated use standards are included in this update because of continued code compliance issues with these uses and their compatibility with neighboring residential uses.
63	Manchester Community Advisory Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transitory accommodations should be near services • Concerns about oversight, trash, crime, behavior standards, liability regarding transitory accommodations • Concerns about noticing for transitory accommodations • Concerns about density impacts of transitory accommodations • Transitory accommodations should be a conditional use 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>See Response 3.</p>
64	Max Platts, WSDOT Aviation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Formal consultation required prior to adoption of development regulations that may affect property adjacent to public use airports to discourage incompatible land uses that impair airports' abilities to operate as essential public facilities 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments.</u></p> <p>The Zoning Use Table update does not change any zoning maps or the density, dimensions, and design criteria. Changes to uses and level of review should have no impact to airports.</p>
65	Stuart Chisholm and Mary Ellen Houston	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Object to the zoning use table ordinance, think it adds time and expense • Feels input from community has been ignored • DCD didn't reach out to event business owners • See no benefit to added regulations, as 17.455 already addresses event facilities • Wants section 17.415.95 event facility removed from ordinance, makes event businesses non-viable • Noise impacts exist and may be perceived as negative, but times are changing • Reject entire ordinance, rework with proper due diligence 	<p><u>Thank you for your comments, no change recommended.</u></p> <p>Staff has had multiple meetings with various community groups/members during the Zoning Use Table update process, and a number of changes to the proposed language have come about from that process and public comments. DCD staff have been interfacing with event business owners on a regular basis as well. Further, the Agricultural code event facility regulations are not applicable to every rural facility and the rural public has expressed a desire for clear code to regulate these situations.</p>