Appendix B. Port Orchard’s Planning History

1965 Port Orchard / Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan

“Residing within an area considered as one of the remaining frontiers of contemporary urban settlement in the United States, the citizens of the Planning Area have undertaken a planning program to prevent the haphazard urban growth which has occurred in many areas of the Puget Sound Region. An examination of the character and development of the Planning Area reflects the community’s desire to plan for the preservation of the open space and scenic lands inter-related with the quality development which they presently enjoy. . . . Single family residential development is the major land use in the Area. The existing communities are enhanced by their encirclement with open fields and tree-covered hilltops, to the extent that many unfortunate occurrences in early developments are softened in their effect on the total environment. South Kitsap County, with its natural beauty, past and present rural character and its remoteness from the expanding edges of the metropolitan areas of the Puget Sound, is truly unique. The time to plan for expected urban growth is now, in order to insure that this Area will not become another featureless component of metropolitan urban sprawl. This Plan recognizes the increasing pressure for urban growth and provides a scheme for the future designed to accommodate new people in the Planning Area while protecting the beauty and character of South Kitsap County cherished by its inhabitants.” Port Orchard Urban Area Plan, 1965.

In late 1965 and early 1966 a cooperative planning process between the City of Port Orchard, School District 402, and Kitsap County yielded a General Plan to guide future development for both the urban and rural areas of South Kitsap. Even though this was done 40 years ago, many of the concerns the Citizen’s Advisory Group had then are identical with those concerns voiced by the Citizen’s Advisory Group in 1995 and today. Specifically, the major concerns were and are, where will we put all the people moving to our area and how can we preserve our valuable quality of life at the same time? This Plan’s purpose was to guide growth for the next 20 years, until 1985. Keeping urban areas urban and rural areas rural was of great importance in 1965. The City of Port Orchard was recognized as the “continuing dominant commercial and cultural center of South Kitsap County, to be enhanced by an expanded and unique waterfront oriented, community commercial center which will provide a new variety of quality goods and services. Gorst, Manchester, Southworth, Long Lake, Olalla, and Burley are recommended as outlying convenience
1995 Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan

The City of Port Orchard and many other cities and counties in Washington State updated or developed new Comprehensive Plans in compliance with the Growth Management Act of 1991 (ReESHB 1025). The 1995 Plan coordinated with Kitsap County and ensured that implementation policies and mechanisms were consistent between jurisdictions. The City and Kitsap County coordinated in water systems studies, resource and critical area analysis, transportation analysis, and housing analysis. Through the 1995 Plan and its community support, the City’s elected officials actively managed the City’s growth and took part in the discussions at the local, state, and federal level as to the City’s role in regional activities.

Benefits of consistent Plans and implementation measures included consistent application of development standards, economical provision and maintenance of infrastructure, improved understanding of the development review process and enhancement of inter-jurisdictional cooperation. Goals and Policies were intended to identify “what the community wants” and “how goals should be achieved,” respectively. To further guide City decisions, specific examples and recommended actions were provided as part of the 1995 Plan in addition to the City’s adopted Goals and Policies.

Background information was provided to indicate the basis for the Goals and Policies and included a discussion of how they evolved from the identified needs and issues.

As part of the 1995 Plan public process, the City of Port Orchard formed joint citizen, Planning Commission, and City Council advisory sub-committees shortly after the Growth Management Act of 1990 was enacted. These sub-committees discussed major concerns including City vision/mission, public facilities, utilities, transportation, growth management, parks, and open space. These sub-committees found there was considerable overlap between the issues, so they joined into larger committees with focused subjects. These new committees were: Capital Facilities; Utilities and Open Space; Housing, Transportation and Land Use; and Growth Management and Vision. The visioning committee developed statements to help define the City’s direction. The other committees developed statement lists with pertinent subject items which led to the 1995 Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan Goals, Objectives, and Policies.
The 1995 Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan, in addition to analysis, supplemental information, and public outreach, formed the basis for the 10 Year Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan Update as it was brought current with the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan 10 Year Updates, regional planning efforts, and updated State of Washington data.

2008 Comprehensive Plan

The 2008 Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan Update was a 20 year plan for the future of the City of Port Orchard in compliance with the Washington State Growth Management Act and state regulations regarding municipal planning. The Comprehensive plan is the preliminary culmination of previous City plans including the 1965 Comprehensive Plan, the 1995 Comprehensive Plan, Tremont Corridor Plan and Kitsap County Comprehensive Plans from 2005 and 2006. The Final 2008 Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan Update was approved by the Port Orchard City Council on December 9th, 2008.
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1 Introduction

1.1 Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan Update
The City of Port Orchard is preparing to update its Comprehensive Plan. A Comprehensive Plan is an officially adopted public document that establishes long-term goals and policies for the City. The core purposes of the Plan are to:

- Offer a consensus-based community vision for future development that inspires action;
- Provide the facts, goals, and policies for translating the vision into a physical development pattern;
- Inject long-range considerations into short-range actions that promote a future development pattern that is livable, socially just, economically viable, and environmentally compatible; and
- Represent a “big picture” of the community that is related to the trends and regional interests in which the local government is located.1

The Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan is required by the Washington State Growth Management Act to address specific subject areas, or elements.

1.2 Initial Conditions report
An initial conditions report compiles and presents key findings about a community pertaining to its existing population and economy, environment, land use, transportation, and infrastructure systems. The purpose is “to assemble, coordinate, and analyze intelligence from these systems, as a basis for public participation, as an input to the plan-making process, and as an indicator of progress toward future goals.”2 The Port Orchard initial conditions report summarizes relevant data and information from existing plans and studies, examining policies and data that will be pertinent to the Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan update.
1.3 Historical Context
The town of Port Orchard was originally established along the shoreline of Sinclair Inlet at the bottom of a bluff abutting the water. The town was centered and platted along Bay Street, which served as the main thoroughfare running parallel to the shoreline. Port Orchard’s location along the waterfront turned out to be quite problematic, as the low land of the town would become inundated by the tides of the Puget Sound, a problem that persists to this day. The solution was infilling the tidal mudflats with gravel, dirt, and sand from nearby re-grading projects. The combination of challenging topography and regarding that occurred explains the disjointed and disconnected downtown from the rest of town.\(^3\)

2 Socio-demographics
This section analyzes the composition of the residents in Port Orchard and provides information the city can use in the provision of services. It serves as a baseline from which service capacities can be determined. Examining changes in demographics and socioeconomic data helps prepare the city for the potential need to shift resources, and also aids in the identification of emerging issues or problems.

2.1 Age Dynamics
Like many other municipalities in the US, the aging of the baby boomer generation (ages 50-70) is reshaping the age profile in Port Orchard. This dynamic will produce challenges for the community, as it likely will increase demand for health care and emergency services, alter market preferences for housing types, increase dependence on public transit, and change the economic situations of households as more people approach retirement.

Cohort Component Trends
The cohort component analysis breaks down the population into age groups by sex and offers a detailed look into the changes facing Port Orchard (see Error! Reference source not found.). According to this breakdown, people aged 55 and over accounted for 17.2% of the population in 2000; in 2010 it rose to 24.3%. Disregarding the effect of annexations, this population group more than doubled over the same timeframe, from 1,318 to 2,710. The cohort comprising the population aged 55 to 64 experienced the largest proportional rise, increasing its share of the total population by 5%.

The ratio of people aged 20 to 44 to the total population decreased over the same timeframe, which reflects the aging of this cohort between 2000 and 2010. This group experienced real growth to a lesser degree than older cohorts, rising from 3,358 to 4,105. The same trend holds true for children.

1.1 Educational Attainment

Based on an analysis from the 2008-2012 American Community Survey, the average education level of Port Orchard residents is on par with state averages. The state average for the percent of high school graduates (or equivalent) is 90%, in Port Orchard, 92.2% of residents aged 25 and older have a high school diploma.
The state average for the percent of people with bachelor’s degrees or higher is 31.6%. Amongst Port Orchard residents, 25.1% aged 25 and older have a bachelor’s degree or higher.\(^5\)
2.2 Diversity

From 2000 to 2010, Port Orchard became slightly more racially diverse (not accounting for annexation effects). Minorities composed 17.8% and 19.2% of the total population in 2000 and 2010, respectively (see Error! Reference source not found.). Pockets of ethnic and racial minorities are located west of SR 16 and in the northeast corner of the McCormick Woods annexation. Low-density minority populations are also present along the southern fringe of the city.

2.3 Household Types and Sizes

The US Census Bureau defines a “household” as the people living in a single housing unit as their usual residence; a “family” is defined as a group of two or more people sharing a residence and related by birth, marriage or adoption. The vast majority of residents of Port Orchard reside in households consisting of families. The share of family households increased slightly from 90.4% in 2000 to 93.4% in 2010. The “two-person household” category (typically empty nesters and young couples) is the largest
type among families in Port Orchard and increased by almost 4% in last decade. This increase is likely largely explained by children leaving the households of aging couples.

The proportion of the number of persons living in group quarters, most of whom are institutionalized, fell approximately 3% between 2000 and 2010.

2.4 Growth and Density

Growth

Port Orchard as a municipality experienced a significant increase in the number of city residents from 2000 to 2012 due partially to annexations. Based on raw data, the city grew from 7,693 to 11,144 residents between 2000 and 2010, an increase of 44.9%. These figures, however, do not account for annexations of unincorporated land and their populations. Accounting for the populations of annexed areas (as of 2012) produces a change in population of 15-16%, placing Port Orchard near the state average.6 The population of the annexed areas increased at a fairly normal rate (about 1.5% annually), but the city experienced a significantly larger increase in the number of residents for which it provides services (about 3.8% annually).

By 2035, population projections and forecasts predict there will be an additional 8,235 residents in Port Orchard. The adjacent Port Orchard Urban Growth Area has a predicted increase of 6,235 residents over the same timeframe.7 The forecasted growth for the city represents an increase of 70.5% over the July 2012 estimated population of 11,680, or an annual growth rate of about 3%.

If the city were to annex the entire Port Orchard Urban Growth Area by 2035, the City would gain approximately 20,000 new residents; this number includes the growth allocated to the Urban Growth Area. Combined with Port Orchard’s forecasted population of 19,915, nearly 40,000 people could reside within city limits by 2035.

Density

Across the city, large changes in population densities occurred between 2000 and 2010, and these varied to a considerable degree from one area to the next.8 The downtown core experienced an approximate 14% increase in density. Development in McCormick Woods also produced a large proportional increase in that area’s density, but it still remains significantly less dense than most other parts of the city.
3 Housing

3.1 Housing Stock Analysis

According to the US Census, total housing stock in Port Orchard experienced a drastic change from 2000 to 2010 due to annexations. In 2000 there were 3,178 total housing units and by 2010 that number increased 46% to 4,630. By 2012 the number of housing units further increased to a total of 4,989. Most of this increase in housing is due to the McCormick Woods annexation in 2009, a large low-density residential subdivision that added approximately 1,280 parcels to the city.

As of 2012, the median housing price of owner-occupied housing in Port Orchard was $269,300, which was about $3,000 less than the average price for the state of Washington, $272,900. The median rental price of a housing unit in Port Orchard as of 2012 was $951. This represents a 41% increase in the rental price in Port Orchard from $676 in 2000.

The percentage of owner-occupied housing has experienced a dramatic shift from 2000 to 2010 according to the US Census. Owner-occupied housing was in the minority in 2000 at only 44.2%, and renter-occupied housing at 55.8%. By 2010 this number had completely switched with owner-occupied housing accounting for 55.8% of the housing stock and renter-occupied housing stock at 44.2%. This dramatic shift is largely due to the McCormick Woods annexation.

Residential housing in Port Orchard is primarily composed of single-family detached housing, accounting for approximately 62% of the total housing stock. Multi-family housing of 10-19 units makes up the next largest category with 13% of the stock. (see [Error! Reference source not found.]).
Port Orchard’s housing stock is fairly contemporary compared to the housing stock of Washington, with nearly 20% of housing built in the past 15 years and over 40% built in the past 25 years (see Table 1).16

### Table 1. Age of Housing Stock

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>Number of Units</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Built 2010 or later</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 2000 to 2009</td>
<td>941</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 1990 to 1999</td>
<td>1,177</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 1980 to 1989</td>
<td>697</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Built 1970 to 1979</td>
<td>695</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 3.2 Existing Housing Plans and Studies

**Kitsap Countywide Planning Policies**

This document establishes new planning policies for jurisdictions in Kitsap County regarding Growth Management Act compliance. This document establishes new population growth projections for the twenty-year planning process into 2035, which Port Orchard and its Urban Growth Area must accommodate.17 These new population projections will form the basis for a new land capacity analysis for Port Orchard and the Port Orchard Urban Growth Area. The updated land capacity analysis will be required to update the Housing Element of the Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan.

The policies in this document related to housing mainly address affordable housing, similar to existing policies already in established in the Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan. Additional policies in the document include:

- Policies regarding the development of low-income housing in a dispersed pattern. Countywide Planning Policies recommend not to concentrating or geographically isolating low-income populations in a specific area or
community and also to prioritizing the siting of low-income housing near employment centers.

- Policies relating to the identification and monitoring of land supply for housing through regular updates to the countywide Buildable Lands Analysis.
- Policies specifically regarding navy personnel.\(^\text{18}\)

Consideration of these policy ideas during the updating process of the comprehensive plan will help Port Orchard more completely address the housing issues facing the community.

**2014-2017 Kitsap County Community Needs Assessment**

This report compiled by the Kitsap Community Resources organization identifies the main housing problems affecting Kitsap County as a whole. These issues include a 69% increase in rental prices over the past ten years and approximately 20% of mortgaged homes in Kitsap County owing more on their mortgage than their current market value as of the first quarter of 2012.\(^\text{19}\) The report also found that foreclosures have declined from 513 in 2009 to 189 in 2012. Rapidly increasing rental prices has already been acknowledged in the Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan as an issue facing the community.\(^\text{20}\)

**2011 Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan**

The goals and policies in the Housing Element of the Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan address a few main topics:

- To provide sufficient, affordable housing choices for citizens of a wide variety of economic backgrounds;
- Cooperation with other jurisdictions in providing low income housing;
- Protection of critical areas from new residential development;
- Innovative development regulations and design standards that enhance the quality of neighborhoods and the overall community.\(^\text{21}\)

### 4 Economic Development

#### 4.1 Introduction

The City of Port Orchard serves as the economic hub for the southern portion of Kitsap County. Port Orchard’s location across the Sinclair Inlet from Bremerton provides it with
economic opportunities. According to the Kitsap Economic Development Alliance, key industries include military and defense, maritime industry, advanced manufacturing and design, technology, healthcare, and tourism. The Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, located in Bremerton, employs a great number of military and civilian personnel in the area and contributes to the overall economy of Bremerton and Port Orchard.

As a member of the Puget Sound Regional Council, Kitsap County has the lowest population of the four counties of King, Kitsap, Pierce, and Snohomish. Of the cities of Kitsap County, Port Orchard has the second smallest population and smallest workforce.

4.2 Household Income
The median annual household income of Port Orchard increased from $34,337 in 1999 to $56,257 in 2012 (estimated and adjusted for inflation); this is slightly lower than the state average of $57,573.

Among five census tracts covering Port Orchard, high school graduates earn an average annual income of $7,093 more than those without a diploma. Those with bachelor’s degrees earn an average of $21,330 and $28,423 more than those with only a high school diploma and those without a diploma, respectively.

Unemployment and Poverty
According to the 2012 American Community Survey five-year estimate, Port Orchard’s unemployment rate 9.8%, while the state average was 8.9%. Port Orchard’s overall poverty rate based on is 13.9% compared to the state average of 12.9%. Single mothers with young children are most affected with 66.7% living in poverty versus the state average of 46.3%, but the margin of error is quite high (+/-36.4%). Least affected are married couples (1.3% +/-1.6%; state average 4.4%).

Educational attainment also affects poverty rate. Among those without a high school diploma, the poverty rate was 39.1%, above the state average 25.6%, while the rate for those with a bachelor’s degree or higher was 0.9% versus the state average 4.1%.
Kitsap County’s homeless population has been declining since 2009. Unsheltered persons counted during the annual Point In Time count dropped from 173 in 2009 to 64 in 2013.\textsuperscript{27} Data on homelessness in Port Orchard specifically is currently unavailable.

### 4.3 Economic Base Analysis

From the results of an economic base analysis, most the industries in the city are basic sector industries that export their excess goods and services across Kitsap County and the greater region. The industries that have the highest relative economic activity are: specialty food stores; motion picture and video industries; lawn and garden equipment and supplies stores; and accounting, tax preparation, bookkeeping, and payroll services.

The analysis also showed that for every 1 basic sector job in the city, 0.71 non-basic sector (producing locally-consumed goods and services) jobs were created.

### Major Sectors of Employment

Looking at the 2007 Economic Census data, the largest sectors of employment in Port Orchard are retail trade; professional, scientific, and technical services; health care and social assistance; and accommodation and food services. Together, those four sectors account for 83.5% of the total number of employed persons in Port Orchard.

### Employment by Industry

Using the four-digit industry level codes of the North American Industry Classification System gives a clearer picture of the specific types of industries present in Port Orchard. Looking at the data available from 2007, five industries employ more than 100 employees in the city: grocery stores (174.5); legal services (106); outpatient care centers (174.5); other amusement and recreation industries (174.5); limited-service eating places (325). These five industries comprise 41.6% of the total employees (see Table 4).

### Economic Development: 2002-2007

Overall, Port Orchard has grown economically between 2002 and 2007. The number of employees in the city has grown by almost 200, although that growth has occurred through some industry sectors gaining employees while others have lost employees (see Table 5). According to data from the Puget Sound Regional Council, the average
annual wages of workers in Port Orchard has grown by 18%, from $22,800 in 2002 to $26,900 in 2007.

### 4.4 Jobs-Housing Balance

Port Orchard’s jobs-housing balance – the ratio of jobs within the city to the number of dwelling units – is 0.87. This indicates that Port Orchard is more a residential area than a robust job center. The nearest job centers are Bremerton, Silverdale, and Belfair (see Error! Reference source not found.). Highways and ferries connect the city connected with other large job centers, including Seattle and Tacoma.

![FIGURE 4. JOBS/HOUSING BALANCE](image)

### 4.5 Economic Forecasts and Vision

Port Orchard is forecasted to significantly grow its population and economy throughout the next decade. Projections indicate that the City will add 2,773 new jobs to its employment base between 2005 and 2025. The majority of job growth is forecasted to occur in the commercial sector—primarily in the finance, insurance, real estate, and services industries. The city also expects to gain about 168 jobs in the industrial sector.

These forecasts and employment statistics have been well accounted for in Port Orchard’s planning efforts, which are highly supportive of new economic development. The City plans to allocate sufficient land and infrastructure capacity to accommodate all
increased demand for commercial and industrial activities. Port Orchard is simultaneously striving to preserve its small-town character and quality of life by guiding new development to support this objective.

## 4.6 Economic Plans

### Comprehensive Plan

The Economic Development Element of the Comprehensive Plan calls for diversifying the local economy to provide private sector growth. Major objectives in the plan include using planning tools to attract new uses by:

- Offering incentives for employers to conduct business in Port Orchard;
- Adopting an employment target of one living wage job per household;
- Supporting the needs of the arts, tourism, and small businesses;
- Valuing and preserving Port Orchard’s historic commercial district;
- Supporting environmentally responsible economic activities;
- Ensuring economic development keeps pace with the development of capital facilities needed to support growth;
- Building public and private partnerships to support and encourage economic development in the city.

The Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan is intended to reflect the needs and interests of the public, and provide the basis for guiding future City action on economic development issues. The plan prioritizes a diverse and robust local economy, but fails to emphasize the development of the city’s downtown as a preferred area for economic growth, which is a major community priority.

### Capital Facilities Plan

Many of these comprehensive planning objectives have been incorporated into other planning efforts, including Port Orchard’s Capital Facilities Plan. The 2012-2018 Capital Facilities Plan provides a strategy for building new public facilities that will accommodate growth in the city. The Plan’s policies establish a framework for directing infrastructure development to work towards meeting the goals set forth in the Comprehensive Plan. The policies call for allocating resources to strengthen the City’s economic base and for providing adequate public services concurrently with
development. These policies are significant for ensuring that economic growth is prioritized in the planning and implementation of future capital facilities as growth occurs. The Parks and Recreation section of the Plan recommends several downtown improvement strategies that were also included in previous planning efforts, such as maintaining Gateway areas, enhancing public use of the waterfront, and preserving historical monuments.34

The Capital Facilities Plan provides a seven-year project implementation plan that is intended to align with the policies. Several of the transportation projects in the Plan, such as improvements to Bay Street, Port Orchard Boulevard, and the Bay Street Pedestrian Path, directly implement downtown enhancements called for in other planning documents.35 The projects listed in the Capital Facilities Plan, however, only address a few of the recommendations outlined in the Comprehensive Plan and Economic Development Plan.36

Economic Development Plan
The Economic Development Plan focuses solely on the revitalization of downtown Port Orchard.37 The Plan was informed by extensive community outreach and also considered the ideas from older studies, including the 1983 Port Orchard Waterfront Revitalization Project and the 1999 report, Downtown Port Orchard: Suggestions for Revitalization. The Waterfront Revitalization Project recommended a set of design strategies and funding options to help downtown attract visitors. Recommendations included improving downtown entrances, revitalizing the commercial core into a historic marine-oriented center, and constructing a city center plaza.38 The 1999 Downtown Port Orchard report gauged the opinions of ferry riders on their downtown shopping and transportation habits. The study found that Port Orchard residents highly value the livability and visual appeal of the downtown area, but are discouraged from purchasing goods and services downtown due to high prices and inadequate selection. Increasing activity downtown through higher densities and a greater mix of uses was recommended in the report.39
5 Community Services, Transportation, and Infrastructure

5.1 Introduction
Most infrastructure systems have their own specific plans managed by the City or another agency, but others are not governmental in nature and less tangible. Infrastructure often goes unnoticed but is critical for maintaining a healthy population and vibrant economy. The infrastructure and services have not kept up with population growth and annexations. Services such as water, sewer, roads, and schools are strained. Additionally, rapid expansions through annexation and low-density development are increasing the costs per capita of providing services.

5.2 Transportation and Traffic Conditions
Summary
A summary of the South Kitsap County’s existing transportation facilities can be found in the Comprehensive Plan. The city and adjacent land includes:

- Five bus routes and two foot ferries, both serviced by Kitsap Transit (see Error! Reference source not found.)
- Two major state highways (State Route 3 and State Route 16)
- Minor county arterial roads
- A city network of arterials (10,000+ daily counts), collectors (2,000 to 10,000 daily counts), and access road (2,000+ daily counts)
• Two regional airports
• The nearby Burlington Northern Rail Road (BNRR)
• 3 Amtrak train stations within 30 miles of the city center

**Status**
The level of service (LOS) of roads within Port Orchard is an LOS of "D," or 85% of 0.89 volume-to-capacity.\(^{41}\) Level "D" represents the ability to travel most of the area's arterial and collector routes with only moderate delays due to congestion levels.

The current status of infrastructure for modes of transportation other than roads is not spelled out in the Comprehensive Plan except that the railroad is maintained as Federal Railway Administration Class 3 on a scale of 1 (low) to 6 (high). The Comprehensive Plan also points out that transit does not operate on Sundays. Further explanation may be found in the 2011 Transportation Plan.

**Funding Programs**
To combat the lack of financial capabilities to keep pace with the ever growing need for new and replaced transportation infrastructure, the City has two funding program approaches: (1) impact fees and (2) grants and other funding programs.\(^{42}\)

The transportation impact fee is the most typical financing tool in Washington State. It allows for the collection of revenue to offset the traffic impacts of new development before occupancy permits are issued. Impact fees are only used to fund facilities such as roads, that are directly associated with the new development. They may not be used to correct existing deficiencies. Currently in the city, only new homes in the McCormick Woods area pay a transportation impact fee. This fee is collected at building permit issuance. In 2009, the fee was $1904.04, plus a $19.04 administrative fee, and is adjusted annually for inflation.

The City utilizes a combination of different federal and state grants and programs that focus on different aspects of the transportation system (see Table 6).

**Future Expansion**
The 2011 Transportation Plan connected to the Comprehensive Plan is the guiding document for assessing future needs of the city's transportation system. The Capital
Facilities Plan, which reflects recommendations from the Transportation Plan, described future improvements (see Table 6).\textsuperscript{43}

### 5.3 Water Systems

**Summary**

The City of Port Orchard’s water services encompass three separate systems.\textsuperscript{44} The original system services most of the city with wells, storage reservoirs and distribution facilities. Most of the existing infrastructure of this system was established in the 1960s. The current network consists of approximately 47 miles of water pipe, six active groundwater wells, and six storage reservoirs.

Along with the original water system, the second system is referred to as McCormick Water Company. This system was constructed in the late 1980’s to service the McCormick Woods Planned Unit Development. The City took over the McCormick Woods Water Company in 1998 in advance of the area being annexed in 2009. The McCormick Woods System is planned for expansion to serve additional development in the western portion of the City.

The third system, the West Sound Utility District, formerly known as Annapolis Water District, serves a small portion of the city. This service area lies east of Port Orchard and includes portions of the City's eastern potential annexation, or urban growth area.

**Status**

In 2009, following the adoption of the 2008 Comprehensive Plan, the city contracted with Pace Engineers to produce a water systems plan. This plan thoroughly evaluated the current conditions of both water systems and laid out three significant concerns related to water supply in the system.\textsuperscript{45} First, the city’s wells have encountered declining output in recent years and are not producing at full capacity. Secondly, as the McCormick Woods area continues to expand, the southern portion of the city’s service area is being stressed. Thirdly is a concern of non-revenue water. Non-revenue water refers to water loss through leaks, breaks and unmetered water use. The major culprit is the McCormick Woods Golf Course. In 2004, city meters indicated that more than 35 million gallons of water were directed to the golf course with only a portion of that water
being recorded for billing purposes. In total that year, 9.24% of all metered water was reported as non-revenue water.

**Programs**
While there are no stated funding programs for the city’s water systems they have adopted a rigorous water conservation plan. This plan consists of six categories: use of internal conservation measures such as meters, conservation program propaganda, rate setting to encourage conservation, encouraging water saving devices, water efficient toilets and appliances, and water reuse and recycling. A metric has been constructed to monitor the effectiveness of conservation efforts by reviewing annual water use records and comparing them to previous years. These findings are compiled into a water use efficiency report; none of which were located.  

**Future Expansion**
The capital improvement plan identified water system upgrades totaling $24 million in 2009 (see Table 6). The ability to implement suggested upgrades is based solely on funding availability.

**5.4 Sanitary Sewer System and Sewage Treatment**
**Summary**
The city’s sanitary sewer system consists of thirteen trunk lines with a capacity of over 31 million gallons per day. Previously, the wastewater treatment facility was located on the waterfront, and all flow from the sewers network was directed to that location. The Marina Pump Station replaced this treatment facility and flow is now directed east through an 18-inch force main to a new treatment facility that is operated by the West Sound Utility District. This pump station is one of thirteen located throughout the city.

**Future Expansion**
The city has identified $14.8 million of improvements that are necessary in the six-year period starting in 2010. This includes three major pump stations that need rehabilitation and capacity increase (see Table 6).
5.5 **Solid Waste Disposal**

**Summary**
The City contracts waste pick-up through Waste Management, which is a multinational waste collection and removal service. They provide garbage pick up to each residence and business once every week and recycling pick up every other week. Waste Management transports garbage and recycling to the Brem-Air Transfer Station located in South Kitsap Industrial Area. From there garbage is transferred to one of the Western Washington landfills and recycling is transported to the Cascade Recycling Center.

**Future Expansion**
Port Orchard has seen two major recent annexations, and population and employment projections for the long-term 20-year planning horizon are extensive. Thus this service certainly has, and will continue to, grow to continue full service to the residences and businesses in the City.

5.6 **Schools**

**Summary**
Primary and secondary K-12 education for Port Orchard is provided by the South Kitsap School District (SKSD), which is a separate entity from the City government. SKSD operates 14 schools within its 360 square mile jurisdiction (see
Table 7).

5,995 students attend school within and near Port Orchard, which makes up 62% of the District’s total enrollment of 9,604 students. A District-wide projection anticipates a total enrollment of 10,834 students in 2030.

SKSD, with 682 teachers out of its 1,210 employees, is the largest employer in Port Orchard. The District’s administration, transportation, food service, and other support buildings are all located within the city’s urban growth area.

There are no higher education institutions within Port Orchard; the nearest is Olympic College in neighboring Bremerton. West Sound Tech, also located in Bremerton, is a collaboration between nine area school districts that teaches workforce technical skills to high school students. Washington State University runs an extension program in Kitsap County that provides a number of educational classes and partnerships related to the natural environment.

In all, 5,995 students attend school within and near Port Orchard; this is 62% of the District’s total enrollment of 9,604 students. A District-wide projection anticipates a total enrollment of 10,834 students in 2030.

SKSD, with 682 teachers out of its 1,210 employees, is the largest employer in Port Orchard. The District’s administration, transportation, food service, and other support buildings are all located within the City’s urban growth area.

There are no higher education institutions within Port Orchard; the nearest is Olympic College in neighboring Bremerton. West Sound Tech, also located in Bremerton, is a collaboration between nine area school districts that teaches workforce technical skills to high school students. Washington State University runs an extension program in Kitsap County that provides a number of educational classes and partnerships related to the natural environment.

Future expansion
SKSD anticipates building new schools within the next 20 years to serve the area’s increasing residential population, especially west of State Route 16 in the McCormick Woods area. In 2005, SKSD bought a 56-acre site in this area on Old Clifton Road, to
build a second high school between the years 2019 and 2030. A new elementary school could be built there as well. A new junior high may be constructed elsewhere after 2030. The District anticipates converting to the more common K-5/6-8/9-12 grade system when another high school is built.

5.7 Open Space

Summary
As of 2012, the total area of open space in city of Port Orchard is 493 acres (42 acres per 1,000 residents), and includes agricultural, forest land, timber, waterfront areas as well as park/recreation managed by Washington State as habitat, managed forest, City- and County-designated open space lands, and land trust holdings.\(^{51}\) There are around 300 acres of parklands. Landholders include the City, County, park districts, school districts and private entities.

In 2006 and 2008 surveys, citizens indicated a preference for bicycle paths, trails, picnic areas, boating facilities, and a safe waterfront walking area along Sinclair Inlet.\(^{52}\) In 2008, the City updated its Parks Plan to better address community needs. Over the last ten years, maintenance of existing open spaces and the steady growth in the total area of open spaces have been funded by the City’s annual budget.\(^{53}\) One large project is the redevelopment of South Kitsap Regional Park, including a new sports field.

Park Systems
The park system includes municipal parks, private play areas that have open spaces, other agency-owned open spaces, and other pieces of land that will be used as open spaces. As of 2014, five types of parks existed in Port Orchard, providing recreational areas for residents, including municipal parks, public waterfront space, private areas that are open spaces, other agency-owned open space, and places that will be used as open spaces in the future.

Municipal parks are mostly located in north Port Orchard. Among all of the municipal parks, Van Zee and Givens Park are the largest and complete with facilities like meeting rooms, picnic areas, and playgrounds.
TABLE 2. MUNICIPAL PARKS SYSTEM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Size (Acres)</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Van Zee Park</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>300 Tremont Street</td>
<td>Play Ground, Baseball Diamonds, Trails, Picnic Area, Golf Course, Basketball Court</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Park (Clayton Playground)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>915 Dwight Street</td>
<td>Play Ground, Sports Field, Basketball Court, Picnic Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Givens Field</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>1025 Tacoma Avenue</td>
<td>Play Ground, Picnic Area, Baseball Diamonds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Powers, Jr., Park (Fire Station Playground)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2035 Sidney Avenue</td>
<td>Play Ground, Sports Field, Basketball Court</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comprehensive Park Plan**
The Port Orchard Comprehensive Park Plan supplements the Comprehensive Plan by detailing goals and policies regarding trails, open space and parks. It also contains demand analysis conducted by the City, park survey data, and implementation strategies. One of the main goals is to connect the Mosquito Fleet Regional Trail through Port Orchard, which would help create a safe and accessible non-motorized trail linking communities all along the Kitsap Peninsula.54

**McCormick Village Park Plan**
This document supplements the Comprehensive Park Plan and lays out the vision for the McCormick Village Park. In addition to creating more park space for the city, the goals include protecting the wetland and forest ecosystem, while creating a space that encourages everyone in the community to come together.55

**Open Space Plan**
The Kitsap County Open Space plan is primarily used as a regulatory document that governs the use of open space and an extension of the state-level Open Space Act (RCW 84.34). The county has refined the definition of “open space” to prioritize areas
that conserve natural resources, protect water supplies and wildlife habitats, and preserve historic and cultural sites.  

**Other Open Spaces**

Other open spaces in close proximity to Port Orchard include:

- South Kitsap School District
- South Kitsap Regional Park
- Veterans' Memorial Park
- Veterans’ Home Cemetery
- Sunset Lane Memorial Park
- Knights of Pythias Cemetery
- Seattle Avenue Property
- West Bay Lease Area
- Neighborhood Pocket Parks
- Port Orchard Boat Ramp
- DeKalb Street Pedestrian Pier

5.8 Community Organizations, Care Facilities, and Services

Typical community organizations in Port Orchard fall into the following categories: community-service and action, health, educational, personal growth and improvement, social welfare, and self-help for the disadvantaged. Community based organizations, which operate within the city, provide the community with necessary services. These organizations become possible with the direct involvement of the community in the
action or operation as needed. In Port Orchard, amateur sports clubs, youth groups and community support groups are typical examples of community organizations.

The City has no formal community center, but it does have public locations where members of the community can gather for group activities, social support, senior assistance and other purposes. Some provide health care, others provide assistance for low-income persons, and some simply offer spaces for community events (see Error! Reference source not found.).

**Daycare and Senior Care**
Port Orchard has many daycares and senior care centers. There are services that provide preschool education, before and after-school care, and private in-home daycare. Some churches, such as Adventure-Faith Presbyterian, also play a role in supporting children’s growth and development. As for senior care, more than six senior care centers provide professional care for the elderly and some offer special service for veterans. The large number of daycare and senior care centers in Port Orchard can meet the basic needs of residents within the community (see Error! Reference source not found.).

**Churches and Other Religious Organizations**
There are a variety of churches and religious organizations with roots in and around Port Orchard. Port Orchard has 50 Christian churches, two Jewish Temples, and no Muslim Mosques, Buddhist Temples or other religiously affiliated places of worship.65

**Youth Services**
A range of organizations exist for children and adolescents in Port Orchard and the South Kitsap area.66 Youth-centric organizations offer programs and services that range from athletics to arts. They provide extra-curricular education and activities in the community and sometimes on school campuses.

Local organizations include:

- Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, and Cub Scouts
- Schools of dance and arts
- Sports leagues and teams, including baseball, softball, t-ball, basketball, soccer, football, lacrosse, rugby, golf, cheer, and wrestling
• Fitness and karate clubs
• Libraries and book stores
• Humane societies and hospitals
• Choirs and orchestras
• Churches and worship centers

Low-Income Housing Services
Several agencies and organizations work in Port Orchard and the South Kitsap area to provide or manage low-income housing. Organizations and projects include:

• Habitat for Humanity: Harris Court (Darrell Lane, just outside City limits), 32 properties broke ground August 2013.67

• The Low Income Housing Institute: A statewide developer that reserves 80% of its units for people making less than 30% of the area’s median income.68 Cedar Heights (333 Lippert Drive West), 51 units of Section 8 housing.69

• Housing Kitsap (formally known as the Kitsap County Consolidated Housing Authority): A public agency that provides subsidized mortgages, rent, and utilities.70 Viewmont East Apartments, Liberty Bay, Orchard Bluff, Port Orchard Vista, Confer Woods Apartments, Madrona Manor.

5.9 Public Service Expenditures and Proposed Capital Improvements
Public services are provided primarily at the City and County level. Within the incorporated area of Port Orchard, the City is responsible for law enforcement; planning and building; public works including library service, water, and sewer; parks and recreation; streets and roads; and a municipal court system focusing on non-criminal infractions. County-level public services include fire protection, public schools, and a criminal justice system including courts and the jail.

City of Port Orchard Budget Summary
In the city of Port Orchard, citywide revenues and expenditures totaled $30,527,920 in 2011, $29,990,470 in 2012, and $30,214,782 in 2013.71 The primary sources of city general fund revenue come from property and sales taxes. Additional funds come from charges for goods, fines, user (utility) fees, and intergovernmental sources such as support from Kitsap County. The general fund serves as the City’s primary bank
account, funding the vast majority of city expenses. The public services provided at the City level by Port Orchard are outlined below, delineated by department.\textsuperscript{72}

**Administration Department**
Port Orchard’s administration department is in charge of the city’s legislative, judicial, and executive functions; its activities composed approximately 9% of Port Orchard’s budget in 2013. Consisting of the seven-member city council, mayor, and city clerk, the administration department ensures the smooth operation of the city and compliance with the statutes of the Revised Code of Washington.

**Law Enforcement Department**
Of the city level expenditures in Port Orchard, law enforcement is by far the largest public expenditure, accounting for approximately 44% of the budget. The Port Orchard Police Department operating out of City Hall has 30 employees and volunteers. Police operations and facilities include both land and water protection.

**Finance Department**
Composing 6% of city expenditures, the financial department is tasked with accounting and finance, information technology management, and human resources management functions. The accounting department focuses on maximizing Port Orchard’s capital reserves, minimizing expenditures, providing accessible information to the public, and managing the city’s debt and revenues.

**Building and Planning Department**
Expenditures for the building and planning department compose 7% of Port Orchard’s general fund expenditures. The building and planning department is responsible for both long and short range planning, issuing building permits, building code enforcement, relations with other communities, maintaining urban design criteria, managing annexation and growth areas, and promoting economic development.

**Public Works Department**
Port Orchard public works is the caretaker of city infrastructure. Its 2013 expenditures made up 7% of the city’s general fund expenses. The public works department is the administrator and overseer of infrastructure activities in the city, including maintaining databases and maximizing system efficiency. Capital costs for the construction and
maintenance of street and water infrastructure is paid for by their respective departments.

**City Street (a division of Public Works)**
The city street division of public works is in charge of maintenance and construction of streets, sidewalks and medians. Its budget goes toward capital expenses such as materials and labor. Unlike other city departments, the city street division does not rely on the general fund for operating expenses. Funding comes from a combination of city, state, county, and federal sources.\(^73\)

**Parks and Recreation Department**
This department is the caretaker of Port Orchard’s 71.7 acres of parks and recreation areas in the city and is allocated approximately 5% of general fund expenditure.

**Water Sewer Utility**
The City of Port Orchard owns and operates its own water utility. The majority of utility expenditures are covered by user fees levied on residents and businesses. Other sources of funding come from the state and county.\(^74\)

**Storm Drainage Utility**
A requirement of the Clean Water Act, the storm drainage utility is tasked with storm drainage and surface water management. Most of the funding for the storm drainage utility comes from user fees levied on residents and businesses, with minor amounts coming from the county and state.\(^75\)

**Debt Service**
Port Orchard debt service includes general obligation bonds from 2003 and debt service from 1984 refunding.\(^76\)

**Port Orchard Municipal Court**
Separate from the Kitsap County justice system, Port Orchard has its own municipal court. In the three years from 2010 to 2012, the Municipal Court heard an average of 1,064 cases per year.\(^77\)
6 Land Use

6.1 Introduction
The Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan is an explicit statement of a community’s land development and environmental protection policies. Policies in the Land Use Element should be implemented via tools such as zoning, regulations, and design guidelines that accomplish community aims pertaining to its spatial area.

6.2 Zoning Overview
Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan
Port Orchard Land Use Designation
The Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan lists seven land development designations in order to accommodate for each type of land use with its own specifications for development: Open Space/Conservation, Low Density Residential, Medium Density Residential, High Density Residential, Public and Community Spaces, Industrial/Manufacturing, and Commercial Retail-Office. These land designations are important in determining land uses for different areas of the city that will fulfill particular needs and goals. They are also important in complying with the Washington State Growth Management Act. The Act requires Port Orchard to increase in density to accommodate more jobs and housing, so designating more land for High- or Medium-Density Residential will be important to the city’s future. Port Orchard is largely a residential city. As indicated in the Comprehensive Plan, the “residential” category comprised 59.5% of the city’s total acreage. After residential, the city’s second highest land use is commercial (12.8% of land), then community facilities (11.6%), greenbelt (9.9%), and finally employment opportunity (4.7%) (see Table 8).

Land Use Goals and Challenges
Through tools such as land use designation and zoning, the city intends to accomplish particular goals in envisioning its future. These goals consist of providing a variety of housing and employment options, preserving open space, developing a multi-modal transportation system, and promoting physical activity. The City has asserted that the existing breakdown of land use classifications has served it well, yet the City still
anticipates future challenges associated with growth. These challenges include traffic congestion, reduced air quality, and a loss of the local character. Port Orchard has expressed great concern over the loss of the city’s character in the face of growth, and the City offers some methods of mitigating the impacts density increases, such as providing open spaces, maintaining consistent architectural styles, and using infill and redevelopment. Nevertheless, with these challenges that Port Orchard faces, the City’s land use designations are particularly relevant for the city’s future (see Error! Reference source not found.).

**Zoning Patterns**

In the past several years, the City has annexed a significant amount of surrounding land (3,578.84 acres between 2007 and 2012), and these additions have increased the residential land supply. The City’s annexed McCormick West region consists of 619 acres and extends the city limits westward. This area was rezoned in October 2012 from Mixed Use to Medium Density Residential (8 units per acre). In addition to this large annexation, the city council approved a rezoning of two other properties for residential purposes in 2013. Port Orchard rezoned 4 acres of Sidney Road SW that were previously Commercial to Residential 4.5 units per acre (Low Density Residential), and the city also rezoned 76 acres north of Clifton Road and East of Feigley Road from the Employment – Industrial/Office designation to Residential 8 units per acre.

**6.3 Regional Plans**

**Washington Growth Management Act**

The Growth Management Act codified land use planning requirements for cities and counties and provided a common statewide framework. The purpose of the act is to counteract unsustainable growth patterns (e.g. suburban sprawl) and to mitigate the impacts of human development on the state’s natural resources and vulnerable ecosystems. Under the act, all urban development must be contained within the Urban Growth Area boundaries. The act requires counties to incorporate population growth projections into the planning process and mandates that a variety of residential densities be accommodated.

Port Orchard is designated as an Urban Growth Area in the Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan. The City is required to plan for population growth by establishing
an appropriate mixture of residential and employment-oriented land uses. The Growth Management Act also requires that parks and open spaces be established to meet the city’s anticipated recreational needs.

**PSRC Vision 2040**
The Puget Sound Regional Council’s Vision 2040 indicates that the region expects to receive a population increase to 5 million residents by the year 2040 and consequently anticipates a need for 1 million new jobs by then as well. The Puget Sound Regional Council has designated Port Orchard as a “small town” in their Vision 2040. Although this designation indicates that the area will remain small, Vision 2040 states that small cities should still maintain vibrant centers that provide jobs, services, culture, and housing for the local community. Additionally, the small cities of the Puget Sound region will accommodate 8% of the region’s population growth and 6% of the employment growth. Increases in housing and changes in development patterns are of great concern to the land use patterns of Port Orchard, as the city will have to adapt to these increases in population with more jobs and housing.

**Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan and Port Orchard/South Kitsap Sub-Area Plans**
The Port Orchard/South Kitsap Urban Growth Area is adjacent to the city and overlaps with the city’s Urban Growth Area. The County sub-plan identifies the land use of these adjacent areas as “primarily suburban in character with single-family residences dispersed throughout and auto-oriented commercial uses located along major transportation corridors. Pockets of medium- and high-density residential uses can be found near neighborhood commercial centers”. In addition to policies promoting orderly, balanced, and compact land use that preserve community character and environmentally sensitive areas while providing sufficient development capacity to support growth, the Sub-area Plan Policies promote:

- Maintain[ing] and enhanc[ing] downtown Port Orchard’s role as the “urban center” for the South Kitsap/Port Orchard region” by emphasizing its development as an active, mixed-use, transit-oriented center connected to its waterfront;
- A compact land use pattern focusing growth in urban areas by re-examining building height restrictions and reducing off-street parking;
• A coordinated and connected system of open space and shoreline access; and

• City/County coordination to create Transit-Oriented Development and pedestrian connectivity.89

**Adopted Kitsap Countywide Planning Policies**

The City is required to update its plans in accordance with Countywide Planning Policies. A Countywide Planning Policy is a written statement that establishes a policy framework to ensure consistency and coordination in the development of city and county plans.90 Thus, the goals and policies in Port Orchard’s updated Comprehensive Plan must be consistent with the recently updated Kitsap Countywide Planning Policies. In addition to the shared vision of maintaining community character and quality of life while responding to population growth, Countywide Policies:

- Direct population growth to cities, Urban Growth Areas, and centers;
- Encourage preservation of open space, critical areas, and natural resources;
- Facilitate city annexation and/or incorporation of urban areas as intended by the Urban Growth Area Management Agreement; and
- State that “the Comprehensive Plan of the City should reflect land use planning for the entire Urban Growth Area.”91

The Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan update must also account for updated population growth targets.92

**Hearings Board Remand**

An August 2011 decision by the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board found Kitsap County non-compliant with the Growth Management Act in its 2006 Comprehensive Plan Update process. The Board concluded that the County’s land capacity analysis was flawed, and that the minimum densities permitted were too low.93 In response, the 2012 Proposed County Comprehensive Plan Amendments propose shrinking the Urban Growth Area and raising minimum densities (see Table 3).94

This change in the Urban Growth Area would have significant implications for land use by increasing density in a concentrated area. The county would then need to revise its growth management strategy and reevaluate its land use policy tools for enacting this change.
6.4 City Sub-Area Plans

Overlay Districts

An overlay district is a set of additional development regulations applied to a geographic area that requires special attention. These added requirements reflect a set of goals and policies designed to address the challenges or opportunities specific to a physical area (or a collection of areas). Overlay district regulations are superimposed over the underlying zoning designations.

Downtown Overlay District

The City has designated a Downtown Overlay District to promote the unique interests of the city’s commercial center. The district includes the downtown center and two “gateway” zones on either end of Bay Street. This area will serve as a “vibrant center for transportation, culture, civic government, commerce, retail, and recreation” and will be a vital area for future growth. The district is bordered by land zoned for medium to high density residential use, which will add residential growth to support the commercial growth of the city.\(^95\) This area has higher height building limits to support the density goals of the city.\(^96\)

View Protection Overlay District

The View Protection Overlay District runs adjacent to downtown, following the contour of the shoreline. Buildings located here are subject to height restrictions intended to preserve the scenic quality of this area. The maximum height allowed is 15 feet for residential structures and 27 feet for commercial development.\(^97\) These restrictions illustrate a critical challenge to development in Port Orchard in supporting a range of development densities, which includes the location of high-density residential near shops and services. This action may conflict with the desire to protect existing residential communities and viewsheds.

Tremont Corridor Overlay District

The Tremont Corridor Overlay District establishes a specific vision for the area around Tremont Street between Sidney Road to SR 16. As one of three primary entry points into the city, this area is significant in establishing the city’s image to travelers and residents. All new developments must include pedestrian amenities, and developments are discouraged from creating direct access. The section between Pottery Avenue and
SR 16 is recognized as a Hospital Benefit District, including the Harrison Hospital Urgent Care campus, Group Health facilities, several residential parcels, and a mixed use development. Land use policies for this area are intended to retain a mixture of healthcare industry commercial development with a variety of housing options within walking distance. This approach was established by the Tremont Corridor Specific Plan and further developed in 2008 by a sub-committee of professional planners and stakeholders.

**Shoreline Management Master Program**
The Shoreline Master Program encompasses a wide variety of considerations, including which land uses are appropriate and desirable along the shore. The primary land use implications of this element are that preference is given to water-dependent land uses along the shoreline and that a diversity of uses (including housing, commerce, industry, transportation, public buildings, education, recreation and natural resources) is desirable.

**Government/Civic Center District**
Port Orchard is home to the Kitsap County seat and its complex of facilities, and the County is subsequently Port Orchard’s largest employer. The boundaries of the government campus are established by agreement between the City and the County. Policies proposed in the Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan are derived from the Kitsap County Campus Master Plan. Taking a 40-year view, the County in its Campus Master Plan anticipates a gradual expansion of its facilities. Input from residents highlighted the need to protect nearby residential neighborhoods from the visual and traffic impacts of the activity associated with the Campus. The Government/Civic Center Overlay District was created to specify the aesthetic and design of a Campus-like government complex and buffer it from surrounding neighborhoods.

Policies in the Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan strive to meet the needs of the county government for expansion by addressing parking, office space, and limited private commercial development (of supporting services). It recommends zoning changes to allow mixed uses, such as professional offices, to buffer residential areas. Plan policies establish a design review board and accompanying criteria. Strategies for improving pedestrian mobility within the campus and the outside areas are encouraged. Some of
the strongest policy language in the Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan requires pedestrian-friendly development, including creation of a pedestrian plaza to serve as a public gathering spot.\textsuperscript{102}

\section*{6.5 Legacy Plans}

\textbf{Generations of Plans/Historical Context}

Port Orchard’s planning challenges have been recurring for decades. The City’s first Comprehensive Plan identified protecting the beauty, character, and quality of life enjoyed by city residents while accommodating population growth as the overarching theme in 1965. This theme remains consistent with the goals and plans as outlined since the adoption of Growth Management Act and subsequent plans. Other plans and studies identify a second set of challenges faced by the community that are very much significant today: envisioning a cohesive community identity based on a revitalization of the historic downtown, and capitalizing on the city’s resources by activating the waterfront and connecting it to a revitalized downtown.

\textbf{The Waterfront Revitalization Project, 1983}

The Waterfront Revitalization Project intended to serve as a promotional document to guide and facilitate involvement of local interest groups and community leaders, the report identifies Port Orchard’s regional setting, natural beauty, historic architecture, and the waterfront as significant “outstanding natural and developed resources.”\textsuperscript{103} It was suggested that the City should modify its image and role by “reasserting and promoting” these assets by establishing design guidelines for the historic downtown and connecting it to the waterfront.\textsuperscript{104} Tying the area’s future to tourism and recreation, projects to enhance aesthetics and pedestrian activity were developed to create an active market area that is distinct from outlying commercial activities. The project also emphasized the need for commitment from public officials for the implementation of complex, long-term goals.
7 Natural Resources & The Environment

7.1 Existing Conditions & Features

Port Orchard is surrounded by lush natural landscapes, diverse wildlife and pristine beauty. The downtown area is close to sea level on the south shore of the Sinclair Inlet, while the rest of the city is generally spread out to the south and east of downtown, at higher elevations.

Shoreline

The majority of Port Orchard’s shoreline has been highly modified, especially around Bay Street; a third of it is publicly owned and is more urban and developed compared to other areas. The water and sediment quality of about half of the shoreline has been assessed as generally not clean, with some areas violating water quality standards as of 2012. However, the Sinclair/Dyes Inlet Water Quality Improvement Project that is currently being implemented treats a portion of the water on the eastern side.

Wetlands and Lakes

Port Orchard hosts a variety of wetlands. Along the shore, there are stretches of tidal aquatic beds. Further inland, shrubbery and emergent wetlands appear most frequently with a scattering of forested and aquatic bed wetlands.

There are two lakes that fall partially within the city limits, but hold joint jurisdiction with Kitsap County. Both lakes are bordered by a mix of undeveloped tracts of land, parks, and a limited amount of residential development.

Vegetation & Wildlife

Port Orchard’s waterfront is part of a marine nearshore habitat, which provides for a variety of wildlife species. Most of these species are highly sensitive to their environment and are identified as priority species with critical habitats.

The existing inventory of vegetation within Port Orchard is centered on nearshore habitat as well. The Bay Street shoreline consists of a mixture of landscape and invasive species. The shoreline of the Gorst/Sinclair Inlet Wildlife Sanctuary, however,
features primarily of grasses and tidal vegetation, followed by deciduous plants, and shrub and invasive species.

### 7.2 Municipal Level Plans & Regulations

#### Comprehensive Plan

The Comprehensive Plan contains several elements dedicated to the function and preservation of natural systems. The plan separates the different goals and policies into regulatory and non-regulatory efforts. The critical areas that are regulated include geologically hazardous areas, critical aquifer recharge areas, wetlands, frequently flooded areas, and fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas. Non-regulatory policies include habitat planning, salmon recovery projects, and water resources management.

The main goals of the Natural Systems Element of the Comprehensive Plan are to protect the public from geological and flooding hazards and effectively manage them, protect aquifer recharge zones and the water resources throughout the area, and preserve biological diversity & fish runs. These goals are consistent in the other existing plans and regulations.

#### Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO)

The CAO is the regulatory document that defines the laws regarding environmental protection. It is found under Title 18 of the City of Port Orchard Municipal Code and features several sections regarding specific enforcement of fish & wildlife habitat management plans, wetland preservation, and the protection of aquifer recharge areas, among others. The regulations within support the goals and policies of the other city-level comprehensive plans and visions. Because this document contains the specific policies enforced by the government, the CAO is used by developers, planners and inspectors to make sure development adheres to specific environmental protections.

#### Blackjack Creek Management Plan

This plan from 1987 by FishPro details the management of Blackjack Creek, one of the most important salmon habitats in the area. This analysis shows which species thrive in the creek, like the early returning chum salmon, Coho salmon, and steelhead trout. In addition to the wildlife inventory and water quality studies, it also lays out a plan to
protect and preserve the area for future generations, working with shoreline management and land use regulations.

**Ross Creek Management Plan**
Much like the Blackjack Creek Management Plan, the Ross Creek Management Plan derives from a study from 1992 that includes the initial conditions of the creek, suggested development practices, and opportunities to preserve and protect that landscape.

**Port Orchard Shoreline Master Program**
Port Orchard's Shoreline Master Program works in conjunction with both the city’s Comprehensive Plan, as well as the Washington State Shoreline Act, to protect and restore the shoreline as an environmental resource. The program achieves these goals by regulating development within 200 feet of shorelines designated by the state. In Port Orchard, this consists mostly of marine shoreline as well as the freshwater shores of Blackjack Creek. Some of these shorelines fall under joint jurisdiction with the Kitsap County Shoreline Master Program. This program also promotes public health, safety, and welfare by providing guidelines and regulation procedures for the future development of Port Orchard's shoreline resources and identifying opportunities for restoration and enhancement.\(^{115}\)

**Shoreline Restoration Plan**
The Shoreline Restoration Plan identifies a number of project-specific opportunities for restoration on both public and private properties in Port Orchard. The plan also identifies ongoing County programs and activities, restoration partners, and recommended actions consistent with a variety of watershed-level efforts. Although there are several restoration projects included, the Sinclair/Dyes Inlets Water Quality Improvement Project is not included.

**7.3 County Level Plans & Regulations**
**Surface and Stormwater Management Program (SSWM)**
SSWM is intended to protect “people, property and natural resources by reducing flooding and stormwater runoff, preserving groundwater quality, restoring fish habitat, and preventing stormwater pollution.” Funded services from this program include
construction, inspection, and maintenance of drainage improvements, water quality protection, public education and involvement, as well as water resource planning.\textsuperscript{116}

**Kitsap County Shoreline Master Program (SMP)**
The Kitsap County SMP is currently being updated. A Cumulative Impacts Analysis was prepared as a supporting document to analyze the existing program, looking critically at the potential cumulative ecologic impacts of development on marine and freshwater shorelines. The ultimate goal of the impact analysis is assesses whether or not the different segments of the current SMP is adequately able to achieve a zero net loss of ecological shoreline functions.\textsuperscript{117}

### 7.4 State Level Plans & Regulations

**Washington State Shoreline Management Act**
The overarching goal of the Washington State Shoreline Management Act is “to prevent the inherent harm in an uncoordinated and piecemeal development of the state’s shorelines.”\textsuperscript{118} This includes all marine waters, and freshwater bodies that meet certain criteria, as well as their associated biological wetlands, river deltas, and floodplains. The three emphases are to encourage water-dependent uses, protect the natural resources it offers, and to promote public access to the shore. Under this act, each city and county with state shorelines must prepare a Shoreline Master Program (SMP) specific to their region.

**Growth Management Act**
The Growth Management Act mandates that towns protect environmentally sensitive areas from development. These laws empower cities to classify, protect and preserve critical areas and other natural habitats.

### 8 Public Safety and Community Well-being

#### 8.1 Police, Fire, and Emergency Response
The City of Port Orchard maintains its own Police Department, while fire and emergency medical services are provided by South Kitsap Fire and Rescue. The crime rate of Port Orchard is higher than the national average, and the City saw an increasing number of police calls from 2006 to 2011. The overall public perception of safety is relatively high,
with 85% of residents feeling safe at home and 90% feeling satisfied with the level of police service (see Error! Reference source not found.).

The City lies in the coverage area of South Kitsap Fire and Rescue District, with emergency medical services being the community’s most requested service from South Kitsap Fire and Rescue.

**Police Facilities and Services**

The Police Department currently occupies the bottom floor of City Hall. The Police Department also leases space in the McCormick Woods Golf Course Maintenance shed as office space. The Port Orchard Walmart has provided a small substation inside of their store on Bethel Road at no cost to the police department.

**Fire and Rescue**

The City of Port Orchard formerly maintained its own Municipal Fire Department, which was merged with Kitsap County Fire District 7, which served the greater South Kitsap area. In 2005, Kitsap County Fire District 7 was renamed South Kitsap Fire and Rescue to better represent the communities served. South Kitsap Fire and Rescue is contracted to provide fire and emergency medical services to the City of Port Orchard.

There are currently two manned fire stations located within the City of Port Orchard: Station 17, located at 7990 McCormick Woods Drive SW, and Station 31, at 200 Tremont Street. The South Kitsap Fire and Rescue maintains a career staff of 84 and also utilizes over 50 Volunteer Firefighters.

In 2012, total department expenditures were $13,776,893 while total revenues were $14,031,316. Primary expenditures go toward fire suppression and emergency medical services. The majority of department revenues came from EMS and fire taxes levied on properties.

**8.2 Hazard Mitigation**

Portions of Port Orchard are highly susceptible to flood and earthquake damage. The City has a history of flooding, especially in Downtown along Bay Street, which is an area built along the shoreline on fill land. In addition, the City’s hills present a high risk for
landsides during earthquakes or from storm water runoff during heavy rain events. The City has laid out positive steps to restrict building in high-risk areas, but little information is available to gauge the level of implementation or effectiveness of these policies.

**Primary Hazards**

**Flooding**

Flooding occurred in 2007, 2010, and 2012 and continues to presents a major challenge to the City, particularly to business owners in Downtown. In 2007, heavy rains led to flooding of businesses along Bay Street and created a large sinkhole near the Hi-Point Shopping Center on Bethel Avenue. The impact of rain events, such as these, are exacerbated at times of high tide in Sinclair Inlet, and by the low elevation on the western end of Bay Street, which was primarily built on filled land. In addition, the City’s steep hills become saturated with water, further compounding the problem by either seeping into buildings built at lower elevations or by overwhelming the storm water system with runoff. The City’s Shoreline Master Program contains existing policies in Section 6.4: Flood Hazard Reduction, which give guidelines to discourage development in flood-prone areas (see Error! Reference source not found.).

**Geologic Hazards**

Port Orchard is located in a seismically active region along the Seattle Fault Zone and in the larger Cascadia Subduction Zone. This position puts the City at risk for upper plate, plate boundary, and lower plate earthquakes, such as the Nisqually earthquake which struck the Puget Sound in 2001. Many of the buildings Downtown or near the shoreline are susceptible to intensified ground-shaking and liquefaction during an earthquake due to being constructed on filled soil.

While historically rare, a tsunami generated by an earthquake would present a particular risk to Port Orchard due to its location on Sinclair Inlet.

**Landslides**

Landslides can occur as a result of seismic activity or during periods of heavy rainfall. This risk is particularly high along the shoreline and in Downtown due to the steep slope running down to Bay Street.
**Hazard Mitigation**
Flooding and earthquakes represent major threats to Port Orchard and have important land use implications for the city. It would be prudent for the City to assess property and structure vulnerability and to partner with property owners and the Kitsap County Department of Emergency Management to perform seismic retrofits where the risk is deemed to be greatest.

**8.3 Health and Well-Being**
Although no data was found for the City of Port Orchard specifically, data on the County level can offer an appropriate reference. The 2013 *County Health Rankings* report ranks counties across the nation according to their summary measures of health outcomes. Among 39 counties in Washington State, Kitsap ranked 15th in health outcomes and 10th in health factors, implying a slight mismatch between better input and worse output.

Residents in Kitsap County have identified health care as the most important factor for community health. Medical and dental health have been the most frequently used community services. The 2011 Comprehensive Community Assessment and 2013 Core Public Health Indicators reports from the Kitsap County Health District offer details on the status and trends of the County’s public health conditions.

Key findings outlined below reference trends occurring over various timeframes, but generally in the range of 10 to 15 years.

**Mental Health**
The self-inflicted injury hospitalization and suicide death rates are unchanged. The percentage of adults reporting mental distress and teens attempting suicide remain at stable levels.

**Behavioral and Lifestyle Health**
The obesity among Kitsap County adults is 27.6%, compared to the state average of 25.7%. Most teens do not walk or bike to school, and many teens and adults do not meet physical activity recommendations. More adults are suffering from high cholesterol and high blood pressure.
Child abuse and neglect, referral rate to Child Protective Services, adult smoking, and youth alcohol use have declined. Adult binge drinking and drug use issues have worsened, causing an increased rate of alcohol- or drug-related hospitalizations and deaths. Fewer teens are abusing alcohol and pain killers, but tobacco and marijuana use has not changed. Although the teen pregnancy rate has decreased, the proportion of births to low-income women and the rate of low birth weight babies has increased.

**Access to Health Care**

Adults without health insurance or with health insurance that does not cover the cost of necessary medical care (uninsured or underinsured) has not changed. Fewer adults report having a primary health care provider. The ratio of civilian births paid by Medicaid has increased over time, higher than the State average. Fewer low-income adults report a dental visit in the past year compared to adults with higher incomes. Kitsap County has a shortage of mental health providers, and the Bremerton/Port Orchard area has a shortage of primary care providers. In South Kitsap, 1 in 25 children and 1 in 5 non-elderly adults are uninsured. Among them, those aged 18 to 34 and minorities are more likely to be uninsured.

On January 1, 2014, improved access to affordable health insurance through the federal Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) took effect. More than 27,000 uninsured Kitsap residents were expected to be eligible for public or subsidized health insurance.\(^{137}\)

**County Goal-Setting**

To address public health challenges, Kitsap Public Health District set goals in their 10-year strategic plan.\(^{138}\) Five primary issues have been identified by community representatives as Community Health Priorities for developing further strategies.\(^{139}\)

- Ensure access to affordable medical, behavioral health, and dental care for all residents;
- Make it easy for all residents to be physically active;
- Ensure all residents have healthier food options;
- Promote economic development that provides living wage jobs with benefits;
• Ensure all children and youth receive the support necessary to be healthy throughout life.

9 Concluding Remarks

Among many other factors, this report reveals that Port Orchard, in its Comprehensive Plan update, must consider:

• Planning for specified population growth targets in accordance with regional policies;
• Possible further annexation of unincorporated Urban Growth Areas;
• Higher densities within smaller adjacent Urban Growth Areas;
• Coordinated transit development and accompanying densities within the city and adjacent areas; and
• A connected network of open space and pedestrian facilities.

Two key challenges confront the City as it works to update its Plan. While Port Orchard has faced these obstacles before, it must strive to continue to find new and creative solutions to overcome obstacles that have prevented the achievement of some of the community’s most important goals.

9.1 Challenge 1: Engage the Community

The update of the Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan provides an opportunity for the community to reevaluate its development plans and local needs. The Comprehensive Plan provides a useful vision and framework for how the city will grow. However, this plan does little to advance the community interests that have been expressed in other planning efforts. The City should engage businesses and residents, to revisit its Comprehensive Plan goals to better align programs and investment priorities with the current needs of the community.

9.2 Challenge 2: Revitalize Downtown

Some of the challenges and opportunities in planning for the City have been recurring for decades. Of particular importance is balancing long-term preservation of the single-family and rural character of the community while implementing policies that achieve increasing residential and employment density and accompanying transit goals. Proposals regarding revitalization of the historic downtown and waterfront activation address the City’s identity and highlight the need for coordination between stakeholders.
and leadership to accomplish long-term goals. Other opportunities for successful implementation of Plan policies are:

- Zoning overlays for mixed use and increasing densities;
- Historic downtown revitalization;
- Protecting natural resources and connecting open space network; and
- Continued or expanded County Government and Naval presence.

Port Orchard's abundant scenic beauty, natural resources, and open space are a baseline for mobilizing community involvement, setting the stage for a successful Comprehensive Plan update process.
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### Tables

**Table 3. Urban Growth Area Proposed Boundaries.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boundary</th>
<th>Size (acres)</th>
<th>Population Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>1018.4</td>
<td>12,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred</td>
<td>524.77</td>
<td>8006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4. Port Orchard Industries (2007 Economic Census)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAICS ID</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>No. of Establishments</th>
<th>No. of Employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4413</td>
<td>Automotive parts, accessories, and tire stores</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4431</td>
<td>Electronics and appliance stores</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4441</td>
<td>Building material and supplies dealers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4442</td>
<td>Lawn and garden equipment and supplies stores</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4451</td>
<td>Grocery stores</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>174.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4452</td>
<td>Specialty food stores</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>59.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4461</td>
<td>Health and personal care stores</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4471</td>
<td>Gasoline stations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4511</td>
<td>Sporting goods, hobby, and musical instrument stores</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4533</td>
<td>Used merchandise stores</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5121</td>
<td>Motion picture and video industries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>59.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5311</td>
<td>Lessors of real estate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5411</td>
<td>Legal services</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5412</td>
<td>Accounting, tax preparation, bookkeeping, and payroll services</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5413</td>
<td>Architectural, engineering, and related services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5617</td>
<td>Services to buildings and dwellings</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6211</td>
<td>Offices of physicians</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6212</td>
<td>Offices of dentists</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6213</td>
<td>Offices of other health practitioners</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>59.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6214</td>
<td>Outpatient care centers</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>174.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6241</td>
<td>Individual and family services</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7139</td>
<td>Other amusement and recreation industries</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>174.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7222</td>
<td>Limited-service eating places</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8111</td>
<td>Automotive Repair and Maintenance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8121</td>
<td>Personal Care Services</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Change in employment by industry sector (2002, 2007 Economic Census)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAICS ID</th>
<th>Sector</th>
<th>No. of Employees (2002)</th>
<th>No. of Employees (2007)</th>
<th>% Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Wholesale trade</td>
<td>59.5*</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>-44.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44-45</td>
<td>Retail trade</td>
<td>885</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>-18.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Information</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>-39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Real estate and rental and leasing</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>-14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Professional, scientific, and technical services</td>
<td>174.5*</td>
<td>247</td>
<td>+41.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Administrative and support and waste management and</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>-19.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>remediation services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Educational services</td>
<td>59.5*</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>-52.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Health care and social assistance</td>
<td>761</td>
<td>1019</td>
<td>+33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Arts, entertainment, and recreation</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>+33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Accommodation and food services</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>773</td>
<td>+9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Other services (except public administration)</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>-4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Number</td>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>Improvement Description</td>
<td>Cost Estimate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-1</td>
<td>Tremont Avenue (.65 mi)</td>
<td>Widen to 4 lanes from Port Orchard Blvd. to SR 16. Add bike lanes, sidewalks and roundabouts.</td>
<td>$14,500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-3</td>
<td>Bethel Ave W (0.5 mi)</td>
<td>From Bay St. to Bethel Ave, widen to 4 lanes with sidewalks, bike lanes, lights and stormwater.</td>
<td>$5,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-4</td>
<td>Lund Avenue Widening (1.0 mi)</td>
<td>Widen roadway to 4/5 lanes with sidewalks and bike lanes both sides per Kitsap County Greenways Plan.</td>
<td>$7,240,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-7</td>
<td>Jackson Ave. Widening (1.0 mi)</td>
<td>Widen to 3 lane roadway with sidewalks and bike lanes both sides, per KC Greenways Plan.</td>
<td>$4,000,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-9</td>
<td>Pottery Ave. Widening (.95 mi)</td>
<td>From Tremont St. to SR 16 overpass, widen to 4 lanes with sidewalk, lights and stormwater system.</td>
<td>$5,700,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-13</td>
<td>Sidney Ave. Widening (.95 mi)</td>
<td>Widen to 4 lanes with sidewalks, stormwater and traffic calming.</td>
<td>$5,700,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-1</td>
<td>Bay St. Seawall</td>
<td>Construct 150’ long pedestrian walkway along Bay St. with drainage.</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-2</td>
<td>Pottery Ave. (Cedar Heights) Sidewalk</td>
<td>Construct concrete sidewalk, curb, gutter, and stormwater system from Lippert Dr. to junior high school.</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N-5</td>
<td>Downtown Improvements</td>
<td>Replace/resurface existing sidewalks, curbs and stormwater culverts; construct traffic calming devices.</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-3</td>
<td>Bay St. Pedestrian Path</td>
<td>Install guardrail and street improvements from downtown to the City limits.</td>
<td>$4,400,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water-8</td>
<td>1.1 Million Gallon 580</td>
<td>Construct a new reservoir sized for ultimate development in the 580 and 660</td>
<td>$2,200,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>Cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water-10</td>
<td>Reservoir zones, planned for 1.1 million gallons of usable storage.</td>
<td>Provide a pipeline to transfer water from the City’s 390 Zone to the McCormick Woods area.</td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water-14</td>
<td>Well 9 Water Treatment</td>
<td>Provide treatment of Well 9 water to eliminate customer complaints. Options include filtration or discharging water to the adjacent Park Reservoir where oxidized iron/manganese can be captured.</td>
<td>$850,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water-16</td>
<td>Water main replacement program</td>
<td>Detailed in Water System Plan Page 7-6, Table 7-1A</td>
<td>$6,306,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer-A</td>
<td>Bay Street Pump Station</td>
<td>Engineering/Construction of a new Pump Station</td>
<td>$1,350,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer-F</td>
<td>Marina Pump Station</td>
<td>5,000 gallons per minute x 150 horsepower</td>
<td>$2,100,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer-M</td>
<td>Trunk G – Sidney Avenue</td>
<td>7,000 linear feet x 15-inch</td>
<td>$3,060,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: City of Port Orchard, *Capital Facilities Plan 2012-2018*, (Port Orchard, WA, September 2013).*
### Table 7. Primary and secondary schools near Port Orchard

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>School (italicized if within city limits)</th>
<th>Designed student capacity</th>
<th>October 2012 enrollment</th>
<th>October 2012 utilization</th>
<th>October 2018 projected enrollment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidney Glen Elementary School</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>653</td>
<td>140 percent</td>
<td>523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Port Orchard Elementary School</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>499</td>
<td>107 percent</td>
<td>456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hidden Creek Elementary School</td>
<td>526</td>
<td>556</td>
<td>106 percent</td>
<td>573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Heights Elementary School</td>
<td>729</td>
<td>539</td>
<td>74 percent</td>
<td>461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Heights Junior High School</td>
<td>605</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>103 percent</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marcus Whitman Jr. High School</td>
<td>796</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>93 percent</td>
<td>708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Kitsap High School</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>2192</td>
<td>111 percent</td>
<td>1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discovery Alternative High School</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>108 percent</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 8. Land Use Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use Designation</th>
<th>Acreage</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>12.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Opportunity</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenbelt</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed Use</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Density Residential</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-Density Residential</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-Density Residential</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 9. Crime Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Murder</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual Assault</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>-37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robbery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggravated Assault</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burglary</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larceny/Theft</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motor Vehicle Theft</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent Crime Total</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Crime Total</td>
<td>592</td>
<td>645</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix D: Record of Public Outreach

Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First Visit to Port Orchard</td>
<td>January 31st, 2014</td>
<td>Visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach (Handing out flyers, advertising, promoting)</td>
<td>March 1st, 2014</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Public Survey Goes Live</td>
<td>March 8th-April 1st</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
<td>March 8th, 2014</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with South Kitsap County School District</td>
<td>April 18th, 2014</td>
<td>Small Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Public Survey Goes Live</td>
<td>April 21st-May 16th</td>
<td>Survey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Whiskey Gulch Coffee Company</td>
<td>April 22nd, 2014</td>
<td>Small Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Public Market Stakeholders</td>
<td>April 22nd, 2014</td>
<td>Small Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with The Coffee Oasis</td>
<td>April 22nd, 2014</td>
<td>Small Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach at Farmer's Market</td>
<td>April 26th, 2014</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open House</td>
<td>May 3rd, 2014</td>
<td>Public Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outreach at the Rotary Club Meeting</td>
<td>May 6th, 2014</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emails and phone calls</td>
<td>Various</td>
<td>Outreach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The documents that follow are memos of our outreach efforts that we conducted between March 2014 and May 2014. These memos are summaries from meetings with individual stakeholders as well as condensed results from our larger public meetings. They are provided as a resource to display the issues and concerns that citizens introduced throughout the planning process. The memos also provide a basis for the policies in this plan, as everything derives from comments and concerns of the citizens and stakeholders in Port Orchard.
March 8 Public Meeting
MEMORANDUM

To: Port Orchard Studio
From: Andrew Brick
Date: April 3, 2014
Subject: Port Orchard Residential Density Breakout Session Summary

People expressed:
- New school needed, especially with the forecasted growth
- Parks desired, especially with tennis courts, baseball diamond, soccer field(s)
- Sense of serenity, rural character is important
- Environmental concerns: clean water in the inlet – sewage dumping? Radioactivity?
- Some skepticism of growth projections
- Traffic around new development (though we did not discuss this in depth)

Regarding densities, housing types, and locations, comments were:
- Small lots ok, as long as there is at least a patch of dirt to do some gardening
- Growth ok, but major changes are not desirable
- More housing (how much?) downtown is desirable
- Favor mix of types, targeting different income groups, with some emphasis on affordability

From the maps (snapshots are in the folder), I can gather:
- Group 1 (1st run-through): 8 du/acre focused mainly along Bethel Road, with a few on Sidney Ave north of Tremont, a bit in western downtown, and southwest of SR16/Sedgwick Rd
- Group 1 (2nd run-through): 12 du/acre focused mainly around the high school, with a bit in central downtown and on the eastern fringe of the city. 30 du/acre on the south end of Bethel Rd and west of SR16 on Sedgwick Rd
- Group 2: 4.5 and 8 du/acre north of McCormick Woods. 12 du/acre west of SR16 on Sedgwick Rd. 4.5 to 12 du/acre in greenfields on the southern end of Bethel Rd. Scattered low density elsewhere.
- Group 3: 8 to 20 du/acre heavily concentrated north of McCormick Woods and west of SR16 on Sedgwick Rd. 8 to 12 du/acre along Bethel Rd. Scattered development on Ross Point (greenbelt west of downtown). Scattered development elsewhere, including a bit downtown.

Summary: Not a whole lot of interest in putting much housing downtown. People seem to think Bethel Rd, Sedgwick Rd, and the area north of McCormick Woods are the places to put housing. Easy access to SR16 was part of what was behind this (except for the McCormick woods area – the pieces left uncovered by our cutout seemed really ripe for the pickin’).
MEMORANDUM

To: Port Orchard Studio
From: Monica Joe
Date: April 3, 2014
Subject: Port Orchard Identity Breakout Session Summary

In our three breakout sessions we gathered participants into a discussion on what they felt was Port Orchard’s identity (or lack thereof), what was going well within the city, what issues need to be addressed, and what suggestions they have for improvement. The general sense was that everyone could agree on major categories of each aspect, but the challenge will be to decide which aspects to focus our efforts on. Below are the summarized notes for each category of discussion. I have combined the notes from all three sessions to account for overlaps.

Identity:
- Small town (like the idea of it being a small town)
- Place to raise kids
- Bedroom Community
- Want to be more of a family community
- Church is a strong identity
- Where people go to retire
- No strong theme
- Never had to have its own thing, but needs one now

The Good:
- Appealing because you can get out of Seattle
- Like PO as a place to live
  - Right location, good quality of life
- Waterfront, breath-taking mountain views
  - Water based, a lot of trees and greenery
  - Great natural resources
- Great access:
  - The peninsula
  - Hwy 16, access to Vashon, West Seattle, Downtown Seattle (central location)
  - Equidistant from many different areas (regional center)
- Prettiest place on earth
  - Well-kept secret
- Small-town flavor
  - Genuine kindness in the people
  - Helpful neighbors
- Golf—a big deal in this town
- A lot of arts, live theater, galleries
The Bad:

- People take the ferry to somewhere else to go shopping
  - Only go to downtown to take the ferry or go to library
  - Do their shopping in Seattle
  - Take their friends to downtown Bremerton
- A lot of wasted land, empty spaces to build businesses
- Some feel disconnected from the community
- Traffic
- Building conditions
  - Backs of the buildings are not attractive downtown
  - Every building downtown needs more money
- Issues of flooding
- Overlooked within the county, feeling like funds are not going to PO
  - Money is instead going to Silverdale
  - Feel left out of the region, investments going elsewhere in the county
  - Everyone going to cities like Gig Harbor but need projects to bring people to PO
  - Fear that they will lose what they came here for if it became a regional center
- Independent

- Too much fragmentation

Suggestions:

- Fun events held here, possibilities to facilitate more events
  - Want to make something in downtown that would bring people in
- Want more recreation overall, hiking access
  - Like the waterfront park
- Downtown should be a part of their identity
  - Vibrant and alive downtown is needed
  - Need planters or more trees to screen it
  - Beautify the downtown
  - Need a reason to stop downtown and not just drive right through it Downtown
- More funds for improvement of Downtown
  - Property owners need a return on their investment
  - Need pride in the buildings they own
  - Many owners not from there
  - Need to look at rent/sq. ft. in downtown
  - Tax credits to invest in improvements?
    - Incentives to grow?
      - Was originally an investment from the Marina—return to that method?
- Refer to when PO was a cool place in the 50s
  - Festivals, events, family-friendly activities
- Don’t want 3 or 5-story buildings, people won’t come
- Needs more recreation—equipment rentals
- Gig Harbor has their old downtown but also a vibrant uptown—model?
- Unify the people for why they would want to be there
Summary of Activity:

Groups of approximately 4-8 people were guided through a visual preference survey in order to determine what types of streetscape and building types and designs were preferred in their town. There were three different groups which were each led through the same exercise. There were three sets of photos; four addressing a downtown context, four addressing the waterfront, and four addressing residential buildings and neighborhoods. Each individual was asked to rate each picture from 0 to 10 based on the desirability of each picture. They were given approximately 15 seconds to give an initial score. After we made it through all of the pictures, we went through each group of pictures and had people give their thoughts and reasoning about why they rated these pictures the way they did. In nearly every one of the three sessions that we did, we barely made it past the group of downtown photos in the allotted time. We never made it to talking about the preferences for residential buildings in any of the groups.

Notes from the Downtown Photo Survey:

- They were worried about the downtown feeling too modern.
- Any new development should fit the style of the current Port Orchard Downtown.
- Liked the idea of a café feeling with outdoor seating, places for people to mingle.
- Worry about height in downtown making things feel out of scale.
- In general they preferred the pictures featuring more public spaces, currently there isn’t much with the sidewalk being separated by the marquee.
- There were concerns with the amount of traffic going through Bay St., being a state highway. This hurts the pedestrian feel of the downtown making it feel busy.
- The amount of parking was also an issue, there needs to be more of it.

Notes from the Waterfront Photo Survey:

- Almost no one wanted to move in a direction similar to Port Townsend with “big” buildings right on the water. They thought it was too restrictive to uses.
- Most other waterfront pictures with trails on the water were received well.

(The Residential photo survey was not discussed in any of the groups)
Notes from the general discussion which happened in each session:

Session 1:

- The sidewalks are not very safe, Gig Harbor has safer sidewalks. The issue of safety for families and mothers wanting to bring their children downtown was discussed. One person said that they go elsewhere because they don’t feel safe as a pedestrian bringing their children downtown.
- In general there needs to be more businesses open for the weekend hours, not just restaurants. The downtown shuts down early (~5-6pm).
- There are not a lot of kid friendly businesses besides the candy store.
- There are a lot of boaters that could be coming downtown because of the very nice marina which has fuel. We need to take advantage of the marina.
- There needs to be businesses in a category somewhere between big-box and antique stores.
- There need to be more amenities for men, it seems that most businesses downtown cater to women, (i.e. antique stores).

Session 2:

- The issue of restricted parking downtown was brought up. There are many ferry commuters using the free parking downtown which keeps actual patrons of downtown from using them.
- The issue of the potential of the marina was brought up again, and businesses that could be in place to cater to the boaters.
- There was some optimism that the downtown is forming its own character, slowly but surely.
- There was a desire for more restaurants downtown.
- There was a concern brought up of height downtown and not building too high.
- The conversation diverged to talking about the increased traffic problems on Clifton Road after a new school is built.
- Also discussion turned to a possible marina entrance to downtown for people coming from the water.

Session 3:

- The buildings downtown are in need of maintenance to make them more appealing.
- There is a lack of availability of public restrooms downtown.
- There needs to be a variety of places to “get your ice cream and watch the bay.”
- Again, waterfront parking was cited as a huge issue, but incorporated without interfering with the character of the downtown.
- The needs of boaters was brought up again and the need to cater to them in order to draw more money to be spent downtown.
- Someone also brought up an idea for a shuttle facility for people needing to get from the ferry to the courthouse.
During the initial public meeting for Port Orchard’s Comprehensive Plan update we had activities set up in the foyer of the council chambers. Participants placed pins on a map for their places of residence and employment. There was some initial confusion about what type of pins were used for which activity, so an analysis of the map results would be inaccurate. Regardless, see below for a picture of the map. In general, attendees’ homes and work are fairly distributed across the city.

Also, five boards posed questions about the city, with the topics being: quality of life; economic development; transportation; downtown; and general character. Meeting participants answered the questions with markers, and the responses are summarized below.

- “What are the best things about Port Orchard? What is it lacking?” (Quality of Life)
  - Waterfront location, but actual waterfront is not well used
  - Historic character and appeal
  - No vision – reference to City of Poulsbo’s new website
  - Topography, views, and environmental qualities
  - Bed and breakfasts, restaurants/eateries
  - “The people are fantastic!”
- “If a friend was visiting for the weekend, what would you want them to experience in Port Orchard?” (General Character)
  - Nice restaurants (clean, safe, good parking)
  - The marina
  - Ferry rides to Seattle and other destinations
  - Something to do on the water
- Parks and trails
- Entertainment and good food
- Older homes and antique stores
- Coffee in the shops, art galleries

- “What services or activities would bring you to downtown at least once per week?” (Downtown)
  - Larger library
  - Extended bike trails, complete bike trail
  - Starbucks, coffee shops
  - Entertainment, such as concerts and comedy clubs
  - Special events like outdoor movies and live music
  - More watersports (canoe, kayak, paddleboard, etc.)
  - Sunday breakfast
  - Banking
  - Senior homes, condos
  - After hours shopping and retail

- “Do you want Port Orchard to be a tourist destination?” (Economic Development)
  - “Yes. Natural resources, potential of downtown, history, foot ferries – all assets that attract tourists”
  - First make it attractive to the people who live here
  - Encourage our own community to be active and take advantage of recreational opportunities
  - If it can be as interesting as Port Townsend
  - But, but a theme is needed like maritime
  - Yes, needs more foot ferry service

- “How do you get around? Would you walk or bike if it was safe and convenient?”
  - Most people said they drive
  - More parking is needed downtown
  - Some indicate they would walk if paths were flat and ‘safe’
  - A couple said they mostly bike
  - Extend the bike trail, but save the houses
  - There are too many hills for walking and shopping
Focus Groups and Targeted Outreach
MEMORANDUM

To: Port Orchard Studio  
From: Mike Ullmer  
Date: April 23, 2014  
Subject: Outreach Meeting Summary - Whiskey Gulch Coffee Company

The following is a summary of my meeting with Samantha Smith, owner of Josephine’s Redeemed Boutique and Robert McGee owner of Whiskey Gulch Coffee Company and Fox Fire Prevention. This meeting took place at 2:30 on 4/22/14 at Whiskey Gulch Coffee Company in Port Orchard. We talked for approximately two hours. I wanted to hear their perspective on the problems and challenges facing Port Orchard, their motivations behind starting “Shop Annapolis” and their past experiences living and owning a business in Port Orchard. Robert has lived in Port Orchard since 1980 and Samantha grew up in Port Orchard.

Problems Facing Port Orchard:

- Apathetic business community downtown who are waiting for the city to help them rather than helping themselves
- Underutilization of park facilities which could be used to host events in order to attract people and produce tax revenue for the city. Mongoose, Raleigh and a skateboarding company contacted Kitsap County to hold an event at a skate park in Jackson Park which is operated by Kitsap County but is in Port Orchard. It was alleged that the Kitsap Council turned down this event because of their perceptions of what skater culture was, even though an event put on by these companies would have drawn a crowd near 3,000 to 5,000 people which would have brought in a lot of money to the city.
- The City Council has a history of not listening to the community and acting on what the community is saying.
- Kitsap County lowered the valuations of all of the properties in the county. This leads to lower tax revenue and then less money for the city to use to provide services, etc. Samantha gave the example of her house which she bought for $252,000 a few years ago was not reassessed at $184,000. This new valuation happened, I believe, the first day of the 2014 calendar year.
- The city does not keep promote the local economy in it’s new developments. Robert gave the example of the construction of the County Jail in Port Orchard which was constructed by a company in Oregon instead of keeping the contract local.
- Four members of the Port Orchard City Council are also board members of Kitsap Transit and this is a conflict of interest when it comes to making decisions regarding transportation.

General Comments from the Meeting:

- in favor of letting larger companies move into Port Orchard in order to create more tax revenue for the city
- Port Orchard has major potential. It has been around for twice as long as Bainbridge Island, why aren’t they as successful as Bainbridge?
TO: Port Orchard Studio, Nick Bond
FROM: Ross McFarland and Monica Joe
DATE: April 22, 2014
SUBJECT: Summary of Stakeholder Outreach to The Coffee Oasis, Paul Morris

On Tuesday, April 22, we met with Paul Morris, the supervisor of the Port Orchard location of The Coffee Oasis and stakeholder in the business community as well as the youth community in the city. The primary mission of The Coffee Oasis is to offer a community gathering space and to support homeless and street youth through job training, case management, and other services. The Coffee Oasis has been in Port Orchard for 3 years (with a prior location on Bethel Avenue), and recently relocated and opened Downtown on March 1. Below is a summary of primary issues and ideas that were discussed during our meeting.

Community Gathering Spaces
• Create places for teenagers to hang out at night.
• Encourage and support coffee shops, restaurants, etc. which serve as spaces for individuals to interact and engage in a larger community identity.
• Allow for places in which citizens encounter each other and broaden the sphere of influence in their lives, encouraging greater awareness of the people and issues in their community.

Downtown Concerns
• Permitting process is difficult for signs, etc.
• Too many rules and ordinances Downtown create cumbersome barriers to businesses wishing to invest and grow Downtown.
• Skateboard laws are not friendly to youth who are looking to use the public space.
• There is a lack of a relationship with the local government for the organizations.

Increased Legitimacy of Youth as Community Stakeholders
• Continue to build upon programs, such as The Coffee Oasis, which aim to help youth become more community-minded.
• Much of the community is not aware of the needs of homeless youth in the area. Increase awareness.
• There should be more events geared toward youth and helping them get engaged in their community. For instance, The Coffee Oasis hopes to host a summer youth event on the Downtown Waterfront.

Vision
• Help Port Orchard continue “figuring out what community is”.
• Build a sense of “community responsibility” in the youth and in all Port Orchard citizens.
• Have a local government that is engaged with the citizens and is aware of their needs.
• The town needs a fresh perspective and new ideas from young people who want to get involved in the community
• It is very difficult to start a business in Port Orchard without buy-in from the community, which is hard for both of them. Not many people know about their businesses even a year after they opened.
• In the branding of Port Orchard, the nautical and pirate themes are too predictable and overdone.
• New events need to come to downtown that attract a younger crowd, some of the current events are not very successful.
• They generally did not like how people identify Port Orchard’s downtown only with bailbonds. There are only about 3 downtown and it makes sense because there is a jail just up the road. The bail bond shops have always been there.
• They are very much in favor of keeping the bones of downtown, but having the buildings renovated.

Some notes on Shop Annapolis and what they are trying to start:

    Their vision for the Annapolis area is for it to be a small retail destination separate from downtown. They are not seeking to associate with downtown but want to be something new in Port Orchard. So far Whiskey Gulch Coffee and Josephines Redeemed Boutique are the only retail establishments that are operating as part of this branding. Annapolis Fitness, which is run by Robert’s wife, is in the same building as Whiskey Gulch. There are some storage units across Bay Street from Josephines which have different artists selling items out of the front of the units, but without regular operating hours. Since the artists started selling those items, the rest of the storage units have filled up with other people seeking to do the same thing. There is now a waiting list for those storage units. This weekend, Sunday April 27th is the first Annapolis Sunday Market, which is going to be a weekly event for the area. It will run from 10-3 on Sundays and take place between Josephines and Whiskey Gulch. It is intended to be a market modeled after the Fremont Sunday Market with local artists selling their stuff. There will also be a band playing there as well.

    Both Robert and Samantha have high hopes for the future of Port Orchard and are invested in its future. They could be valuable contacts moving forward with this process. Robert in particular has had a lot of interactions with City Council and the Mayor and is actively involved in the community.
On April 22, I met with Susan Keller and Don Ryan, stakeholders in the development of the Port Orchard Public Market. Mr. Ryan is also President of the Bay Street Association. A summary of their comments is presented below:

- **Parking**
  - Waterfront parking is a big asset to downtown. Not only does it provide downtown patrons a place to store their cars, but the lots are good for market and festival use.
  - Several lots are available for potential parking garages
  - It is cheaper for foot ferry commuters to park at the waterfront all day (and collect a $20 parking ticket) than it is for them to drive to Bremerton and park. Mr. Ryan suggested increasing the fine if people are concerned about parking availability.

- **Downtown Development**
  - One of Mr. Ryan’s primary interests in pursuing the public market was to protect the other businesses he owns in Port Orchard. The town was dying, and he felt the need to do something to turn the town around. **Drawing tourists** to the town is an important goal of the market.
  - Developer interest in Port Orchard is present and growing. Investors not only from the city, but from the region, are expressing a desire to move on downtown properties.
  - From an economic perspective, the primary hindrance to downtown development is the **height restriction**. It is difficult to conduct economically-feasible development in three stories (south side of Bay Street) and two stories (north/waterfront side of Bay Street). High rises are not required, but four stories would be nice.
  - The goal with the public market is for it to be a catalyst for revitalization. From Mr. West’s perspective, it is working, and the residents of Port Orchard are responding extremely favorably. Ribbon cutting is tentatively set for late May.
  - Getting higher-end residential and office space downtown (over ground floor retail) is a great way to make downtown redevelopment economically feasible.
  - The foot ferry used to run until 2:00 AM, and the 10-11 bars that used to be downtown captured a lot of sailor traffic from Bremerton. At some point mid-2000s, Kitsap Transit purchased the foot ferry and subsequently stopped making runs at 8:30 PM (when the bus service shuts down). Mr. Ryan stated this change cut his revenues by about 30% overnight. As one of two big things he’d like to see (the other being the aforementioned easing of height restrictions), he advocates longer service hours on the foot ferry.

- **Vision**
  - Modern shops and restaurants downtown
  - Port Orchard is a “cool” place to go and attracts tourists from the region, capitalizing on its waterfront location
  - Bustling nightlife, downtown residents
  - Port Orchard attracts Bremertonians for dinner, drinks, and entertainment on a routine basis
Port Orchard Public Market Snapshot

- Full-service butcher (organic)
- Full-service live seafood and wine merchant
- Specialty lavender products merchant + hand-made clothing items
- Taqueria
- Ice cream and chocolatier
- Produce and craft store
- Restaurant/wine bar using meats from the vendors
- Day stalls (akin to Pike Place Market) in the central area
- Giant propeller icon at entrance (see photo)

Other recent success stories referenced:

- The Oasis coffee bar
- Café Gabrielle (bakery, too)
- Re-opening of Lighthouse restaurant and lounge
- Bay Street Bistro (I think)
TO: Port Orchard Studio, Nick Bond
FROM: Cole Kopca, Stephen Veith, Jason Garnham, Ross McFarland
DATE: April 26, 2014
SUBJECT: Recap on Saturday Farmers Market booth

The purpose of this memorandum is to summarize the opportunity of utilizing a public market as community outreach as well as thoughts and insights heard by Port Orchard residents at our Market experience.

What worked:
- Arriving early. We had 30 minutes to introduce ourselves to the market coordinator and set up
- Flip charts: Two large writing pads mounted on easels for writing comments with black markers
- Number of students: We had four students, which was optimum for two facilitators at a time which allowed time for the other two to accomplish other tasks
- MAPS; have maps out because it draws people into the booth. They love pointing at where they live and seeing their properties’ zoning designations
- Stack of flyers with information about how to stay connected and advertising our open house

What didn’t work:
- Anything requiring paper as any small amount of wind instantly turns a well thought out activity into a paper bombing of the parking lot
- Pre-planned agenda. This type of outreach works best for qualitative, conversational interaction with small amounts of note taking; either mentally or on aforementioned flip charts. The mental mapping exercise did not happen - too windy and too time intensive.
- Sign-in/sign-up sheet. Both probably because the wind discouraged us from passing paper and pens around and because nobody seemed interested in giving out their contact information
- Car rental: Ross couldn’t get into the parking lot to get the car so we had to drive his car instead. We lost time and had to spend more than we wanted.

General “opportunities” we heard (see our writing pads in studio for full notes):
- A lot about underutilization of the water and the Downtown. Specific downtown improvements: more and better shops, restaurants, bars, night life, clean up fire damage and mold, etc.
- Real opportunity to connect the town with bike and ped trails/sidewalks.
- We heard a lot of “more parks”, yet some members of the community think there are plenty of parks - just not access or advertisement that they are there.
- Opportunity to spend money developing something other than downtown.

General “challenges” we heard:
- City government does not listen to, or communicate well with, residents about their wants and needs
- While many want better retail downtown, several “artisan” business owners suggested that Port Orchard does not have a sufficiently large affluent population to support artisan shops. This lead conversation to bringing in more, better, and higher paying jobs.
- Growth thus far has been very euclidean (segregated); residential goes here, commercial goes over there. Residents expressed desire to see uses better mixed...mixed-use.
- Schools are not supported through levies - need more support for education/safe paths to schools.
- Business owners (or “family owner that has half of downtown”) not interested in redeveloping downtown until someone else spends the money.

TAKING IT TO THE STREETS
My perspective on a day at the Port Orchard Farmer’s Market

By Jason Garnham
UrbDP Port Orchard Studio, Spring 2014

On Saturday, April 26, four of our studio members spent the day at the Port Orchard Farmer’s Market as part of a public outreach campaign during the comprehensive plan update process. We went to the market with the following goals:

- advertise our “open house” meeting taking place at City Hall the following Saturday
- educate, inform, and engage individuals about the City’s comprehensive plan and community planning in general
- continue to gather information via responses to focused questions, pertinent to perceived planning-related issues and goals

This outreach effort was unique in that it involved a fundamentally “passive” approach to citizen engagement. Market attendees had no prior knowledge of our presence. We had no schedule of presentations, activities, etc. The context dictated a casual, friendly approach that required a lot of explanation and indirect questioning. Our first attempt at exploring such a technique, we learned a number of valuable lessons:

- know the venue:
  - Many of our paper-based “activities” such as mental mapping and survey questions were difficult or impossible to use in the open air because of wind.
- People are eager to engage
  - A significant majority of passers-by at least inquired about our presence. This surprised me. More surprising, still, is that many of those remained to talk. We confirmed that individuals enjoy sharing their thoughts about their community.
- Practice…
  - While engaging residents in general planning conversations proved simple, arriving at answers to focused questions was not. Gathering specific information via casual dialogue is a special skill that must be learned through practice.

More specific to our work with the City of Port Orchard, I observed the following key themes:

- The default topic of choice is the downtown and waterfront and, specifically, what both areas are lacking. Improved interface, a completion of the pedestrian network, and an expansion of amenities such as restaurants are desires held nearly unanimously by the community.
- Many citizens express cynicism and frustration that their opinions and desires are not heard or shared by city officials. Small town politics prevail. There is an obvious pride in the community and an equally obvious enthusiasm for the subject of long-term planning. We are on the right track in supposing that a long-term citizen involvement program, comprised of creative approaches to bringing planning issues to the community, will be of lasting benefit.
- There is a fair amount of interest in mixed-use development and walkability. Some individuals understand with a high degree of sophistication the relationships between, say, excess commercial zoning and high vacancy rates in retail buildings. Unexpectedly, many believe that higher residential densities adjacent to and within existing commercial areas are necessary to community vitality.
- Planning with a family-focus came up as a sensible approach to future growth. Investment in schools and evaluation of the location of new schools is important, as new facilities are planned in areas far from most
residents. Walkability is a concern. Lastly, investment in a youth-focused community center is of interest to young people and families in the area.

In summary, I believe that our passive engagement effort was extremely worthwhile. The real lesson learned is that people are eager to speak and to engage with issues when truly given the opportunity. A sustained outreach program that includes regularly scheduled (passive engagement?) activities such as this might pave the way toward a greater planning literacy and commitment from citizens, while better informing leaders (and possibly addressing accountability issues). In terms of our specific goals, our greatest success was in generally educating and informing people of the planning process and wrestling with important issues. Unfortunately, our information gathering goals fell short, considering the number of individuals we spoke with. Windy weather was a major factor. I also believe that our use of casual questioning to arrive at a useful set of responses will improve with practice over time.
The purpose of this memorandum is to summarize the studio’s first focus group event so other team members can more effectively engage with the public at future outreach events.

What worked:
- Arriving early. We had about 30 minutes to set up, introduce ourselves to staff and early arrivals, and help arrange furniture.
- Pre-planned agenda. We stuck to our agenda, which was 15 minutes for a group conservation about Port Orchard’s challenges and opportunities with particular focus on families and student life.
- Flip charts: Two large writing pads mounted on easels for writing comments with black markers.
- Number of students: We had three students, which was optimum for two recorders and one discussion leader.
- Sign-in/sign-up sheet provided with a pen on a clipboard: Nearly all attendees provided their name, organization, title, and email address. Copies of these sheets are available in the Gould Hall studio, and the Word file can be provided upon request to Scott.
- Stack of flyers near entry: Most attendees grabbed a flyer when they walked in, and those who didn’t acquired one when we mentioned it at the end of our session.
- Nick’s presence: The Development Director provided some technical and legal information.
- Car rental: Once an account was setup and linked to the studio budget, UCAR rental went flawlessly. Talk to Scott if you need to do this, or go to https://www.washington.edu/facilities/transportation/fleetservices/ucar/info.php. We returned to Seattle via ferry because of severe region-wide congestion.

What didn’t work:
- Not explaining more about the visioning and update process. State clearly what we are doing.
- Absence of the Comprehensive Plan itself. One or two hardcopies should be provided for participants to browse at future meetings. The ICR might also be good to include.
- Absence of a city map. A map of Port Orchard and surroundings should be provided for participants to orient themselves and draw and write upon.

General “opportunities” we heard (see our writing pads in studio for full notes):
- People want to get involved in their community/government, but need a medium to do so
- People in Port Orchard are friendly and tight knit
- Parks are a great regional asset
- School system is excellent

General “challenges we heard:
- Teenagers don’t have many places to hang out or activities to do
- There is ongoing residential development while many houses stand vacant
- Downtown has underutilized space and non-ADA accessible shoreline in some places
- It is unsafe to bicycle almost anywhere; compare to Port Angeles
- Struggles with affordable housing, nearby employment, and long/expensive commutes
This memo provides detailed results of a public open house held on 3 May, 2014 as part of Port Orchard’s Comprehensive Plan 2016 update. The open house consisted of five stations covering different topics; each was designed to introduce certain concepts and elicit feedback and opinions pertaining to a discrete set of issues:

- The idea of centers, whether or not they are preferred, and where centers should be designated
- Preferences regarding housing densities and land use (the preservation of open space)
- Preferences and issues regarding transportation networks, including the trail system
- Preferences and ideas regarding the development of the waterfront and waterfront amenities
- Preferences and ideas on public outreach and public participation in the planning process

Reports from each station present the purpose of the station or exercise, direct reflections of the input received from participants, and key takeaways as interpreted by the studio team. The “input received” sections are free from the team’s interpretation, while the “takeaways” sections hold team members’ subjective interpretations of the input and observations from the exercises.

**Centers Station**

**Purpose:** The purpose of this activity was to educate Port Orchard citizens about what centers are as defined by the Kitsap Countywide Planning Policies document. These centers provide focused hubs of growth and activity and allow resources to be concentrated in particular sections of town. This would allow for funds to be used more efficiently by the city toward infrastructure that could support this type of growth. Additionally, areas with increased activity and density would account for the projected population and employment needs for the future of Port Orchard.

**Input Received:** Within this exercise, we had display boards explaining what centers are as defined by Kitsap County along with definitions and outcomes of the four different types of centers: Town/City Center, Transportation Hub, Mixed Use, and Activity/Employment centers. After these boards, citizens were given the opportunity to express their concerns with challenges regarding the idea of centers in addition to the opportunities they see with this concept.
### Opportunities

- Tourist Activities
- More integrated transit systems
- The new market will hopefully be a catalyst to bring in more retail/tourism
- Extended bus system or even light-rail train service
- Ferry systems provide opportunities to work in Seattle
- Bus system through McCormick Woods and other underserved areas
- The new market could be like Olympia’s! Active + happening

### Challenges

- Finding appropriate locations
- No central theme for buildings
- Can be deceptively used
- Visible impact of old buildings or damaged property in downtown
- Who pays?
- Why so many bail bond places? Looks pretty seedy
- No condos downtown
- Difficult to keep businesses on the bottom floor [in mixed use buildings]
- Transportation changes = $
- Traffic + noise
- Existing burned out buildings downtown

---

**Vision Port Orchard**

Now it’s your turn: where would you like to see centers in Port Orchard?

Consider Existing:
- Uses
- Connections
- Access
- Infrastructure
- Space
- Needs

Port Orchard Boundaries
- City of Port Orchard
- Urban Growth Area

Your Centers (Stickers)
- City/Town Center
- Transportation Hubs
- Mixed Use Centers
- Activity and Employment Center
Some general observations of this exercise include:

- Desire for Mixed-Use and Transportation Hubs along Bethel between Lund and Sedgwick, and on Sedgwick between Sydney and Bethel
- Desire for Activity Centers in the Harrison Medical Area and along Mile Hill between Bethel and Jackson
- Desire for all center types centralized around the current downtown
**Takeaways:** While we heard a lot from residents about retaining small town feel and character, most were not opposed to strategically focusing growth in appropriate clustered areas. Most concerns, with regard to centers, revolved around funding. Residents did not understand or believe how something like a center could effectively happen and were also concerned with how pays for such development.

**Housing and Open Space**

**Purpose:** This station was designed to validate or refute citizen preferences for housing types, densities, and locations as currently expressed in the comprehensive plan. The exercise was also intended to judge citizen preferences with regard to striking a balance between housing development densities and the amount of open space that would be lost at various densities.

**Input Received:**

- **Locations:** Based on the map (hos_locations.jpg), results were fairly consistent with input received on March 8, 2014. Some higher intensity housing development is acceptable (to some) in downtown, along Bethel, and southeast of SR16 along Sedgwick. Lower and medium intensity development further from the Bethel corridor is preferable.

- **Parks:** As shown in hos_parks.jpg, participants indicated current use of South Kitsap Park, Central Park, the Boat Launch, and the downtown waterfront. Participants expressed a desire for the greenspace along Port Orchard Boulevard and Lundgren Park to be preserved.

- **Comments:** The following is an accounting of comments received as articulated by participants.

  - Keep downtown quaint; no condos; do not turn downtown into a valley of tall buildings.
  - In the planning process, it should be remembered why people come to Port Orchard to live: it is quaint, quiet, and rural.
  - Downtown housing is “ok” to put in.
  - Mixed use buildings are ok.
  - It is bad that there is no life in commercial zones after 5pm: crime/hooliganism/vagrancy appear in the evening
  - Keep big-box commercial businesses on the outskirts of town – out near Sidney/Sedgwick.
  - It is ok for development to have the look and feel of single-family housing, but have the internal functioning of an apartment building (visual preference).

  - Leave Port Orchard the way it is.
  - Preserve neighborhood-like character (small retail is ok).
  - Concern about the potential for downtown development to block views from the bluff.
  - Be mindful of view preservation.
  - Older homes on the bluff are a draw for tourists.

  - Conduct redevelopment first before permitting buildings on vacant land. (two comments)
  - Why is the beautiful waterfront a parking lot? (two comments)
  - Having Bay St as a thoroughfare (heavy traffic) is not very nice.
  - Is it possible to make elder care centers multi-story? They might take up less land that way.
**Takeaways:** Preserving the current character of Port Orchard appears to remain a high priority for many residents. Balancing this goal with population growth is the difficult task, but strong opposition to higher densities in certain locations was not encountered. Based on this feedback, the designation of centers — areas in which the city will attempt to direct growth and thereby retain current development patterns in most of the city — should be considered. These centers should have as part of their aim the preservation of Port Orchard’s rural character; this can be achieved with design guidelines (particularly regarding bulk) and potentially incentives to encourage the development to occur in these, vice other, locations.

**Trails, Traffic, and Parking**

**Purpose:** The purpose of these exercises was to gather feedback from the community regarding traffic issues, the trail system, bicycle routes and parking downtown. Each issue had 32” by 48” board with a map pertaining to each issue and a variety of questions regarding the specific issue. Each question was printed in a distinct color and if a citizen had an answer or opinion on a certain question they could place an appropriate colored dot matching the question on the map. Also, there were matching colored post-it notes on which comments could also be written if they wanted to elaborate on their dot placement.

**Input Received:**

**Bike Routes Poster**

**Which Streets are Safest to Bike on?**
- (no comments)
- 1 McCormick Woods

**If your kids bike, where do they bike to or which routes do they take?**
- (no comments)
- (No dots)

**Where do you wish there were safer bicycle routes for your kids?**
- It would be fantastic to have Bremerton and Port Orchard connected by a bike path
- Mile Hill would be a good place to have a continuous sidewalk and bike path
- Dots
  - 1 downtown, 1 at 166/16, 1 on baystreet near comfort inn, 1 at mile hill/horston, 1 at jackson/lund, 1 bethel, 1 salmonberry

**Where would you like to see bicycle infrastructure?**
- Need bike route connecting Bremerton and Port Orchard
- Access to Beach Drive
  - Through Town
  - Up Jackson
- Route to Manchester and Southworth
  - Also out Lake Flore Road, Jackson Road, Jackson-Lund Park
- Paved Shoulders are not the answers, pedestrians, broken down cars, bikes strollers All need more space
- Bike Lanes along Tremont
- Bike trail out to Manchester Beach! Used to ride Beach Drive but road is less safe now, beautiful ride
- Salmonberry Road needs pedestrian shoulder
Downtown Parking Poster

Where are the parking problems downtown?
- Break up all day parking to free up 4-5 hour parking, use shuttle for all day parking
- What a waste of nice waterfront
- 4-hour max downtown, no all-day parking for commuters on waterfront
- DOTS
  - 1 bay east of sidney, 1 library parking lot, 1 on the shoreline east of the foot ferry dock,
    2 parking lot near the water between frederick and sidney,

Where could we consolidate parking downtown?
- Kitsap Bank lot multi-leve (2) w/ library and parking on top
- Frederick and Bay, condemn this building and make it a parking garage
- Kitsap Bank lot, mixed use with retail on ground level plus floors of parking
- Consolidate parking away from the immed. waterfront for more park green and small businesses
- Cline and Kitsap, tiered parking structure shared by the city and county, all day parking, then limit waterfront parking to 4 hours
- Parking garage where Kitsap Bank lot is, enter from Prospect too
- DOTS
  - 1 sw corner frederick and bay, 3 parking lot on se bend of bay street across from kitsap bank, 1 parking lot west of city hall across bay st

Where would you like to park downtown?
- The water side of Bay Street, often these are full and these are the best spots to park when using downtown
- above ground parking at corner of Bay and Port Orchard Blvd.
- Different lengths in parking spaces
- small pockets of parking near shops
- even for 4 July fireworks, I’ve never had to walk more than 4 blocks to my downtown destination

Traffic Issues Poster

Which areas of the city do you experience traffic backups/problems?
- I would like a bus from Port Orchard to Silverdale
- Traffic backups in downtown at “rush hour”
- Kitsap and Sidney
- Downtown at rush hour, exhaust is bad and it is difficult to access shops
- DOTS
  - 3 in downtown, 1 at bethel/mile hill, 3 on bethel, 1 bethel/salmonberry, 1 Tremont, 1 bethel sedgewick, 1 sedgewick,

Where do you wish there were quicker routes/bypasses?
- (no comments)
- DOTS
  - 2 bethel/sedgewick

Where in your neighborhood are there traffic safety issues?
- High School speeders even with speed bump already in place
- Bethel Ave needs 2-way turn lane
- High school traffic totally uncontrollable in all directions
- need traffic light at Salmonberry and Bethel
- Please! We need the crosswalks that light up in front of Comfort Inn. The flags don’t work. I’ve seen so many people get hit or almost get hit
- DOTS:
  - 2 downtown, 1 downtown near comfort inn, 2 farragaut/mahan

**Additional Traffic Comments from other workshops**
- more sidewalks are needed throughout the city, especially on school routes (along Pottery in particular).
- Concern about traffic at the Bethel/Sedgewick intersection
- Need pedestrian lights at the crosswalk across Bay Street east of Rockwell (near Comfort Inn)
- The traffic signal at Salmonberry Road and Bethel Road should be studied for timing

**Trail System Poster**

**Which parts of the proposed trail system would you use the most?**
- Port Orchard Blvd. trail looks like a great place as well
- Blackjack creek would be a great place
- trails to accomodate quads for maintenance
- LOVE Port Orchard Blvd., but safety issues from traffic coming too fast on curves could be impressed
- DOTS
  - 2 on Blackjack creek, 2 on Port Orchard Blvd, 8 on waterfront trail, 2 on sidney/pottery, 1 on the ridge trail

**Where else should the trail system go?**
- improve teen trail across Blackjack Creek to Highschool
- DOTS
  - 2 on Olney Avenue, 1 on sidney avenue, 1 near Manchester

**Which parts of the trail should the city build first?**
- continue waterfront trail east first, then west
- DOTS
  - 11 on the waterfront trail, 1 on Mitchell Avenue, 2 on Sidney Pottery,

**Takeaways:** Regarding bicycle routes, there was only one place that was mentioned as being safe to bike and that is in the McCormick Woods neighborhood. There was also a desire for bicycle infrastructure on most of the main arterials through town including Bethel, Mile Hill and Tremont. A safer connection to Bremerton from Port Orchard around the Sinclair Inlet was also desired. It seems that there is a desire for some sort of bicycle infrastructure in Port Orchard because it currently has none and clearly there is a need, not just from residents but also for people who commute through Port Orchard on the foot ferry and also through to Bay Street.

Regarding parking downtown there were a few major takeaways from people’s responses. First, there are many ideas floating around about where to consolidate parking downtown. Clearly, there are people in favor of building a parking garage somewhere near downtown and the activity pointed out a few of these potential sites. Additionally, the idea of a shared parking system between the city and county workers was also discussed quite a bit. Last, there was a desire expressed to rethink the parking schedules downtown in order to address the taking of most of the parking spaces by ferry commuters.
Regarding the trail system in Port Orchard, there were quite a few people excited about the new trail system and the possibilities it creates for the city. Improving the connection between McCormick Woods and downtown through a trail was brought up as a priority, as establishing this connection would bring people between the two places on foot or bike and alleviate traffic for people traveling between the two areas. The waterfront trail was also another area that got a lot of attention as a place to prioritize building out the trail system first.

Lastly, regarding traffic problems in Port Orchard the major issue that arose was about the need to alleviate and control traffic problems around the High School. Also, pedestrian safety was brought up downtown and also near the Comfort Inn as many pedestrians have been close to being hit by cars which fail to stop for them. There was also concern brought up over traffic back-ups downtown, so a plan to alleviate traffic congestion downtown should be considered.

**Waterfront Station**

**Purpose:** To find out if people care about the Port Orchard waterfront, why or why not, and what can be done to improve it or preserve its character.

**Input Received:**

- **Map**
  - Port Orchard is one of only three regional locations with boat maintenance facilities (others are Port Townsend and Olympia)
  - Kayaks and a dock for them by the boat ramp
  - Contact Bryan Pertro, Myhre’s owner
  - Foot ferry from Manette (Bremerton)
  - Buildings need to be in better shape to bring in more diverse shops
  - Remote parking for downtown businesses, shuttle bus, Westbay shopping center owner has offered space
  - Aquarium and children’s museum!

- **Questions**
  - Is the waterfront important to you? Why or why not?
    - Yes, I live on a boat. I like living in a little town.
    - Views, bring people here, shops to visit
    - Yes – don’t own a boat, but enjoy the activity and taking the foot ferry
    - Yes – it’s one of our special assets and we love to use/appreciate it.
  - What would bring you to the waterfront?
    - The new market and library
    - Tuna boat, oysters, library, bakery, pub
    - Canoe, kayak, and bike rentals
    - Farmer’s market, library, ferry dock
    - No condos on Bay Street
    - Arcade or kid friendly areas
    - An active farmer’s market, more variety of stores and restaurants
    - Farmer’s market, art, and recreation
  - How can Port Orchard capitalize on its waterfront?
    - Great job on waterfront walking trails, how about to Ross Point?
- Tear down all the burned out buildings. Nice condos? More water access, better walking paths
- Better building facades, Starbucks
  - Your waterfront, what should it be?
    - Recreation plus tourism
    - A mix of all – pedestrian friendly
    - Natural and recreational develops tourism; working waterfront causes pollution

**Takeaways:** Port Orchard’s waterfront is unique but needs more attractions like businesses, watersports/rentals, and shoreline access(paths). Most people didn’t disconnect the waterfront from downtown, even though it extends far beyond downtown.

**Outreach and Participation Station**

**Purpose:** This exercise consisted of gathering written responses to a set of independently presented survey questions. Its purpose was to identify initiatives that will mobilize citizens and increase community spirit and activity (such as events and volunteerism), and to discover ways to bridge the information and participation gaps between city government and citizens. Also, several questions serve to follow up on earlier outreach by confirming our notions regarding community character and identity.

**Input Received:**

**What makes Port Orchard a great community to live in?**

- “Small town outlook”
- “Great people who want this to be a good place”
- “Small town feel”
- “Very nice people”
- “Quiet town”
- “Lots of things to do”
- “The environment & the people”
- “The small town feel”
- “Small town America”
- “Friendly community”
- “Beautiful landscape & weather”
- “Libraries, parks, community events”

**What would make Port Orchard a better community?**

- “Sidewalks, community gardens, artist-friendly venues”
- “Dilapidated empty buildings getting fixed and occupied”
- “Community involvement events”
- “More entertainment on waterfront”
- “More walking areas”
- “Stoplight at Salmonberry & Bethel”
- “Sidewalks”
- “Fill empty stores. Redevelop what’s there”
• “Focus on building what is already here”
• “More interaction between people and government”
• “More places to walk”
• “Music, outdoor seating, activities downtown”
• “More communication; interactive website”
• “Neighborhood groups”
• “Replace some council members who think ‘It’s all about me’ and who want to be ‘autonomous’”

If a town planning genie granted you three wishes for how you think Port Orchard should change over the next 10 years, what would you wish for?

• “Community food gardens”
• “The homeless would have a safe place to go to support the community and get back on their feet”
• “Lots of parks with trails”
• “Pockets of commerce throughout the city”
• “Parking downtown”
• “More city marketing for what we have”
• “Promote the small town feel”
• “Make it more walkable & livable”
• “Traffic light at Salmonberry & Bethel”
• “More community waterfront entertainment”
• “Traffic light at Salmonberry & Bethel”
• “More pedestrian friendly areas”
• “More sidewalks & pedestrian paths”
• “Better buildings downtown – better design, mixed-use”
• “More evening foot ferry service”
• “Sign ordinances redesigned for events – make them user friendly”
• “More jobs & higher wages”
• “Restaurants staying open later downtown”
• “Walk lights in front of Comfort Inn instead of the flags”
• “Fix Bay St. flooding problem”
• “Change building facades to reflect small town seaport Cape Cod look”
• “Fix conditions of streets: potholes, mow shoulders, weed”
• “Sewer lines on Division St. clean out required”
• “Businesses open on Mondays”
• “Restaurants open later especially on Sunday”
• “Repaint some of the buildings with awful colors”
• “Put businesses on waterfront and get rid of parking lot”

**Summary/Takeaways:**
- Community identity/character = rural, small town, quiet residential
- Key issues/desired improvements = walkability, active outdoor spaces, rejuvenated commercial areas, infrastructure improvements

What concerns or interests motivated you to join us today?
“Require surveys before developing; make it right when possible”
“Afraid developers will destroy our downtown”
“Improve the waterfront areas instead of having a parking lot on the best part of downtown”
“I’ve been seeing a lot of trees being cut down. We have lots of roads with no sidewalks. We need local food options. We need to help our homeless.”
“I want P.O. to remain quaint. Have downtown be a tourist attraction – no high rise condos yet. Businesses catering to boaters – kayak, rowboats, paddle boats, sailboats – bicycle rentals. Antiques, art market, restaurants, festivals. Move all day parking to off Cline, Quilt store”
“Member of Planning Commission. Making City a better place to live. Making City more inviting to tourists.”
“Like to see ideas for how the area/city will develop”
“Top down management fails... Bottom up works...”
“I love our place and its potential and I want to contribute towards the future.”
“A better city”
“Business, public safety, public involvement. Working front desk at Comfort Inn we have a lot of questions from guests/tourists.”
“I want the City to continue to grow and do well, more people we can bring into our city, the more everyone will do better.”
**Summary/Takeaways:**
- Working toward a better, growing city.
- Support businesses, but not necessarily developers.
- Potential for future improvements in the city.

Have you every participated in the land use planning process in Port Orchard? If not, would you like to?

- “Yes – involved in several studies over last 20 yrs”
- “1. No, 2. Maybe”
- “Yes – Downtown Overlay Dist., all of city council meetings”
- “Yes”
- “1. No, 2. Possibly Yes”
- “Yes, I have – Yes”
- “1. No, 2. Would like to”
- “1. No”
- “Yes, Jackie Blankenship”
- 5 have participated in the land use planning process before, 4 have not participated before

What can the City do to improve its community engagement? To reach you better?

- “Notice in utility bills; notice in city wide papers”
- “Have a Facebook page. Maybe it has one and I haven’t seen it yet. I check the Facebook group often.”
- “Have all council meetings at city hall – all should be videoed, no more council meetings in restaurants”
- “Postcards. Open Houses on “visioning” or future goals for city development.”
- “Community bulletin at a popular centrally located area (example: new marketplace, ferry!)”
• “Make all council committee meetings in council chambers and online.”
• “Be more receptive.”
• “More fliers / monthly newsletters. Posters put in and around the area. T.V.”
• **Summary/Takeaways:** More visible advertising in heavily trafficked areas and more accessible council meetings are two primary suggestions.

**How do you find out what’s happening in Port Orchard?**

- Newspaper
- City Website
- Word of Mouth
- City Facebook Page
- Other: Email, SK Politics Facebook Group

**What is the best way for the City to connect with you?**

- Direct Mail
- a postcard or letter
- email
- email list: inform about meetings
- readerboard – maybe as you enter town
- Port Orchard group on FB
- water bills
- public TV commercial
- online/email
- facebook/email
- monthly newsletters brought into the businesses
• **Summary/Takeaways:** All available outreach is necessary and potentially effective. Online communications critical.

**What kinds of community events or activities are you involved with?**

- City Government
- School
- Youth Sports
- Charity
- Religious
- Parks/Garden
- Neighborhood
- Business Org
- Fairs and Festivals
- Other: GMO Awareness Community Kitsap, USCG Aux (Water Safety), Quilter – Hospice – Harrison, Diabetes, Habitat for Humanity
• **Summary/Takeaways:** not likely a representative sample of population (low school/youth/religious response)
What kinds of community events or activities would you like to be involved with?

- “Festivals”
- “music for young and old “
- “more on the water events”
- “community meetings”
- “socials where the town can get together and share ideas to make Port Orchard better”
- “Safety (speeding, crime) in neighborhood”
- “community garden”
- “runs/walks”
- “Art!”
- “Boating”
- “Kayaking”
- “Bikes”

**Summary/Takeaways:**

- Promote more community events that highlight the waterfront.
- Advertise public meetings and/or devise new forums for citizen input.
1.0 Executive Summary

This report summarizes the results of a survey for parts of the Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan update for 2016. The survey was conducted online and distributed via social media, email, and physical flyers. The response period lasted approximately four weeks, ending on May 16, 2014. A total of 73 responses were recorded.

Each question on the survey was entirely optional. Topics included basic information about the respondents, and their thoughts on land use, housing, transportation, and the downtown in Port Orchard. Both quantitative and qualitative data was recorded.

Full records of responses are included in Appendix A (Quantitative) and Appendix B (Qualitative).

2.0 Method

The survey was built using the free online platform “Google Drive” and its “Form” document, which allows an unlimited number of customized questions. Answers are recorded in a separate online spreadsheet and can be automatically summarized in graphic form. However the style of these results were not intuitive and were reformatted to be more readable.

The survey went live on April 21, 2014 and was posted to the “Port Orchard” Facebook group. It was also distributed via the City’s Facebook page, in email announcements, and a URL was listed on flyers passed out at meetings and focus groups. The survey closed on May 16, 2014.

2.1 Reading this report

This report is divided into sections based on questions’ grouping in the survey. Except where noted, pie-charts are used for single-choice questions and bar-charts are used for multiple-choice questions. Summary and brief analyses for each quantitative question are below the graphics, and textual responses follow those.

3.0 Basic Information

In order to check if the survey answers were representative of Port Orchard, this section sought to identify who answered the survey, how they found it, and where they lived. There is a separate “Demographics” section discussed below.
The question about how people found the survey as actually at the end of the survey, but is relevant to see which outreach efforts were most effective. Clearly, social media was the top method. Email messages and links on the City website followed far behind.

Those who answered one of these were directed to another set of more specific questions. For those who answered “social media”, almost half found it through the unofficial Facebook setup by community members for sharing and discussion news, events, and other activities. The link was posted by a Vision Port Orchard team member three times on that page throughout the survey collection period. The 39% of respondents who found it posted by a friend likely saw the post being shared from that page. Only a few found it on the City website. Comments suggested the City should do more to keep people updated on current events and community activities. This indicates the need for strong, continued outreach to the public via social media platforms.

Of those who responded, 61% said they live within city limits. 13% live within the Urban Growth Area and 26% live in unincorporated areas or other cities (a map was provided). In anticipation of future annexations, it may be appropriate to reach out more to those who live in the Urban Growth Area.

When asked how long they had lived in Port Orchard, the largest answer (30%) was “20+ years” and the two second largest (26% and 22%, respectively) were “1-5 years” and “6-10 years”. Most respondents have either lived in Port Orchard for a long time or moved here relatively recently.

Another question asked about perceived status. One-third said they were employed and one-third said they were parents. 10% identified as other; alternate entries included “business owner”, “self-employed”, “empty nester”,

---

**Where do you live?**

- Within city limits: 61%
- Within the urban growth area: 13%
- Within unincorporated Kitsap County: 22%
- Other: 4%

**How long have you lived in Port Orchard?**

- Less than 1 year: 4%
- 1-5 years: 22%
- 6-10 years: 10%
- 11-15 years: 7%
- 16-20 years: 10%
- 20+ years: 30%
- Other: 1%

---

**Which of the following best fit you?**

- Student: 3%
- Employee: 32%
- Retired: 17%
- Parent: 31%
- Military: 6%
- Other: 10%
and “commuter”. In a trend that has been common with the Vision Port Orchard efforts, few students and military members were reached.

Two multiple-choice questions asked about people’s general perceptions of Port Orchard. Top answers were “an independent small town” and “a bedroom community”. When asked about Port Orchard should be in the future, the top answers were “a center for social activities”, “a tourist attraction”, and “an independent small town”. Fewer people were interested in the city becoming a regional center or an economic development hub.

3.1 Demographics

These questions were placed before the final page of the survey and were reemphasized as optional due to their sensitive nature. The goal of these questions was to see if the survey respondents were representative of Port Orchard’s general population.
All demographic questions were explicitly described as optional due to their sensitive nature, but 100% of respondents input their age and gender. The majority of respondents were in the 30-69 age range, which is about what might be expected. It is apparent that the very young and the very old are not connected with the City via social media or other mediums. The great majority of respondents identified as White. Further, there was a larger share of female respondents (59%) than male respondents (41%).

81% of respondents identified their annual income level. Over a quarter of people earn over $100,000 per year. Lower income brackets had progressively less answers and 5% of respondents indicated “I’m not employed”, this would include youth and retired people.

4.0 Housing

The goal of the housing questions is to see how people feel about different types of housing and perceived issues.

When asked what kind of residence they live in, 99% answered “single family home” (the other 1% was “duplex”); the latest Census shows that only 55.8% of residences are owner-occupied in Port Orchard, so these respondents are likely not representative of all residents.

Further, almost two-thirds of respondents said they pay one-third or less of their income on housing; in contrast, at public meetings we have heard that housing affordability is a problem. Based on survey respondents’
income levels, it is likely that most can easily afford their homes and are not personally concerned with housing affordability, availability, and diversity issues affecting Port Orchard.

And, indeed, when asked how future housing should be built most answers (61%) were “single family neighborhoods”, but the second-most (26%) answer was “houses and/or apartments mixed with commercial services”. After hearing from citizens at public meetings and focus groups, it seems that residents would not be opposed to the idea of mixed-use development and town centers.

At the end of this section respondents could elaborate when asked, “Do you have any other comments on housing in Port Orchard?” 27 respondents provided written responses, available in Appendix B. In general, respondents expressed concern with preserving the character of existing neighborhoods and questioned recent multifamily development. But some respondents were also supportive of growth based around adequate transportation, high-quality infrastructure and construction, and dense housing with appropriate buffers.

5.0 Transportation

The goal of this series of questions was to determine how people get around Port Orchard currently and how supportive they would be of public transit and non-motorized transportation infrastructure.
Car travel is the primary mode of travel for almost all residents for all types of activities. No question asked about carpooling. Notable exceptions include a small number of people using transit for work and school trips, and walking and biking for recreation trips. Recall that almost all respondents live in single-family homes and were on the higher end of the income scale, both of which typically correlate with car usage.

When asked “Is traffic a problem for you?”, respondents were almost split between yes and no. A follow-up multiple-choice question asked about transportation problems. “Incomplete pedestrian paths” ranked first, which could support the need for building more sidewalks. This was followed closely by “road congestion”, a common issue we’ve heard from the public.

27 respondents provided written responses (available in Appendix B) when asked, “Do you have any other comments on Port Orchard’s transportation systems?” Multiple comments said foot ferry service is inadequate and needs extended hours or more frequent service. Similar comments said bus service is limited and does not serve most shopping destinations, including a lack of service to McCormick Woods. Two comments even proposed a light rail system connecting to the rest of the region or neighborhood streetcar system. Several comments mentioned the need for improved biking and walking paths. Pending road improvements on Bethel and Tremont were urged to finished, along with better road maintenance and traffic enforcement.

6.0 Land Use

The largest number of questions concerned land use and future development in Port Orchard. The goal of these questions was to assess people’s support for more compact forms of development and types of commercial services and employment the City should pursue.
When explained how much population and employment growth the city is expected to see in the next 20 years, most respondents said they would prefer to see growth concentrated in clusters. This supports the “town centers” idea proposed by the Vision Port Orchard team. Internal growth is also supported by the second leading answer, “spread out growth evenly across the city”. Less respondents were supportive of development on the fringe and the downtown area. An alternative answer suggested focusing on infill development on vacant lots.

Almost half of respondents said they do most of their shopping in Port Orchard. Most of the other half said they shop either in Gig Harbor or Silverdale, both of which have multiple large shopping centers. When asked if their current shopping needs are met in Port Orchard, two-thirds of respondents responded “no”. 44 respondents answered a follow-up question about what shopping needs and commercial services are unavailable to them in the city.

Respondents commonly remarked on big-box stores like Costco (the most common), Home Depot, Petsmart, Target, Trader Joes, and TJ Maxx. Other comments remarked on the lack of shopping opportunities for outdoor recreation, local/natural food options, clothing varieties, restaurants, pubs, furniture, art supplies, and electronics. Several people mentioned vacant retail space, such as the South Kitsap Mall and downtown buildings, that could be rehabilitated to concentrate shopping in central areas.
Two multiple-answer questions asked about commercial development. In contrast to previous comments, respondents think Port Orchard mostly needs “small local retail stores”. And the second highest answer was “mixed use (ground floor retail w/ housing or office above)”. Shopping centers and big box stores also ranked relatively high. When asked what types of jobs Port Orchard should attract, respondents’ top answer was “retail/customer service” and the second most was “hi-tech/startups”. Other high answers included “industrial/manufacturing” and “business/professional services”. People seem to be supportive of keeping the city’s economy diverse and locally oriented.

Though the Vision Port Orchard Team is not specifically addressing parks, respondents were also asked about their use and thoughts of city parks. Respondents were almost evenly split on how frequently they visit and use the parks. A follow-up question asked, “Do the parks in Port Orchard meet your recreational needs?”, and replies were split equally between “yes” and “no”.

Respondents also identified what park features that Port Orchard lacks. The top answers were “recreational paths” and “shoreline access”, which is similar to what we’ve heard during public outreach. Respondents also apparently want more “picnic areas” and “parks close to home”.

26 written replies (available in Appendix B) were made to the question, “do you have any other comments on land uses in Port Orchard?” The previous question seemed to prompt many comments on parks. Respondents said some parks seem to be poorly maintained and could use more lighting, but that South Kitsap Regional Park is
an asset that should be better promoted. Park space needs to be increased as housing density increases and residents have smaller private yards. Several respondents repeated the need for bike and walking paths. Some people said the downtown needs more attention. Other comments said the city does not need more commercial space, as many commercial areas are vacant and in need of new tenants or have redevelopment potential.

6.0 Downtown

This section consisted of a single matrix question and written comment opportunity. The public has repeatedly expressed concern with the state of downtown, so the goal with this section is to identify what type of features are needed to improve the area.

Respondents were asked to rate their desire for different types of features and amenities related to land use, activities, and transportation in downtown. The largest “much more” answer was for “renovation of buildings”. Most other answers received a fairly strong “more” rating, with the top concepts being “retail shopping”, “restaurants/eateries”, “people doing their shopping”, and “parking”. Respondents were generally in support of “city involvement”, “waterfront access”, and “grocery stores”. Respondents have a clear desire for a more lively downtown environment.

Respondents were more neutral or had no desire to change things like “traffic” and “boater amenities”. Notable desires for “less” were “traffic”, “bars and nightlife”, and “office/professional services”. The latter may reflect other written comments about the need to relocate bail bonds stores currently in the downtown.

29 respondents available in Appendix B submitted written comments (available in Appendix B) for the question, “do you have any other comments about downtown and the waterfront?” Many were about the visual state of downtown buildings and the need for aesthetic improvements by business owners, with some suggesting
new city ordinances. Many respondents are discussed the issue of limited parking availability and the need to reconfigure parking along the entire waterfront. Walkways between different sections of downtown don’t exist or are unsafe. However, others commented on positive changes such as the pedestrian path and several recent business openings. Some respondents said they want better access to the water.

7.0 Conclusion

The survey provided useful information for updating the Comprehensive Plan and should be incorporated into goals and policies. However, the survey as tool is limited by distribution and those willing to fill out surveys. Information from other sources, such as public meetings and focus groups, must be taken into account.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Port Orchard is conducting a periodic review of its Comprehensive Plan as required by the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA). As a city in Kitsap County, Port Orchard is required to complete its update by June 30, 2016. The entire Comprehensive Plan will be reviewed and updated with review to include the following elements or chapters:

- Introduction (Vision)
- Land Use (and Zoning)
- Housing
- Parks
- Natural Systems (Critical Areas)
- Economic Development
- Utilities
- Transportation
- Shorelines
- Capital Facilities
- Implementation
- Appendices

In addition to the review and update of these elements and chapters, the city will also conduct a consistency evaluation to ensure that its development regulations are consistent with the updated comprehensive plan.

The GMA requires early and continuous public participation in the Comprehensive Plan and Municipal Code Update in RCW 36.70A.140:

Each county and city that is required or chooses to plan under RCW 36.70A.040 shall establish and broadly disseminate to the public a public participation program identifying procedures providing for early and continuous public participation in the development and amendment of comprehensive land use plans and development regulations implementing such plans. The procedures shall provide for broad dissemination of proposals and alternatives, opportunity for written comments, public meetings after effective notice, provision for open discussion, communication programs, information services, and consideration of and response to public comments ...

The purpose of this document is to identify the City of Port Orchard's public participation objectives, approach, audiences, schedule, and opportunities for public participation. This document may be updated over time to reflect the needs of the Comprehensive Plan and Municipal Code Update project and experiences in early outreach to ensure public participation is effective.

II. OBJECTIVES

The Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan Update Public Participation Objectives include:

- Meet the public participation goals of the Growth Management Act.
• Offer engaging opportunities to the Port Orchard community to participate in planning and comment on the future of the city.
• Provide objective information to assist the public in understanding issues and solutions.
• Provide opportunities for the public to provide feedback through all phases of the review.
• Use a variety of participation methods (such as meetings, media, social media, mailers, etc.) to offer all residents a variety of ways to participate.
• Make the review inclusive to people of all ages, races, cultures, and genders.
• Make the plan itself easily accessible to residents of the community.
• Ask new questions of the community in order to gain new insights about Port Orchard and choices about the Comprehensive Plan policies, regulations, and implementation strategies.
• Identify GMA requirements, policy trade-offs, and opportunities to voice unique conditions about Port Orchard.

III. APPROACH

The city’s current Comprehensive Plan while technically complete, contains very little in the way of an overarching vision which reflects citizen goals for the future of the city. In addition, the city has grown considerably through annexations since 2008 and the city’s newest residents’ goals may not be reflected in the existing plan. As such, the city has determined that a visioning process is needed as a precursor to the 2016 Comprehensive Plan update.

Due to the city’s limited staff resources, the city has contracted with the University of Washington to kick-off the 2016 Comprehensive Plan update process and to conduct a thorough visioning process. The University is responsible for facilitating public workshops, focus group meetings, and other methods of public outreach related to developing the city’s vision and draft comprehensive plan elements. In accordance with their contract, the University is responsible for the following deliverables:

• Draft Public Participation Program
• Initial Conditions Report
• Draft Urban Growth Boundary Map
• Draft Introduction/Vision Chapter 1
• Draft Land Use Chapter 2
• Draft Housing Chapter 3
• Draft Transportation Chapter 8 (Bicycle and Pedestrian Portion Only)

Department of Community Development (DCD) staff will be responsible for drafting the remaining comprehensive plan elements and will coordinate with the Public Works Department and its consultants as necessary. DCD will handle the task of noticing public hearings and documenting to and responding to public comments.

IV. AUDIENCES

There are several audiences - individuals and agencies - that will participate in the 2016 Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan Update, and each will become engaged in the process in different ways:
• General Public: Port Orchard residents, property owners, and business owners.
• Elected and Appointed Officials: City Councilmembers, Planning Commissioners, Design Review Board Members.
• Non-City Service Providers: Special districts such as Water and Sewer District, Fire District, Kitsap Transit, etc.
• Non-governmental Organizations: Chamber of Commerce, Rotary Club of Port Orchard and other service clubs, the Port Orchard Bay Street Association (POBSA), Kitsap Alliance of Property Owners (KAPO), Futurewise, etc.
• State, Regional, and Other Local Governments: Puget Sound Regional Council, Kitsap County, Kitsap Regional Council, The Suquamish Tribe, and the cities of Bremerton, Gig Harbor, Poulsbo, Bainbridge Island, WSDOT, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Ecology, the Port of Bremerton, and the Department of Natural Resources.

V. ROLE OF DECISION MAKERS

City Council: The City Council will provide policy guidance and is the final decision maker for the Comprehensive Plan update. Council members will be notified of public workshops and are invited to participate early on in the planning process. All public workshops will be noticed appropriately so that all Council members are able to fully participate in these events in the event of a quorum. The Council will receive periodic briefings on the update and will review the Planning Commission recommendations on the periodic update to the Comprehensive Plan. Council will hold a public hearing on the final draft periodic update to the Comprehensive Plan prior to taking final action.

Planning Commission: The Planning Commission will provide policy recommendations for the periodic update to the Comprehensive Plan and ensure that the public is involved throughout the process. The Planning Commission will review the draft update on a chapter by chapter basis, providing opportunities for public comments while providing feedback and recommendations to the administration. All public workshops will be noticed appropriately so that all Planning Commission members are able to fully participate in these events in the event of a quorum. The Planning Commission shall forward its final recommendation to the City Council for the periodic update no later than March 31, 2016.

Administration: The Administration will oversee staff and consultant work on the periodic update. They will facilitate public meetings and present draft materials to the Planning Commission and City Council for review. They will revise documents as needed and provide all materials to Planning Commissioners and City Council members in a timely manner.

VI. ROLE OF THE PUBLIC

The Comprehensive Plan is primarily written for and with guidance from the public. It contains their preferences, ideas, and policy objectives. During the update is important to retain the public’s interest by making citizen participation as accessible as possible. The process is driven by the community and guided by the University of Washington team and city’s professional staff, so it is vital to involve public participation. This will be accomplished through advertising, outreach, stakeholder involvement, and numerous public events.
Goal 11 of the GMA requires citizen participation and coordination: “Encourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts.” The Washington State Department of Commerce lists benefits of including citizens in the process:

- Enhances the quality of planning by incorporating a wide variety of information and perspectives.
- Allows communities to make decisions based on shared values.
- Engage citizens in the ownership of local land use challenges and solutions.
- Educates and empowers citizens.
- Supports swift and efficient project implementation.
- Ensures that good plans remain relevant over time.
- Fosters a sense of community, and trust in government.

VII. METHODS AND TOOLS

Techniques for public participation vary in scale, technology, structure, and timing. The primary means of participation will be the traditional public meeting at several key points during the update process. Because not all interested citizens can attend public meetings, it is essential to provide alternate means of communication. Port Orchard has a historical lack of citizen interest, so it essential to encourage involvement from as wide an audience as early as possible.

The following tools will be employed to achieve widespread and ongoing citizen involvement:

- Public open houses and meetings
  - Background presentations, educational lectures, workshops, roundtables, one-on-one interviews, activities, games, etc.
  - Encouragement of participation by attendees
  - Effective notice
    - Underrepresented groups will be specifically targeted for outreach
    - The date, time, and location of events will be published early enough and widely enough for all interested citizens to be notified
    - Notice will be published in the Port Orchard Independent (official newspaper of record) and possibly also the Kitsap Sun
    - Regular press releases will be published ahead of public meetings, and city staff will be available for interested reporters and media outlets
    - Postings in public spaces, social media updates, and email subscription lists
- Focus events
  - Small scale focus groups with underrepresented members of the community (at schools, businesses, neighborhood centers, etc.
  - Presentations and workshops with community organizations and neighboring jurisdictions
- Opportunities for open discussion
  - Speaking sessions and roundtables at meetings
  - Additional public comment periods at Planning Commission, Council, and sub-committee meetings
- Written comments
  - Online public feedback
o Comment forms available at public meetings

- Surveys
  o Online, phone, and paper surveys will be conducted to collect public opinion on a wide range of topics and from a diverse and representative sample

- Distribution of background information
  o The current Comprehensive Plan and other relevant documents will be easily accessible on the City website and available at the local library
  o Information will be shared with the Planning Commission, city departments, and regional agencies as needed

- Public hearings
  o The Planning Commission will conduct public hearings on the draft plan elements and on the final draft plan prior to making a recommendation to the City Council. Written and oral testimony will be accepted at public hearings.
  o The City Council will conduct a public hearing on the final draft plan prior to adoption. Written and oral testimony will be accepted at this public hearing.

- SEPA
  o The city’s environmental process will include opportunities for the public to provide comments on the proposed plan and its possible adverse impacts.

- Interested Parties List
  o The city will build and maintain an interested party’s notification list and provided notice to interested parties when opportunities to participate in public workshops or to provide testimony exist.

XIII. SCHEDULE AND OPPORTUNITIES FOR PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

(See Appendix A attached)

IX. CONCLUSION

A public hearing on this Public Participation Program was held on April 21, 2014 by the Port Orchard Planning Commission at which time the plan was recommended for approval by the City Council. The Port Orchard City Council adopted the program at its regular meeting on May 27, 2014. This program may be updated administratively as conditions change or additional resources to support outreach activities become available. A current copy of the program shall be available for viewing at the front counter of the Department of Community Development and on the city’s website.
Appendix G. Land Use and Zoning Designation Descriptions

Open Space / Conservation

This designation applies to lands that have environmentally sensitive areas or are intended for public use. Parks, natural greenbelts, open space preservation, aquifer recharge areas, geologically hazardous slopes, sensitive habitat resources and critical shoreline and stream corridors and any other environmentally sensitive lands are included in this designation. The implementing zones for this designation include Open Space / Conservation and Greenbelt land use zones.

Open Space / Conservation – This zone is intended to create long-term consistency and nexus between both the City of Port Orchard and adjacent Kitsap County parks and open space properties and the implementing zone. Lands that utilize the Open Space / Conservation zone are intended for the long-term benefit and enjoyment of Port Orchard citizens. As such, uses for these lands shall be limited to the development of parks, open space, or recreational facilities. Private lands in permanent trust or easement may also utilize this land use zone.

Greenbelt – The Greenbelt designation is created to ensure that lower densities occur in the close proximity of critical and environmentally sensitive areas. Environmentally sensitive areas include aquifer recharge areas, geologically hazardous slopes, sensitive habitat resources, and critical shoreline and stream corridors. Maintaining lower densities in or near critical areas is an important tool in protecting those environmentally sensitive resources.

Low Density Residential

This Comprehensive Plan designation is created for areas of future and existing neighborhoods with slightly larger lots where infill and redevelopment is not warranted. Generally these areas of less dense development create quiet and safe neighborhoods and provide reasonably priced housing for families.

Residential Four point five (units per acre) – The primary purpose of the single-family detached residential zone (R4.5), up to 4.5 units/net useable acre, is to (a) provide for an urban residential environment that is consistent with the traditional image of the Port Orchard area, and (b) to
implement comprehensive plan goals and policies for housing quality, diversity and affordability.

These purposes are accomplished by: Providing for a mix of predominantly single-family detached housing types including zero lot line and housing arrangements with a variety of densities and sizes in locations appropriate for urban densities and allowing only those accessory and complementary nonresidential uses that are compatible with single-family residential communities.

This zone is appropriate where: Designated by the comprehensive plan when such areas are served at the time of development by adequate public sewers, water supply, roads, and other needed public facilities and services as defined in the concurrency management system.

Surrounding lands have already been developed for lower intensity single-family detached housing types and offer greenbelt, recreation, and pedestrian services most supportive of lower density living arrangements.

Medium Density Residential

Medium Density Residential land use designations provide for a mix of single-family detached including lot line and village detached housing arrangements, and attached housing types including duplex or twins, patio house, atrium house, weak and strong link town or row house, and multiplex attached housing products with a variety of densities and sizes in locations appropriate for urban densities and allowing only those accessory and complementary nonresidential uses that are compatible with higher density single-family residential communities. Medium Density Residential Comprehensive Plan designations include R8 and R12 zones.

Residential Eight & Residential Twelve (units per acre) - The purpose of the single-family detaches/attached residential zones (R8 - up to 8.0 units/net useable acre) and (R12 - up to 12.0 units/net useable acre) is to (a) define areas that allow a greater dwelling unit density – particularly in locations that are well served by the arterial circulation system and community facilities in general, (b) implement comprehensive plan goals and policies for housing quality, diversity, and affordability, and (c) efficiently use residential land, public services, and energy.

These zones are appropriate where: Designated by the comprehensive plan when such areas are served at the time of development by adequate public
sewers, water supply, roads, and other needed public facilities and services as defined in the concurrency management system.

Surrounding lands have already been developed for lower intensity single-family housing types but abut more intensely developed commercial, office, employment, or other nonresidential land uses - and offer greenbelt, recreation, pedestrian, and transit services most supportive of higher density living arrangements.

High Density Residential

The purpose of the High Density Residential Comprehensive Plan designation and single/multiple family detached/attached zone (R20 up to 20.0 units/net useable acre) is to (a) allow high density residential development in urban locations where public services and facilities are most available; (b) implement comprehensive plan goals and policies for housing quality, diversity, and affordability; and (c) efficiently use residential land, public services, and energy.

These purposes are accomplished by providing for a mix of some higher density single/multiple family detached/attached housing products including clustered village housing types, weak and strong link townhouse and multiplex, and garden apartments with a variety of densities and sizes in locations appropriate for urban densities and allowing only those accessory and complementary nonresidential uses that are compatible with multiple family residential communities.

Residential Twenty (units per acre) - This designation is appropriate when such areas are: served at the time of development by adequate public sewers, water supply, roads, and other needed public facilities and services as defined in the concurrency management system.

Surrounding lands have been developed for commercial, business, employment, public facility, or other nonresidential but higher intensity activities - and offer greenbelt, recreation, pedestrian, and transit services most supportive of higher density living arrangements.

Residential Thirty (units per acre) - This designation is appropriate when such areas are: served at the time of development by adequate public sewers, water supply, roads, and other needed public facilities and services as defined in the concurrency management system; designated as Centers; as of
the writing of this plan, unincorporated and authorized by the county up to thirty units per acre.

Surrounding lands have been developed for commercial, business, employment, public facility, or other nonresidential but high intensity activities - and offer greenbelt, recreation, pedestrian, and transit services most supportive of the highest density living arrangements.

Public and Community Spaces

The purpose of this Comprehensive Plan designation is to provide for public spaces, public and private schools, churches, hospitals, parks, outdoor recreation use, government, and cultural or educational institutions. This designation recognizes the important public lands and uses.

Community Facilities – The purpose of the community facilities zone is to specifically separate and control those public, semi-public, institutional, and private facilities, and services that prime and make feasible centers of urban use. It is also the purpose of this zone to coordinate these uses to the extent that they are serving to prime the same direction, magnitude, orientation, and form of urban growth to avoid waste, inefficiency, or contradiction.

Commercial Retail-Office

The economic centers of the city provide centralized retail, professional office facilities, and tourist and related services. Future architectural designs should take advantage of and enhance the city’s waterfront character and outlying commercial centers. The downtown commercial designation is intended to create a compact, pedestrian oriented shopping and employment district which provides a variety of urban and social activities. The downtown city center should be safe, attractive, and convenient. Uses in this district should meet the high standards for design and appearance for such uses as retail, restaurants, offices, and financial institutions. Dwellings may be stacked on upper floors at densities appropriate for an urban center.

Commercial – The commercial zoning designation provides the most comprehensive list of uses that support the goals and policies of not only economic sections of the Comprehensive Plan, but also a portion of the housing goals by providing the framework for the creation of affordable housing units. The Commercial Comprehensive Plan designation includes zoning designations of Mixed-use, Commercial, and Business Professional.
In all Commercial Comprehensive Plan designations except Industrial/Manufacturing, the city should ensure that multi-family housing is developed at densities that provide affordable housing opportunities for the citizens of Port Orchard. The concept of providing multi-family units in the vicinity of retail uses is a well-recognized planning tool that provides supporting retail businesses within walking distances, thus minimizing automobile use and dependency.

Mixed Use - Generally the mixed-use zoning designation allows small retail establishments on the first floor of buildings with a residential component on the floors above. However, mixed use is not limited to a vertical configuration. Some light manufacturing may occur, provided the manufacturing contains a showroom or retail sales unit. Having a residential component in the same designation as commercial makes a pedestrian friendly, minimizes daily automobile trips, and can create a neighborhood sense of place.

Business Professional - The Business Professional zoning designation differs from general commercial designations in that Business Professional limits the amount, size, and type of retail uses. This designation is appropriate where traffic management is required. Generally, professional offices, as encouraged within this zone, create less daytime traffic and therefore minimize impacts to traffic counts. This designation is intended to support small neighborhood business as well as major employment centers such as Harrison Hospital/Urgent Care, Group Health, and the Kitsap County Administration Campus.

Industrial/Manufacturing - This Comprehensive Plan designation is created to allow commercial storage, shipping and processing operations, appliance storage and repair, bulk good storage, upholstery and furniture refinishing shops, laboratories, wholesale and warehousing light manufacturing, contractor storage, and fabricating yards.

Areas designated industrial/manufacturing should have adequate water, sewer, and fire services, as well as at least three of the following characteristics:

- Existing legal industrial/manufacturing uses.
- Direct access to major arterial or collector street.
- Resource location (i.e. gravel pit)
- Include facilities for public and industrial employees for rest and recreation.
- Ability to identify existing buffer or to create adequate buffers through appropriate design between designations.

Employment-Industrial and Office - The purpose of the employment industrial and office zoning designation is to provide for the location and grouping of industrial and related enterprises and activities involving manufacturing, assembly, fabrication, processing, bulk handling and storage, research facilities, warehousing, and heavy trucking.

It is also the purpose of this designation to provide land for those types of professional, research, business, service, and similar uses that are based in office structures and that require separate sites or developments from other, more commercial and retail activities. This designation should include provisions for on-site daily retail and personal services for employees.

This zoning designation must provide convenient and safe access by vehicle, transit, bicycle, and pedestrian systems located on minor and major arterials.
Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan Update 2016
Future Land Use Map (FLUM) Summary of Changes (May 2014)

- Removed areas outside current UGA
- Changed to “CITY” those areas within the city limits
- Minor corrections throughout to align shapes with parcel/city/UGA boundaries
- Changed the far eastern UGA parcel containing Howe Farm County Dog Park to “POS”
- Changed South Kitsap Regional Park to “POS”
- Modified the majority of the UGA to “UMHDR” (Urban Medium-High Density Residential). This was done to accommodate areas falling under county zoning of “UL – Urban Low Residential,” which allows up to 9 DU/Acre.
- Parcels falling under the county’s “UM – Urban Medium Residential” were changed to “RHD” to accommodate up to 18 DU/Acre allowed by the county.
- Select parcels in the southeast corner of the UGA were changed to “ULDR” (Urban Low Density Residential) to cover some “UR” (Urban Restricted) parcels. A parcel-by-parcel match was not conducted.

Issues
- There is a chunk in the southwest portion of the City that is contained within both the city boundaries and the UGA boundaries. This chunk was changed to “CITY” in the FLUM.
- Northeast of the intersection of Olney Ave SE and Mile Hill Dr, there are two small areas of land that that lie in between the city boundary and the UGA boundary; these areas do not fall within either the city or the UGA (but probably should).

Future Land Use Zoning Map: Recommended Changes

As the studio team did not have access to the Future Land Use Zoning Map shapefiles, we were unable to harmonize this map with the Future Land Use Comprehensive Plan Map. We suggest changes to planned zoning in the UGA to coincide with the land use designations, but additional discretion is required to determine which parcels to designate as 8, 12, 20, and 30 DU/acre as the land use designations as shown on the draft map do not wholly differentiate between these zones.

At a minimum, large portions of the UGA will need to be upzoned from the current 4.5 DU/acre designation to align with the change of these areas from Low Density Residential to Medium Density Residential.
Appendix J. Overlay Districts

G.1 Land Use Overlay Districts

The purpose of the special district overlay designations are to identify district specific goals and policies and to identify special opportunities for achieving public benefits by permitting or requiring alternative uses and development standards that differ from the underlying zoning designation. Special district overlays are generally applied to a group of individual properties or sub-areas and are designated primarily through the area zoning process adopted in conjunction with the Comprehensive Plan. The primary special district overlays within the City of Port Orchard include the Downtown Overlay District, the Downtown Gateway Districts, the Tremont Corridor District, and the Government Civic Center District.

G.2 Downtown Overlay District

The Port Orchard Downtown is the cultural, civic, and recreational hub of the community. The downtown includes the Port Orchard City Hall, many business that support the Kitsap County Campus, as well as the preponderance of historic buildings that created the foundation for the establishment of the city. The purpose of the downtown special district overlay designation is to identify special opportunities for achieving public benefits by permitting or requiring alternative uses and development standards that differ from the underlying zoning designation.

G.2.1 Vision

The fourteen “Purposes” of the Downtown Overlay District are found in the Land Use Regulatory Code and were developed with extensive public input in 2005-2006. The vision of downtown is a vibrant center for transportation, culture, civic government, commerce, retail, and recreation. The Downtown Overlay District maps are shown in Appendix K.

The specific purposes of the DOD are to:

1. Implement the land use goals and policies set forth in the Comprehensive Plan.

2. Provide for the development of an integrated mixed use downtown district that contains office, service, retail, residential, and recreational uses within close proximity to one another.
3. Encourage imaginative site and building design and development while maintaining view corridors and a small town feel.

4. Identify significant environmental impacts and ensure appropriate mitigation with attention to sustainable or low-impact development.

5. Encourage environmentally sustainable development.

6. Promote economic development and job creation in the city.

7. Encourage energy conservation in building design and layout.

8. Promote an integrated system of pedestrian-friendly walkways and parking areas.

9. Enhance the city’s waterfront character while maintaining the maritime presence.

10. Encourage the development of buildings with ground floor retail with office uses and residential uses above.


12. Locate and combine parking areas in order to minimize the number of points of access to and from Bay Street.

13. Encourage architectural and site designs that serve as gathering places in wet and dry conditions.

14. Promote greater public transportation availability within Port Orchard and across Sinclair Inlet during the evening hours to improve access to/from the DOD.

Figure G-1. Downtown Overlay District Map
G.3 Downtown Gateway Districts

The Downtown Port Orchard Gateways are the entries to Downtown Port Orchard. In 2007, the City adopted the Downtown Overlay District, which established goals for the Central Core of Downtown Port Orchard. The Downtown Gateways are located east and west of downtown. This section is intended to provide a comprehensive future land use plan for these unique areas.

G.3.1 Vision

The fourteen “Purposes” of the Downtown Overlay District, as found in the Land Use Regulatory Code, should be applicable to the Gateways. In addition, more open space, pedestrian-friendly thoroughfares, attractive facades, maximum utilization of space, keeping the scale of the current town, beautification of the entrances, functionality of space, attractive landscaping, scale based on topography, retention of maritime industries, rental facilities for water sports, and walkability were mentioned as high priorities for the Downtown Gateways.
The Gateways should tie into Downtown with common design guidelines, zoning, and a theme or "brand." The theme is to be decided by Council and the Chamber of Commerce and will be marketed throughout the region. This theme will include unifying elements, such as light fixtures and pavement markings that will be standard on all new projects throughout the Downtown area. The light fixtures should match, or tie into, the existing light fixtures on the Port of Bremerton property along the waterfront.

G.3.2 Public Participation

A Downtown Gateway sub-committee met each month for three months (April through June, 2008) to discuss the vision for the Downtown Gateways, the boundaries of the gateway districts, and the types of preferred development within the districts. The committee was composed of Planning Commissioners, residents, property owners, and interested citizens and was open to anyone who wished to be involved in the process. The committee chair provided regular updates on the activities and decisions at the regular monthly Planning Commission meeting. In addition, an online survey (Appendix L) was conducted specifically relating to the Gateway Districts.

The preferred alternative for the Downtown Gateways boundaries from the sub-committee includes all of the commercial property along Bay Street, as well as a section of town that is proposed for the new Business/Professional zone stretching from the commercial properties along Bay Street south to Dwight Street, and east to Austin Avenue.

Figure G-2. Council-approved Option for West Gateway Boundary
Figure G-3. Council-approved Option for East Gateway Boundary
Survey respondents and the sub-committee preferred this alternative for the East Gateway. The proposed boundary extends from the Central DOD boundary along Bay Street, excluding properties that are on the bluff. It also includes lowland properties along the Bethel Corridor south to the roundabout and east on Bay Street to include commercially zoned properties near the Westbay Center. The committee identified goals and policies for the Downtown Gateways District that are reflected in Section 2.5 Land Use Goals and Policies.

G.4 Tremont Corridor District
The purpose of the Tremont sub-area plan is to ensure that future development in the Tremont Corridor is guided by specific guidelines and land use regulations that have been generated by community wide involvement. This Comprehensive Plan and Tremont Corridor District plan incorporate existing comprehensive or other documents related to properties within the Tremont Corridor sub-area. This plan will establish certain important visions, goals, and policies as well as standards and guidelines within the Tremont Corridor sub-area.

G.4.1 Vision

The Tremont Corridor is one of three primary entry points into the City of Port Orchard from Highway 16. Presently the area is a mix of single-family residences, commercial, health care facilities, and multi-family residences. The expanded Harrison Hospital Urgent Care Campus and Group Health facilities are the anchors for businesses along the corridor, particularly from Pottery Avenue west to Highway 16, forming the basis for a Hospital Benefit District. The Tremont Corridor is a throughway for travelers and residents wanting to access shops and services in the core of the city and businesses and homes in outlying areas. The Tremont Corridor also announces to residents and visitors alike that the city has economic vitality and provides services and opportunities to its citizens and residents in the south Kitsap area.

Tremont Corridor residents and Port Orchard citizens have determined that they would like to see the corridor developed in ways that encourage professional businesses that support the health care facilities already in place and businesses that allow the continuing free flow of traffic from Highway 16 into the downtown areas. Focus should be placed upon pedestrian connections within the district as well as providing a regional connection to the South Kitsap areas served by the hospitals and emergency service providers within the district.

Tremont Avenue will be improved and widened with sidewalks, street trees, and a landscaped island that will create a boulevard style of roadway. The Tremont Corridor is promoted to include design standards that will necessitate new development to provide a consistent, attractive landscape edge while maintaining a human scale to new and redevelopment projects. A system of trails that are pedestrian and bike friendly connecting the Tremont Corridor to the Port Orchard marine walkway with trails through natural areas are key to the success of the Tremont district.
The Tremont district is envisioned with some multi-family residences to accommodate the combination of residential and employment land uses within walking distances of the major health care facilities. Some cafes and neighborhood services are also envisioned to support those living, working, or visiting the health care facilities. Regulations and design guidelines should help to ensure that parking is provided in a manner that is beneficial to the neighborhood and enhances the flow of transportation through the district. In addition, Tremont Corridor stakeholders envision monument signage that are tastefully designed and constructed of natural materials.

The corridor from Pottery Avenue east to Sidney Road consists primarily of single-family residences and small clinics. Single-family uses are encourages as a desired mix of services and residential uses within this district.

G.4.2 Public Participation

The ensure that the Tremont community was involved in the Comprehensive Planning efforts, and that the citywide vision that developed was embraced by the community as a whole, a grass roots movement was deemed necessary to gather input from the citizens of Port Orchard. It was seen as an opportunity to update the 1994 “Tremont Corridor Specific Plan” and incorporate the plan in the city Comprehensive Plan. To include as much community involvement as possible, city staff used multiple mediums to get the word out to the public, including mailers, websites, an online survey (Appendix L), and a Tremont Corridor sub-committee.

A Tremont Corridor sub-committee met each month for three months (April through June, 2008) to discuss the vision for the Tremont Corridor district, the boundaries of the district, and the types of preferred development within the districts. The sub-committee was composed of Planning Commissioners, residents, property owners, and interested citizens and was open to anyone who wished to be involved in the process. The committee chair provided regular updates on the activities and decisions at the regular monthly Planning Commission meeting. In addition, an online survey (Appendix L) was conducted specifically relating to the Tremont Corridor district.

Figure G-4. Council-approved Alternative for Tremont Corridor District
The committee identified goals and policies and preferred alternative for the Tremont Corridor district that are reflected in Section 2.5 Land Use Goals and Policies. The preferred alternative identified by the committee was further vetted with the residents of the Tremont Corridor to reflect the most accurate input related to the community’s desires. Numerous residents did not agree with the committee preferences and requested that the boundaries include fewer residential parcels north of Tremont and east of Pottery.

G.5 Government / Civic Center District

The City of Port Orchard has benefited from being the Kitsap County seat, as well as Kitsap County long serving as the city’s largest employer. Kitsap County has proposed several phased development scenarios to provide options
for the expansion of county facilities within the city over the next 40 years. The district included land use and regulation proposals derived from the Kitsap County Campus Master Plan created in 2003 (Appendix M), which was designed to accomplish the expansion of community facilities and allow uses that would serve to buffer the residential areas from the Campus.

Figure G-5. Kitsap County Campus Master Plan 2003, courtesy of Kitsap County

G.5.1 Vision

The vision of the Government / Civic Center District (GCCD) is to encourage the aesthetic development of the Kitsap County government buildings in a campus-like setting. The GCCD has been delineated to be bounded by Dwight Street, Cline Avenue, Kendall Street, and Sidney Avenue. The purpose of the design standards and review criteria is to ensure that site development and structures in the GCCD meet the intent of the city for high quality construction in a campus-like setting. The proposed standards address an array of design elements to pedestrian safety, along with design standards to promote compatibility with surrounding residential uses such as setbacks, landscaping, architectural elements, and screening.

G.5.2 Government Campus History

The proposed boundary is based upon longstanding agreements between Kitsap County and the City of Port Orchard, established by previous zoning ordinances that allowed the conversions of single-family residences to professional offices through the provision of “special use permits” and Resolution 1636, passed in 1996, which directed future conversions to be
centered within the area from Dwight to Sroufe Streets and Cline and Sidney Avenues.

In 2000, the County submitted an application to construct a jail expansion, which led to a renewed focus on the issue of growth and conversions in the neighborhood. Resolution 1918 was passed in 2000 to provide further clarification that “Kitsap County expansion of facilities shall be consistent with a Master Plan mutually approved by Kitsap County and the City of Port Orchard, and consistent with the city’s Comprehensive Plan.”

In 2002, a Comprehensive Plan amendment was approved to re-designate property on the south side of Dwight Street between Austin and Cline from High Density Residential to Community Spaces to accommodate the need for future administrative offices as identified in a programming study indicating the need for approximately 60,000sf of office space. The County submitted a site-specific rezone for the County Administration Building which was approved in 2003. During the design phase of the County Administration Building, the County was also proceeding with community input and planning toward the development of the master plan for county and privately owned properties and submitted an application for a Comprehensive Plan amendment identifying the current Government / Civic Center boundary.

Figure G-6. Kitsap County Government / Civic Center District, courtesy of Kitsap County
G.5.3 Public Process

The public process for the Campus Master Plan began with the creation of a stakeholder group in 2002 that included residents, business owners, and land owners who are impacted by the Campus. The input from these meetings resulted in the Draft Master Plan that was then reviewed at a County-sponsored open house and then before the City Planning Commission at approximately six public meetings. During their deliberations at the public hearing, the Port Orchard City Council recognized the need to integrate future city developments and residential neighborhood protection, with ongoing County Facility expansion projects. To that end, the Council defined the proposed boundaries as a “Government Use Master Plan Overlay District” and directed staff to prepare development regulations and review criteria to ensure that the proposals within the district implement the intent of the Master Plan together with the goals of the city’s Comprehensive Plan.
The area bounded by Dwight Street, Smith Street, Cline Avenue, and Sidney Avenue is designated to encourage government-use, and is intended to be an area that will meet the immediate needs of county government for additional parking and office space. The area bounded by Smith Street, Kendall Street, Cline Avenue, and Sidney Avenue will be focused on governmental-use and private government supporting uses, and is intended to meet the needs of the general community of private services that support the County Administrative functions, and the long term needs of County government. The GCCD recognizes that as phased expansion of the County campus occurs over time, there will be an on-going need to protect the interests of the community to provide for land for expansion, while also furthering the protection of the remaining residential properties from the impacts of development.
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I own residential property within 5 miles of downtown, shop in downtown as often as possible and am a resident of Port Orchard.

2. I live about one mile from downtown.

3. I've lived in the city for 30 years.
1. Owner of 110 Lounge

2. The library is the ONLY place I go to...I go there pretty often, but as far as patronizing the businesses, I do not ever consider downtown a shopping destination.

3. downtown needs revitalization. Nothing to do.

4. Every day

5. every day but not for work

6. I live close to downtown, but am older and don't need most of what is sold downtown. On a limited income so eating out is rare, home full, so don't need to purchase many decorative items. Food, medicine, gas and T.J. Maxx seem to be where I spend most of my money. Don't go to shows, probably 15 years since I have been to a movie theater.
1. We walk along the waterfront and make an effort to support as many businesses as we can downtown, especially restaurants.
2. Kitsap Bank
3. Shop downtown or drive through on way to other stores
4. Walking
5. I only recently heard about the Marina park; I am looking forward to checking it out.
6. Go to City Hall
7. I take the foot ferry but I refuse to park downtown.
8. I live downtown
9. Banking

### 3. Why do you come to Downtown Port Orchard (select all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I work downtown</td>
<td>18.6% 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I go to the library</td>
<td>40.5% 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I park downtown and commute using foot ferry</td>
<td>9.3% 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take my kids to the Marina Park</td>
<td>23.3% 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers Market</td>
<td>53.6% 23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie theater</td>
<td>25.6% 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping</td>
<td>34.6% 15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants/Bars</td>
<td>60.9% 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a boat at one of the marinas</td>
<td>4.7% 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To donate items at a thrift store</td>
<td>23.3% 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I only drive through on the way to somewhere else</td>
<td>16.3% 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answered question</strong></td>
<td>d3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Chipped question</strong></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. I did live there for 18 years until going to college
2. Lived here entire life until I was 18 (993) and moved back 2 yrs ago.
3. 18 years in Kitsap; 3 years in South Kitsap
4. I worked in Poulsbo and did most of my shopping after work so that I could avoid the commute traffic so I didn't shop locally. Also all the grocery stores are past P.O. so I had to drive beyond P.O. to shop and I didn't want to add that time onto the commute. About the only time I used our local grocery stores was during vacation or at holidays.
1. Historic Charm
   The downtown is unique in its natural vistas. We love the little businesses, including the restaurants and bars that we patronize regularly. We love the library and the foot ferry. We love walking along the waterfront for miles. I would prefer the buildings downtown to be kept small scale and not exceed the 33-39 feet limits.

2. Waterfront, marinas, view

3. Waterfront, Kitsap Street (old historic homes)


5. The waterfront, Movie Theater, Moon Dogs Too, Amy's, Bayleaf Bistro, and The One Ten martini bar

6. "the foot ferry, noting its longer hours of operation "downtown library "the bakery, which must have finished its expansion by now, as it will be among many assets needed to encourage people to live and shop downtown "the boardwalk, since walking on that is probably better for one's joints and spine than walking on concrete for exercise AND it fits better with the maritime context "the farmers' market, as I assume that it still draws a crowd "a covered walk along the storefronts in the downtown core, at least it was there in '06 and made for a more comfortable walk downtown when the weather wasn't so good "live music within earshot of downtown core residents who keep the windows open at night, though I know there's been a debate on keeping bars on the permitted use list

7. Water orientation geography

8. from a distance, it looks like a cute sea town

9. Some restaurants and the water & marina

10. Everything is super close to each other

11. Old world charm, Marina and great access to boating and Puget Sound Views

12. crosswalks are well marked.

13. The best thing about downtown is the main street feel. Wings??

14. It's not Seattle

15. potential

16. The charm of the little town on the waterfront. The marina and park with the library and coffee shops, the view of mountains and the ferry, etc. make for a pleasant day.

17. waterfront POTENTIAL

18. marina park, library, farmers market, wine bar and restaurants

19. Concentrated shopping with unique stores, great potential for downtown walkable living spaces, waterfront access with parks and trails

20. Nice small town feel. The waterfront is nice and you can walk around and enjoy yourself, cheap entertainment for the kids (very young kids) We like to take the foot ferry to Bremerton

21. The potential for it to become a place for entertainment and leisure.

22. It's potential for becoming a destination.

23. The waterfront.


25. The water. This asset should be built upon.

26. Village like charm with wonderful natural vistas, strong maritime element, quaint stores, all in a historic setting.
28. I love the downtown, small town atmosphere.
29. Retains "small town" feeling. Waterfront Foot Ferry
30. I love the waterfront and all the new shops.
32. I enjoy the small town feel. I like the looks of our old buildings, even though everyone else seems to think they are horrible. I love sitting on my porch and watching the activity on the water, the Friday night sailing group, the Christmas ship, the entering of the ships at the Navy Yard. The mountains when they are snow covered and sparkling the in morning sun, or the beautiful sunsets in the evening. When I was younger I spent a great deal of time spending money at the antique stores, but my house is full to the brim now. I do go to the thrift stores occasionally to find a treasure now and then. I used to go to Market Foods when it was down next to the Beachcomber, but now the grocery stores are too far away. I go to quilt stores alot, and spend a great deal of money their each month, didn't remember to put this in the first question, so adding it here. We need a beautiful quilt store downtown. That would bring alot of business. Quilter spend and buy even though they don't need the material. Rochelle isn't as personable as I like so I seldom go there. Heirlooms Quilts, Poulsbo, Material Girls, Silverdale, Sue's Stitch and Sew, Shelton, Shirborie Dragon, Lakewood, Auburn, Olympia, Centrallia. Quilters drive to good quilt shops looking for that right piece of material.
33. Its location within Puget Sound, access to Seattle, Olympic National Park, various towns around Puget Sound, access to Puget Sound itself, fishing and boating- it's a great central location. Also the small town feel- access to public officials and the fabric of the community.
34. waterfront
35. The small-town feel. No overcrowding, no feel of being in a "rat race". For city living, it's quiet. Beautiful waterfront that can be viewed by so many from the comfort of their homes. Many restored/well maintained period homes that add to our charm. Many old business buildings that add to the charm. I enjoy being able to walk to the public library.
36. Proximity to Puget sound

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. What are the worst things about Downtown Port Orchard and its Wings?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No grocery store 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shipped question 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. No grocery store
2. The worst things about downtown are the buildings in disrepair and needing painting, I do not prefer to necessarily see them torn down but would like to see them cleaned up and renovated. I do not like the wires seen from every angle. I would like to see all run down buildings cleaned up and worked on.
3. Empty, run-down buildings
4. Old shopping center just east of Blackjack Creek.
5. The new hight allowance of 55 feet. Way too tall for the geography/topography of the area, which will obstruct / or alter current residential views. Also, the removal of the view protection ordinance from the DOD area.
6. The curb appeal, the run down buildings are very unattractive. Bay Ford and the vintage shops are misplaced and are unappealing.
7. *sidewalk quality/continuity in the areas that you might call the ‘transition’ from the downtown core to the wings—certainly something that will improve as part of the renewal *after dinner public transit between the downtown core and the restaurants and retail around Safeway and Albertson’s—early transit shut-down still an issue? *lack of reasonable parking for City Hall, particularly for people working there, pending completion of a parking structure *Does the shuttle service have a stop at the laundry in the east wing? Some people would not want to carry their laundry from the downtown core and back, but then again, most people would not be without a car during the week. *Overhead utilities and other obstructions to view of the inlet and mountains
8. decaying buildings traffic poor design
9. up close, it doesn't look like a cute sea town
10. run down. keep the historical buildings, but maintain them
11. High turnover in businesses and it seems kind of dumpy in areas
12. It isn't inviting, out-dated and needs better sidewalks.
13. Needs updating
14. The business are ugly—the buildings need to be demolished
15. The buildings need to be painted and more uniform.
16. Looks its age. Wings??
17. It's not tourist friendly, or attractive to all the Marina visitors.
18. current buildings on bay street, with a couple exceptions
19. The run down look of some of the buildings but can be improved.
20. It looks run-down and there aren't enough shops that people really need.
21. Parking, no grocery store, wasted real estate on feed and thrift stores
22. Lose the car dealers, tire store, roofing company and shoreline parking.
23. It's too bad the parking lot is on the water, it would have been nicer to put the town on the waterfront and the parking inland
24. Junky looking store fronts, unpainted buildings, cigarette buts on the sidewalks, TOO MANY bail bonds and antiques stores, not enough restaurants, inefficient use of the water view (more like non-existent), the farmers' market is merely a craft/plant store (we went last weekend and NO produce!)
25. ugly buildings
27. It looks old and worn down. The buildings are falling apart.
29. The place is rundown and needs big improvements to draw people to downtown. More parks along the waterfront would help. Downtown needs to be an environment for working, living, and playing.
30. Junk shops, parking lots on the waterfront, poor use of waterfront locale.
31. The town is in need of a make over that when accomplished would still reflect our small town charm and character. The wings offer opportunities that the downtown doesn't, like marinas, condos with more height than 3 stories or so, and development like parking garages that doesn't muddle our downtown them and historic nature.
32. A lot of the older buildings are run down and uncared for.
33. A lot of the buildings look terrible.
34. The downtown structures look like they were beat up and barely survived the fight. It's not pretty. There's no harmony.
35. To me, it is that it doesn't have what I buy. I spend my check to the hilt each month, but little is spent in downtown P.O. Also, I am 63, overweight, and walking and carrying anything any distance is difficult. Those that want a more walkable city aren't talking about me.
36. Land usage and building condition. Pedestrian access.
37. unkept road sides including side walks and vegetation.
38. No grocery store to walk to. I don't mean a mega store like Safeway or a small store like a mini mart. It would be nice to have a grocery store like Trader Joe's, Red Apple Market, Larry's Market, etc. Something large enough to have most of what one needs yet small enough to not overpower the small town feel. Terrible traffic moving through downtown after the shipyard closes for the day shift. Run-down buildings. Parking lots along the waterfront. The bulk of the parking should be in the wings, not the core historic area. If a parking garage is chosen, it should NOT be located in an area that blocks views of current residents nor should it be obvious as a parking garage. Blend the structure into a hillside, underground, etc. Do not make it a towering structure that is unattractive, puts an emphasis on driving or ruins the skyline for residents. The rip rap fill of Blackjack Creek. Large concrete parking lots devoid of vegetation (i.e. Westbay shopping center or St. Vincent's). Poorly maintained rentals. Limited walkability. Limited number of restaurants.
39. Parking
1. historic charm
2. Small business is vital for our downtown character. I love the library being so centrally located. I hope Port Orchard can maintain the small town feel while being cleaned up. I prefer the buildings stay lowers rather than become too tall or too modern.
3. Waterfront access and parks
4. Historic look
5. The waterfront parking and the library location.
6. Unfortunately I don’t know what should be kept. Honestly I get a little depressed every time I drive through. There is a ton of potential with the water so close and it is being completely wasted.
7. See the answers to Question #3
8. public access to shoreline provision for water views
9. movie theater, ale house, antique stores, the yummy bakery
10. Restaurants & farmers market
11. The city hall bldg.
12. Old town feel and keep the parking on the waterfront, don’t let developers build on the waterfront and move the parking back, We are the last of the great waterfront venues for car shows, fairs, carnivals, music & Farmers markets
13. the parks and marina.
14. The main street feel. Wings??
15. Small town feel
16. The parking the way that it is, but add in the wing areas that parking be included in development
17. I continue to think that it would be best to keep the buildings and make the improvements on them through repair and paint/details. The town is historical. As we have seen in our world travels (literally), Port Orchard is a gem.
18. The library and foot ferry dock
19. Cafes, the quaint feel, the park, library though maybe not at that location
20. See answer to number 3.
21. Keep improving it and make it nicer. There are some nicer shops coming in (Garden Baby, Morning Side) these shops have things that are more interesting to me that Tatoo and Bail Bonds. I know there needs to be something for everyone. It would be nice if all the buildings could get occupied. That is the problem with this town, lets of empty retail space.
22. The original integrity of the buildings (similar to downtown Port Townsend)
23. The not ugly buildings
24. Waterfront park. Library.
25. Shops, restaurants, library.
27. The downtown bakery and the dance studio is the right direction in creating downtown home town feel. Love City Hall. It makes a statement.
28. I like the old buildings and small town feel of the downtown corridor.
29. The strong marine element. The current scale and building size. The openness of the buildings to the water---i.e. not let buildings close in the city and roadway to being able to still enjoy the water and marine elements. As for the Wings, there is nothing that I believe couldn’t be changed.

30. Everything

31. Fix the buildings that are salvagable.

32. Small town feel. Keep as green as possible. Keep building heights from Bay to water, at the 33 ft. level.

33. I want the small buildings. A 44,000 sq. ft. building that jutes in and out isn’t what I want. High rise condoh’s that will eventually turn into rentals, because the wealthy won’t want to listen to the traffic nose, smell the gas fumes, and listen to the drunks arguing after the bars close. Some nights they wake me up and I live almost at the top of the hill.

34. The Library. The Library is already well utilized in the community. I think it should be improved and serve as the Gateway for people accessing Port Orchard by water.

35. the Port Orchard Marina and the foot ferry to Bremerton

36. Those items I mentioned as liking in question number 3. Some of the old buildings that are attractive are in need of a restoration but not necessarily a remodel or demolition. There should be an amenity provided to a building owner that has a charming old building that could be restored for reuse instead of torn down.

37. Marinas

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. What would you change about Downtown Port Orchard and its Wings?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. I would hope to make better use of our waterfront views, with relocating more to the waterfront and moving parking to an area further outside the downtown...area 5 on the parking study with a shuttle service helping to move people from her to there. I do not support the idea of having a parking garage in the center of the most scenic area downtown. It is both too costly and would be built in an area that would be better suited toward public enjoyment. The parking could be handled better in joining together with the county to help pay for a joint-access parking area off Port Orchard Boulevard but with access form the Cline Street area. I would like to see the car dealerships relocated to another area so as to utilize the waterfront better for scenic dining and lodging.

2. Add mixed-use buildings, improve variety of stores

3. Facade improvements and painting of downtown buildings

4. Add walking trails. Encourage a company to have a boat rental facility so you could rent a rowboat, or kyaks, or canoes.

5. I would move the businesses away that don’t make sense in such a beautiful setting, such as Peninsula Feed, the Library, the vintage shops, the auto repair businesses, the car dealership, things like that and replace them and the old run down ugly buildings with new ones with businesses that should be on the waterfront and maybe add a few nice parks.

6. "Improve sidewalk safety and quality in conjunction with new development—sufficient width to allow two adults to pass each other, address areas with standing water where curb cuts meet sidewalk, control plant growth, eliminate dark spots "push for shuttle and ferry availability until 9 pm so that those who travel to or within Port Orchard for dinner at a restaurant can take the same mode for the return trip "understanding the reasons for opposing the continued operation of bars and clubs, perhaps there’s an incentive that would bring the live bands to the shell for outdoor performances "develop the farmers’ market into a bigger event with more fresh seafood to bring local fishermen into the picture, a ‘Taste of Kitsap’ event, and, of course, somebody from the County Health Department on-site to check for the usual food handling/storage issues ‘the new development between Bay Street and the inlet should consist of buildings with ‘best faces’ toward Bay and the inlet, sidewalk/boardwalk around the row of new buildings for pedestrians’ loop paths, park benches or seat-height masonry planters, etc.

7. allow more progressive development enhance water orientation
8. painting it would be nice.
10. Move marina parking & actually use the waterfront more effectively
11. Everything else.
12. rebuild downtown buildings with new retail and condos above them, but in the same places as the buildings are now
13. the buildings should be destroyed
14. Give a face-lift of the whole facade and fill in the missing pieces for that facade
15. I’d make it more tourist friendly, bulldoze the UGLY buildings that have been there all my life. Build store fronts below and condos above, make the currently marina parking a lovely park ie: Poulsbo. Turn the town into something beautiful we can all be proud of.
16. wires every where, non connected walk ways
17. I would definitely get a color scheme and possible simple accent ideas for the buildings. The few buildings that have been improved (bakery, pub, photography shop,deli) are very cute and the same can be done with the others. It doesn't need to be torn down to be improved. Awnings might be nice to take the place of the previous marquee, for shade and rain.
18. Where do I begin?! More restaurants, waterfront orientation with a park with sidewalks, more useful shops, more parking.
19. Better layout or flow to streets and stores, parking upgrades to buildings
20. Parking elsewhere, add connectivity from shore up the hill southward, and along shore line, add multi-value living spaces.
21. Keep cleaning it up. I believe it is getting better
22. See #4 and make the opposite (i.e. make better use of the view, clean up the trash and the shabby buildings, remove the multiple bail bonds stores closer to the city hall, etc.)
23. Adopt design/function conclusions from the consultants. Great Ideas! Great plans! Then nothing!! This is one of the reasons I may move from PO.
24. Redevelop the area with an emphasis on the waterfront and views. Use mix uses and a mixture of building heights. Use Tremont as the primary by-pass to reduce traffic downtown.
25. Increase density to draw more people to live in the downtown area. People who live downtown are searching for conveniences for working, living, and shopping. To jump start the area there should be some low interest loans available or tax incentives. More parks, bike trails, and etc should be added.
26. Retail overhaul, get rid of waterfront parking lots
27. I would upgrade the buildings as opportunity presented itself. While encouraging condos, I would take a good look at Bremerton and realize that we already have a strong residential element (the historic district that is made up of our founding father's homes) and that while a mix of condos is desirable, we should be self limiting. If they don't have at least one parking spot per unit, they shouldn't have the unit. The redevelopment of the waterfront is important: moving the parking and making/developing a town center that draws people to our historic downtown. I want to see buildings that reflect our 19th century roots, but again, tastefully done, and each created with the idea that all roads, paths, and walkways lead to the town center—likely the Sydney area near the library. Note: most economic development experts will tell you that retail isn't the draw for historic downtowns, but the ambiance created in unique and charming ways. As one expert recently reported, we need to give people a compelling reason to come downtown. The mix of retail needs to be such that the stores are of the type that keeps people coming back. If we fill our downtown with occasion type retailers, we will not be getting much draw. Another important issue is creating a "Third Place" type of occupany. These are the places where people enjoy shopping, or being, or being seen; and can be a boutique type grocery story with outside sitting for their deli and coffee service, to restaurants with interesting and unique features. It can also be a new Library/Community Center mixed building where people can go for a multitude of reasons. Lastly, downtown is fragile and the land is precious and should not be wasted for uses that could easily be shifted to the Wings. Be wise. The opportunity before us is unique and limited. We make wrong choices, we can't easily recover. The town will lose vitality and the "Big Box" shopping areas will become the area that people frequent.
28. New paint and maintenance on the buildings.
29. Tear down and replace the buildings that are falling apart.
30. Work with downtown merchants, and help those with less funding, to adopt a plan that remodels or in some way makes the buildings look like they didn't just survive a tornado.
31. A more pleasant entrance would be nice. Buildings that contour to the existing landscape and don’t block the view of anyone already living there. The city hall if out of proportion to me. It reminds me of the building in Back to the Future. Too big for our community. New building looking like they were built 50 or 60 years ago and not modernistic glass filled. If housing were really needed, then I might think about condo’s downtown, but there are plenty of places in our wings where large condo’s could be built and not change the character of our town. In campaigning for certain council members, most of the locals that aren’t in real estate wanted the character of our town to remain the same. They want the downtown to look quaint and not turn into what Bremerton is doing to their waterfront. They moved here to have the small town feel. They believe our community has many places where condos could be built and not take away from our character. If business come in that cater to the needs of the existing population then it will thrive. I went to Kingston to buy quilting material, decided to have a coffee, we walked around some of the small shops and I left almost $200.00 in those stores. Those are the kinds of businesses I think we need. Art stores that have reasonably priced items. Book stores, I don’t buy much jewelry, but my sister does, so jewelry stores.

32. I think the wings should be developed more with higher buildings as the topology affords the preservation of existing views. The wings themselves offer potential for tremendous views and water access which are currently enjoyed by the back sides of buildings- Westbay Center, Bay Ford and St Vincents. I would like the ability to walk from one end of town to the other and enjoy access to the water along most of the way. Where access to the water is not available I would like to see dedicated pedestrian walkways. I think making the Port Orchard walk-able from one Gateway to the other, and making the walk pleasant, an attraction in and of itself, would be a great boon to the community. I would like to see a buffer between vehicular and pedestrian traffic- as it is now a good portion of the walkways are in or almost in Bay Street. They do not provide a comfortable means of walking from one end of town to the other.

33. Have the city of Port Orhard maintenance department be more diligent in roadside maintenance of sidewalks and vegetation. Encourage home and business owners to improve the looks of their properties.

34. The items I do not like in question 4. In addition, it would be beneficial to residents and boaters to have a State Liquor Store.

35. New buildings with restaurants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10. Which Figure best represents the West Wing of Gateway area of Downtown Port Orchard?</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure One</td>
<td>40.9%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure Two</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure Three</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>22.6%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. answered question

37. skipped question

Downtown Overlay District Wings Survey Results
### Question 11: Which figure best represents the East Wing or Gateway to Downtown Port Orchard?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure One</td>
<td>34.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure Two</td>
<td>16.2%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure Three</td>
<td>33.4%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Answered question: 33
- Chipped question: 12
1. Downtown Port Orchard should have the feel of a small scale destination place that encourages families and people to visit from outside the area. Should we start building high-rise condos made of concrete and steel we will lose what is most vital to this area. We need to clean up and make better use of the waterfront vistas without building too high and without losing what people have moved here for...some have called it Mayberry. A small town in which neighbors know neighbors. We must be mindful of protecting habitat for wildlife and preserving the significant trees. We should preserve historic areas and though they may need cleanup and some renovation, be protected from careless development that levels everything in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Not important</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allow Mixed Use zoning to encourage a mix of commercial, retail, and housing</td>
<td>72.2% (26)</td>
<td>22.3% (8)</td>
<td>5.4% (2)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow housing only on upper floors</td>
<td>30.6% (11)</td>
<td>41.7% (15)</td>
<td>22.2% (8)</td>
<td>5.6% (2)</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage more public open space along the waterfront, including a waterfront path</td>
<td>93.2% (23)</td>
<td>6.8% (2)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide incentives for developers to create outdoor public spaces</td>
<td>78.4% (29)</td>
<td>13.5% (5)</td>
<td>8.1% (3)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow reduced parking requirements for commercial developments</td>
<td>22.2% (8)</td>
<td>36.1% (13)</td>
<td>38.9% (14)</td>
<td>2.5% (1)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create more parking</td>
<td>32.4% (12)</td>
<td>37.8% (14)</td>
<td>27.0% (10)</td>
<td>2.7% (1)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt design guidelines for new development</td>
<td>76.5% (26)</td>
<td>20.5% (7)</td>
<td>2.9% (1)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage awareness to historic elements of Port Orchard</td>
<td>54.1% (20)</td>
<td>24.3% (9)</td>
<td>21.6% (8)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow construction of commercial and mixed use buildings with no setback to sidewalk or property lines</td>
<td>17.1% (6)</td>
<td>31.4% (11)</td>
<td>40.0% (14)</td>
<td>11.4% (4)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve pedestrian connectivity and safety along the waterfront, Bay Street, and Rathed Avenue</td>
<td>89.2% (33)</td>
<td>10.8% (4)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide bicycle lanes</td>
<td>90.8% (21)</td>
<td>32.4% (12)</td>
<td>10.6% (4)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide street landscaping</td>
<td>82.2% (23)</td>
<td>29.7% (11)</td>
<td>8.1% (3)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require Design Review Board approval for all new projects in the Wings</td>
<td>55.9% (20)</td>
<td>18.7% (7)</td>
<td>22.2% (8)</td>
<td>5.0% (2)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow taller buildings on the landward side of Bay Street than on the water side</td>
<td>41.7% (15)</td>
<td>47.2% (17)</td>
<td>8.3% (3)</td>
<td>2.0% (1)</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limit new construction to three stories</td>
<td>37.1% (13)</td>
<td>25.7% (9)</td>
<td>26.7% (9)</td>
<td>11.4% (4)</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage Low Impact or &quot;Green&quot; development practices</td>
<td>55.6% (20)</td>
<td>25.0% (9)</td>
<td>19.4% (7)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require more landscaping/less pavement</td>
<td>37.6% (14)</td>
<td>88.8% (31)</td>
<td>13.5% (5)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments on items above? 15

Answered question 37

Skipped question 8
sight to make the project less costly in the short term, but costing everyone in the long term when we lose the charm and appeal of being a destination.

2. It’s important to encourage developers to come to our area and improve it. In order to do that we need a very clear set of guidelines for them to follow as well as provide incentives for them to build in our area. Without those things Port Orchard is going to stay run down and ugly for another 20 years.

3. "For any mixed use project, the possibility of restaurant uses (presumably on the ground floor only) shall be decided upon early in the review process. Plans for buildings with restaurant potential must include indications of roof- and wall-mounted exterior ducts and vents so as to attend to aesthetics from the perspective of neighboring property owners. *Allow the 55 and over group, plus those with limited mobility, the option of living on the ground floor in the west wing and along flat sites/streets in the east wing. *Balancing open space needs with the limited prime development space along the waterfront is one of the bigger challenges. There’s a fair amount of open space now, with the boardwalk, band shell and piers. I would expect developments to feature outdoor restaurant seating and the like while preserving the boardwalk and sidewalks that would tie the wings to the downtown core. That would be enough open space. Do not allow owners and tenants to obstruct pedestrian passage along the waterfront, Bay Street, etc. *Extending ferry and shuttle transit until 9 pm should reduce the need for travel by car in the study areas. Perhaps development impact fees that would normally go toward road construction and maintenance could go toward public transit instead. In the near term, parking requirements in the study areas should be reduced in favor of pedestrians and public transit. Developers who propose X number of spaces beyond what is required for a given project should be made to pay for those spaces. The City could apply that money toward public parking, transit or events to draw people to Port Orchard on a weekend. After all, it's hard to pursue more parking while pursuing ‘green’ development at the same time. *In my opinion, the existing structures in the downtown core and the wings do not go far in representing the town’s history. Rather than encumber the renewal effort with historic overlays, find more fluid ways to inform people of the town’s history (e.g. exhibits at the library, limited use of historic site markers, a quarterly or semi-annual resolution or newsletter by the City Council in recognition of Port Orchard's historical figures, etc.). *Provide bike lanes or allow bike/ped use of sidewalks and the boardwalk, but do neither of those things in a way that encourages bicycling on streets as steep as Bethel.

4. I hope that these things can happen. PO would be savvy if they happen!

5. Do not take away from the massive Marina parking areas, that’s what brings in tourism,

6. clean, neat, and modern appearance is more important than historic. historic seems a code word for trashy current buildings

7. So much of the maps had so little South side of Bay and would like to see that increased. The limit of height to three stories on the north side, yes. On the South side, no.

8. I'm actually not in favor of letting developers build up, etc. This is going to create several problems. I'm not sure if taller buildings are a good idea for a small town with one road. I certainly wouldn’t want buildings build up on the water side. That would create a tunnel effect. Also, new buildings with upscale shops and condos that I’ve heard talked about worry me because we can't support “upscale” in this town. We are not Bainbridge island or Bellevue. I also worry about impacting home owners on the hill, many who’ve been here a long time and/or bought here because of the view and quiet charm. If any part of a view is impacted, the value of the home goes down and I consider that a theft of value, no matter what the ordinances are. The hill neighborhood is also historical and can be part of the whold Port Orchard experience.

9. Virtually anything you do would be an improvement--just please do something!

10. The wings should focus on shops closer in to encourage a walkable business district with living above, but further out, hotels, condos, townhomes to encourage transit oriented development. Some day I want to live downtown and walk along the shore or tree-lined path to a foot ferry to Seattle. Coming home I want to stop and pick up dinner or buy a few groceries, on weekends, I want to rent a kayak or take my boat out of the Marina or visit shops and a farmers market and expanded library...

11. Brermerton is a perfect example of changing the waterfront environment. They had a great plan however they have taken waterfront too far in the density and design of the buildings. I envision Port Orchard to be like Winslow. Quaint. People enjoy walking around Winslow on a nice sunny day. They have unique stores, art, etc.

12. Above all I want us to reclaim the waterfront for better public use. Shift the parking somewhere else, perhaps a garage somewhere off the path a bit. Add bike paths along the water and any biking amenities to encourage folks to leave their cars at home and visit downtown on bike or foot.

13. A city garage, whether in the wings or totally underground on propect is important if we are to move parking off the waterfront; however, new condos must provide their own parking, otherwise we would need multiple parking garages. The number of downtown residential must be limited as the downtown itself is too small to accomodate all the parking that the marina, parks, library, and retail need to operate and survive. The cookies cutter approach to development where everyone can have zero clearance property lines, or must have the same set backs or landscaping, or green issues, makes it very difficult for developers to develop their unique site. That is why oversight is so important when trying to maintain small town charm and character. Leavenworth didn’t get to be they way they are without stringent rules with practical oversight.

14. Comments seem to lead to what developer are asking for in the city. Hard to pick some of choices. I don’t want the tall buildings downtown. I want it to remain “quaint” I want the taller more imposing buildings in the wings, but not blocking existing people’s views. Right now P.O. if ripe for the plucking by developers with lots of money to come in and destroy our town and then pack up and leave and we are left with the mess. Bremerton will fill the condo’s eventually, but why would we want our town to look like that on our waterfront. It isn’t what I want. Kent, modernized around their “Old Town”, but left it
intack, but spruced it up. If our buildings need to be replaced because they are structurally not sound, fine, but not huge buildings that change the face of our downtown. Some people believe all we can do is tear it down and rebuild. Those people are in it to make a lot of money off of us and then leave. The boaters pick small communities that have quaint shops, restaurants and activities downtown. They don’t particularly boat to Seattle as a destination. They go to Poulsbo, Gig Harbor, Port Townsend, Port Ludlow, The San Juans, LaConner, etc. None of these places are high rise communities. Having the Library downtown is a draw. Bookstores, Art shops, Marine suppliers for fixing broken things on their boats, I go to Peninsula Feed to keep my lawnmover, BR trimmer in repair, Kitsap Housing Authority is selling us out also, basically like they are doing to Silverdale. Build, live in a place for a short time and then move on. Monsieur isn’t hanging around any longer than he has to build, and then sell to K.H.A. Not what I want for my downtown.

15. I think encouraging the walk-ability of the downtown area, access to the waterfront with green areas and more landscaping along the roads is very important. Set backs that create a buffer between traffic and pedestrians is very important. I think 3 story or possibly taller buildings are okay - I agree with stepping building back to mimic the hillsides as a means of reducing the tunnel affect. I think varying the building facades is another way to achieve this. I also think it is very important to agree on a theme for the city. I like the Craftsman suggestion. I think it is vague enough to not be kitschy, but still provides developers, current and potential business owners with a guideline. Port Orchard needs some sort of means to tie all areas together. I think the Craftsman style has the connotation of understated quality. From Wikipedia “The style incorporated locally handcrafted wood, glass, and metal work that is both simple and elegant. A reaction to Victorian opulence and the increasingly common mass-produced housing elements, the style incorporated clean lines, sturdy structure, and natural materials.”

16. Increase greenery, decrease impervious surfaces! Increase walkability, decrease focus on driving everywhere! No tall buildings in the core district. Follow the topography in the wings to allow for taller buildings (taller than the 3 stories mentioned above). LID is a must! Promote environmental stewardship and sustainability.

13. Are there specific types of businesses you would like to see in the Wings or Gateways to Downtown?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. deli’s, pubs, antique stores, Trader Joe’s
2. Low impact hotels, restaurants, specialty groceries (small scale), shops, boutiques, businesses that allow boaters access to their shopping needs.
3. Grocery stores, boat rentals, boat repairs and maintenance, boat sales, restaurants, flower shops, stationary shops, quilt shops
4. Bistros and Cafes, Coffee Shops, book stores, high end retail. Maybe add an attractive grocery store/boaters mart. Anything that will draw boaters in is a good thing. The farmers market is wonderful. Take the library out of the center of downtown and move it to the land side of Bay Street on the Bethel wing. I know a good used car lot that would be perfect for it. Just a suggestion…
5. bakery, laundry, pharmacy, restaurants, bank, small grocery, library/bookstore/newsstand
6. no
8. Boutiques, cafes, vintage shops, kid friendly places.
9. coffee bars, delis, book stores–the kinds of businesses where folks in a community congregate and interact
10. National restaurants
11. Keep the medical up the hill, otherwise community focused services, retail, office
12. I like restaurants of different types. It would be nice to have a small grocery store, bigger than a mini mart but not huge.
13. restaurants (chains), new/clean movie theatres, painting/pottery places, bookstores, coffee shops,
14. A grocery store would be great to get more boaters and live aboards to the area.
15. Hotels, Brew Pub (as in olden days ;), marinas, docks and boat & bicycle rentals
16. Sidewalks and bike lanes along the full route of downtown.
17. Retail shops - galleries restaurants - similar mix to poulsbo’s. on the wings, new small business research industry.
18. grocery store, mariner shop
20. The Wings should be the home of most new condo type residential units. The geography would allow increased height without adversely affecting our image. There would be more room for parking on these sights. Other types of stores, that support and increased Wing population would be appropriate as well as stores that support or marine orientation.
21. book stores
22. I need a good gas station. I also would like a grocery store so I don't have to drive all the way through town and then up to Mile Hill of Bethel Ave. I usually buy my groceries close to where I have already been shopping so I don't have to drive farther/
23. Businesses that encourage visiting the waterfront- that provide access to the waterfront. Currently there are a number of businesses that block access to some of the best waterfront in Port Orchard. I prefer independent businesses to chains but I am not totally opposed to chains especially if they are required to participate in the theme of the town.
24. small grovery store, liquor store, variety of restaurants/coffee shops/tasteful bars

| Are there specific types of businesses you would NOT like to see in Downtown Wings or Gateways? |
|---|---|
| **Response Count** | 25 |
| **Answered Question** | 25 |
| **Skipped Question** | 20 |

1. tatoo parlors, adult stores, gambling establishments, big box stores
2. Please, no large box stores, no huge parking structures, no tall buildings, office or condos, as little asphalt as possible. It doesn't make sense to have waterfront car dealerships although the sales tax generated from their sales is vital to our economic survival so perhaps relocating them to the commercial corridor by Sedgewick and Highway 16.
3. No more Bail Bonds facilities or tatoo shops.
4. Car dealerships, car repair shops, vintage shops those sorts of things are pretty ugly. Get rid of the ugly buildings too.
5. anything intended to be concentrated in the GUMPOD
6. more bars
7. Not really, bring it all!
8. just keep out the junk 'antique' stores
9. Strip or nude places, no adult stores
10. NO strip-mall type crap. No casinos, laundry mats, and we already have too many tattoo parlors for one small town!
11. Medical or industrial, nor box stores
12. I really don't think that "upscale" clothing stores would work.
13. tatoo, "divey" bars, smoke shops, used collectible junk disguised as "antiques," laundry mats, "check-n-go check casing type of places, tanning salons,
14. No car dealers, tire shops, or additional gas stations.
15. Bail bonds and less antiques/crafts.
16. Porn shops
17. No more bars or tattoo parlors
18. Porn shops, sleezy bars
19. Farm equipment sales.
20. tatoo parlors, bail bondsmans, warehouses,
21. Antique shops, bicycle graveyards, etc.
22. Auto dealer. Stores that have little to do with providing attraction to tourists and residential. Stores that would not attract
people on a regular basis would not be good.

23. The businesses should be pleasing to the eye and not draw a clientele that would scare most of us away from the area. I don't think Tatoo parlors, bail bonds men, construction equipment, etc. We are a marina, so I don't think anything would be wrong with boat sellers. I have always though the boat yards going into Port Townsend look messy and not eye appealing so I probably wouldn't enjoy seeing those on a main drag.

24. I don't really like chains, but I think if the embrace the theme of the town then I would not be opposed to them.

25. Tatoo parlors, adult entertainment, gambling, shops with names like "Cheap Smokes", mini marts, big box stores, etc.

15. Are there specific parcels that should be zoned differently than they currently are (please specify address, parcel number, or business name)?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. yes
2. I would like to see the proposed housing area off Morton Street be low impact housing and not be high density.
3. Not that I can think of
4. no comment
5. no
6. no
7. unknown?
8. Zone south of Bay be expanded for mixed use. and then higher density potential adjoining neighborhoods
9. I don't want to see any area built up against the hill that will impact any homeowners aesthetic or monetary value.
10. none that I'm aware of...
11. St. Vincent de Paul, Peninsula Feed, WestBay Shopping Center, Bay Ford
12. from Bay St up Perry Ave. N to Tracy there should be zoned for multi-family housing. There are pockets of multi-family housing currently.
13. ?
14. No comment.

16. Are there specific housing types you would encourage in the Wings, or Gateways of downtown?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. single family detached, condos
2. Low impact housing, 2-3 story restrictions for heights meeting design standards.
3. Turn of the century to 1930's period looking houses and buildings.
4. Condo with views would be nice, new, and attractive.
5. affordability is debatable, so just be sure that you allow enough housing to create a population big enough to support nearby businesses
6. condominiums
7. none
8. Craftman and or Victorian styles
9. Condos
10. yes, mix housing with community support (stores)
11. If housing ends up being built, I would like to see something build with historic details.
12. chain restaurants, large “box” bookstore, up-scale housing on upper floors, retail on the bottom floors...
13. Condos, apartments
14. mixed condo/retail buildings
15. housing above retail/business
16. Condos
17. condos, multifamily housing
18. High density housing (like condos), however I would restrict the height so as to not block views.
19. Modern type construction should be discouraged; craftsman for residences or 19th Century type construction for other commercial type structures.
20. condos townhouses
21. If we are to have condo’s at least try to make them look like older more stylish building of the previous decades. Not "futurist" concrete, glass lined boxes. I think about how bad some of the apartments along Alkai Beach in Seattle look. Concrete, glass and balconies. No character.
22. I think mixed use, retail on the first floor and housing above is best suited to all areas.
23. owner-occupied, period appearance.
24. Structures that are vertically and horizontally modulated

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
<th>Answered Question</th>
<th>Skipped Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Are there specific housing types you would discourage in the Wings or Gateways of Downtown?</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. duplex, apartments
2. Yes, I strongly disagree with allowing large and tall buildings made mostly of concrete and steel with a large city appearance in our small town.
3. Yes, anything that does not look like definition in question 2.
4. Run down rentals, renters don't have the pride in ownership like a home owner.
5. remember that condos can be rented, too, so they actually serve more than one type of resident--just be sure the owner/renter can afford the place
6. no
7. none
8. Modern
9. Apartments
10. Single Family residences (one house per lot)
11. Too modern or boxy, with no consistent style that fits with the area.
12. ones with no architectural integrity
13. Duplexes
14. apartments and low rent facilities
15. condos
16. single family units.
17. large lots for single family detached housing.
18. Modern type construction should be discouraged; craftsman for residence or 19th type construction for other commercial type structures.
19. big apartment buildings
20. Modernist, glass, concrete buildings, that lose their character to are so years down the line. Buildings with character that last through time. Ones people want to live in even though they are twenty or thirty years old.
21. No comment.
22. massive apartments, T 1-11 sided homes, cheap construction, low-income projects, duplexes/triplexes
23. Blocky concrete

18. Do you have any comments or questions about the Wings or Gateways of Downtown Port Orchard?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>shipped question</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. preserve views when possible
2. Though the wings could accomodate some taller heights than the immediate downtown area, I prefer that the whole downtown provide a welcome to visitors, not unlike LaConner, Steilacoom or Gig Harbor. With our gorgeous vistas, views should not be blocked by excessive structures but more open for general public viewing. Think small scale and attractive.
3. I can't wait to see some positive change in our downtown.
4. no
5. the only parcel that should be taken down is the Library, bus depot. Move that building somewhere else and open up more parking along the waterfront to flow from end to end
6. no
7. I'd like to have the opportunity to see an illustration of what changes may look like when plans are developed, before any action is taken, as a citizen of downtown Port Orchard.
8. Do something!
9. I think I've put some of the answers to the questions of Zoning within prior answers and hope you would carry them to here. I'd change the West Wing to be Option 2 West of Port Orchard Blvd and East of the Blvd, Option 3, except include the triangle of lots above Vlist Motors and Marina Mart.
10. Please make it more appealing to the citizens so we don't need to go out of town for a good time.
11. The development of our downtown is crucial to our future. How it is going to look and feel is as important as to what is going to be here. Developers who don't live here and won't when their project is done, don't necessarily have our best interest at heart. Those of us who live here, and will alter construction, have to live with what is built and therefore have a huge stake in the process. Finally, the historic residences that line the hill and abut to the downtown are every bit as important to our image as the commercial buildings. A buffer or tasteful construction must provide the transition between the two areas. For example, again, if the garage is to go on Prospect, it must be ALL underground with tasteful construction on the lid, such as a new Library and Community Center with craftsman detail and early century charm. Finally, do not let the dollars that developers want to bring dupe us into selling out our town at the expense of character, scale, and function.
12. We can discuss all the various ways in which it can develop forever, what specific questions need to be answered in order to move forward? I think determining the wing borders was a good one. I think we need to determine the theme as well.
19. Please submit your name, address, and email. Your information will not be shared or sold to anyone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Field</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>96.5%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address 2</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City/Town</td>
<td>98.8%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZIP/Postal Code</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td>93.8%</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>71.2%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 32
skipped question 13

20. Would you like to be notified via email of upcoming meetings and the Comprehensive Planning process regarding the Downtown Wings or Gateways?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>65.7%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify) 3

answered question 26
skipped question 16
Tremont Corridor Study Area

1. Tremont Corridor Vision Statement; The Tremont Corridor is the primary entry point of three into the City of Port Orchard from Highway 16. Presently the area is a mix of single-family residences, commercial/health care facilities and multi-family residences. The expanded Harrison Hospital Urgent Care Campus and Group Health facilities are the anchors for businesses along the corridor, particularly from Pottery Avenue west to Highway 16. The Tremont Corridor is a thoroughfare for travelers and residents wanting to access shops and services in the core of the city and businesses and homes in outlying areas. The Tremont Corridor also announces to residents and visitors alike that the city has economic vitality and provides services and opportunities to its citizens and residents in the south Kitsap area. Tremont Corridor residents and citizens would not like to see the corridor developed with strip malls and expansive views of parking lots. The corridor should encourage professional businesses that support the health care facilities already in place and businesses that allow the continuing free flow of traffic from Highway 16 into the downtown areas. Whenever possible, vehicular access should be combined to limit the number of access points onto Tremont. Tremont Avenue is expected to be improved and widened with sidewalks, street trees and a landscaped island that will create a boulevard style of roadway. The Tremont corridor will require new design standards that will necessitate screening on new development while maintaining a human scale to new projects. If parking is placed adjacent to Tremont Street, there should be adequate screening to prevent the parking lots from becoming the focal point of new development. Individual structures outside the community facilities zoning, should not be large rectangular buildings but should be smaller and visually interesting with both vertical and horizontal modulations. In addition, Tremont Corridor stakeholders envision strict signage requirements allowing monument signs that are tastefully designed and constructed of natural materials. Tall, rotating, internally lighted, neon or flashing signs are to be discouraged. A limited number of multi-family structures such as condominiums are appropriate within walking distances of the major health care facilities. Multi-family development would provide support for the health care anchor businesses. A limited number of restaurants should be encouraged to support those living, working or visiting the health care facilities. Regulations and design guidelines should help to develop a system of trails that is pedestrian and bike friendly that connect the Tremont Corridor to the Port Orchard marine walkway with trails through natural areas. The corridor from Pottery Avenue east to Sidney Road consists primarily of single-family residences. Allowances should be made for the single-family residences to remain but if the owners at some point in the future wish to convert the residences to office space, the corridor regulations should encourage but not require retention rather that tear downs and replacement with larger office buildings. Do you generally agree with this vision statement?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>78.3%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 46

skipped question 1
Do you have any suggestions, changes or comments about the vision statement?

Open-Ended Response

1. Because the vision statement and zoning regulations may be revisited in five years, it would make sense to focus on protecting the residential property owners for the time being. Considering that many of the owners are elderly and have lived on the properties many years and made them their homes, we would like to see that they do not realize property tax increases from zoning changes. We are in agreement that the corridor remain a corridor; routing traffic through the area as quickly and efficiently as possible to other Port Orchard destinations. We hope that the residents will be protected with sufficient berms and landscaping to allow families safety and privacy. The idea of design standards are wonderful. Having Port Orchard move towards a lovely destination for visitors seems like a great way to utilize our lovely location. Thank you.

2. IT IS MY OPINION THAT WE SHOULD GO AHEAD AND DEVELOP THIS AREA.

3. The roundabout on Pottery does meet the “Design Manual” M22-01 WA DOT page 915-1. The roundabout on Kitsap Blvd. meets the criteria. Also, response time for Pottery Ave by the fire department is a critical issue based on the increasing number of senior care facilities and medical facilities. I will never vote for Rob Putanssu, Fred Chang, Carolyn Powers, Fred Olin or John Clausen for any public office again, and will work to get my neighbors to not vote for them. I am highly disappointed in the City.

4. How does this “vision” promote the revitalization of downtown Port Orchard? It appears that downtown will become a virtual ghost town because all of the traffic will bypass it. Why aren’t you putting all of your time, effort and money into a plan that will improve the existing businesses and attract new businesses to the downtown area?

5. This area should remain primarily residential as the original plan was to widen Tremont Street, NOT rezone for commercialization. This proposed plan does NOTHING to help the downtown merchants and corridor; it will only detract from their businesses. Both the fire department and police department have expressed concern over the proposed plan, citing that it will be more difficult for them to reach the residents of the senior living facilities on Pottery. How will pedestrians cross 4 lanes of traffic? Have you considered the number of students that need to cross Tremont and Pottery to and from school?

6. This area has to remain primarily residential, with minimal commercial businesses intermixed along the street. THE PROPOSED LARGE, ARBITRARY RE-ZONING FROM RESIDENTIAL TO COMMERCIAL WILL RAISE TAXES AND FORCE PEOPLE OUT OF THEIR HOMES. ATTRACTING BUSINESSES BY TAXING PRIVATE RESIDENCE OUT OF THEIR HOMES WILL NOT BENEFIT THE CITY, IT WILL ONLY BENEFIT PROMOTERS AND SHORT TERM CONSTRUCTION ENTITIES AND CREATE A HUGE AFTER HOUR DEAD ZONE THAT WILL INCREASE CRIME AND VANDALISM.

7. Add “deli style” to paragraph 5, such that it reads: "a limited number of deli-style restaurants should be encouraged.....

8. no

9. Widen the road, making it easier for people to travel to that area.
10. I only disagree with the last proviso; Make design regulations that allow for commercial, with buildings at the "front" of the property and parking behind, with adequate sidewalks, trees and lighting. The design guidelines could call for a specific style of building.

11. Two things: I would like to eliminate the word "limited" on the descriptions of how many restaurants should be encouraged. This would be a great place for business--close to the freeway, close to Port Orchard residents (so we don't have to drive to Silverdale when we want to eat out), and 2. Wouldn't this be a good place for a park and ride lot? I like the idea of it hidden from the street, so that trees block the view of an expansive lot, but the location would be great for people who commute north.

12. Clarify and strengthen the access issue, new residential should not be accessed from Tremont to limit turning

13. While restaurants support the existing population, having entry off of Tremont is still going to slow or impede the flow of traffic.

14. we have heard rumors of a round about at the intersection of pottery and tremont. if it is well done, like the one on bethel, we support it

15. Leave as is

16. no

### 3. Which of the following maps best describes the area that should be within the Tremont Corridor sub area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>26.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*answered question 28*

*skipped question 19*

### 4. Are there other areas that should be included or excluded from the Tremont Corridor boundary?

*answered question 17*

*skipped question 30*
Open-Ended Response

1. If map C or D is chosen...Because I live in the very corner of Tremont and West Avenue, 405 Tremont, and there is currently only limited access to it which is from Tremont right at the intersection area of Tremont and Sidney Ave., it would seem important and reasonable to include the end of West Avenue dead end within the boundary line and perhaps even the corner treed section of unused property between West Avenue and Sidney Avenue to allow a second option for easy access from Sidney Avenue to the (my) 405 Tremont corner property.

2. It seems vital to listen to the concerns of the residents within the areas regarding rezoning. In general, rezoning should be kept to a minimum to protect the residents currently residing there.

3. NO

4. Exclude the residences on Tremont Place from being turned into businesses and cafes. Forget the roundabout—there is too much traffic on Tremont for something of that nature. Having travelled in Europe, I can tell you that they do not employ roundabouts in high traffic/pedestrian areas. They are for more rural/residential areas, where the flow of traffic is slower and there is less pedestrian foot traffic.

5. It is interesting that you cannot "disturb" businesses who have only recently opened, but have no problem disturbing and inconveniencing citizens who have lived in this area for over 35 years. Don’t forget, election year is coming.

6. The area above Tremont goes too deep, the pond that it cuts through has no outlet and it also takes out a house that was just built in that steep sloped pond area.

7. tighten up on north side of Tremont east of Pottery

8. I believe the neighborhood of Forest Park should not be overlooked. This would encompass the area between South Kitsap Boulevard and Sidney, and Tremont and South St. This neighborhood is quite run down and the existing zoning does not encourage redevelopment at all. Business Professional zoning makes some sense on the Tremont Fronting parcels as long as it goes far enough back off the street to make parcel assemblage by a developer feasible. This should then fall back to High Density R20 zoning all the way back to South St. This would make redevelopment of some of the currently eyesore properties into duplexes and small apartment buildings a very viable option. Also I think it is very important that the Northeast and Southeast corners of the Sidney - Tremont intersection be looked at as well. Particularly the North East corner. It makes a lot of sense as a commercial site if there is sewer available to it.

9. Huh? What's this?

10. no

11. no

12. I don’t understand the maps...The writing is too small to read.

13. I suggest the South side of Alt B with the North side of D to the Commercial (red) along Port Orchard Blvd and then no more on the North side.

14. this is very hard to read/understand

15. There are no explanations as to what I'm looking at on the map??

16. They all look the same. How are they different? No street names here. Can’t tell what I’m looking at.
17. The corridor should extend across Sidney to include the corner of Sidney and Tremont

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5. Would you like to be included in the Tremont Corridor Stakeholders email list?</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>61.5%</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. Please select the item(s) that best describes your relationship with the Tremont Corridor.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I live in the Tremont Corridor and own my home</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I own vacant land in the Tremont Corridor.</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I live in the Tremont Corridor and rent my home.</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I own a business in the Tremont Corridor.</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I own an office/commercial building and rent space to businesses.</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I patronize medical facilities or commercial enterprises in the Tremont Corridor.</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Tremont Corridor is my primary access into the city of Port Orchard.</td>
<td>63.4%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>22.0%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 41
skipped question 6
7. If you live in or own a business in the Tremont Corridor, how long?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A Less than 6 months.</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B Six months to two years.</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C Two years to five years.</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D More than five years.</td>
<td>81.3%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 16
skipped question 31

8. Which sub committees or subjects would you be most interested in participating in?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commercial Land Use/Design Guidelines.</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential/Multi-family Housing.</td>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation/Pedestrian Improvements.</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural environment.</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 25
skipped question 22

9. What is the best thing about living/working in the Tremont Corridor?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 15
skipped question 32
What is the best thing about living/working in the Tremont Corridor?

Open-Ended Response

1. Easy access to Hwy 16 and Downtown
2. WANTING TO SELL
3. Easy commute
4. The close proximity to downtown and Highway 16. It still has a residential feel, but is close the heart of the town.
5. The close proximity to downtown and Hwy. 16.
6. NO CRIME, GOOD NEIGHBORS, REASONABLE TAXES AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENT.
7. Parking is convenient for users of services.
8. The traffic noise except when I’m in the mood for peace and quiet. The location is amazing. It couldn’t be better for my business.
9. the trees instantly move you away from the freeway feeling
10. I don’t live or work there, but I commute through it every day as I either head north to Bremerton to work, or as I drive north to do my shopping/dining in Silverdale.
11. close to highway
12. proximity to commerce and recreational options
13. I live on May St. and it is a nice little street with no thru traffic.
15. N/A

What would you like to keep about Tremont Corridor?

Open-Ended Response

1. The tall trees that currently exist.
2. The Corridor is unusual in it’s lovely natural beauty; mature trees and older homes. Even though many of the older homes need repair, they add to the small town feel that people in this area love. That is not to say homes should continue in disrepair but instead of being leveled, it is appropriate to have them remodeled and used for low impact offices along the corridor.
3. NOTHING
4. Traffic lights with two lanes in each direction. This more then doubles the capacity.
5. I would like to see it kept residential. If homeowners on Tremont Street are so inclined to sell their properties to businesses, that is their prerogative, however, I suspect that residents are going to hear the words "eminent domain" very shortly, and that is a tragedy.
6. MY HOME.
7. GOOD NEIGHBORS, REASONABLE TAXES AND NATURAL ENVIRONMENT.
8. Keep the stop light on corner of Pottery and Tremont.
9. The planned Traffic Circles.
10. trees
11. I like the idea of the tree-lined center island, giving it a boulevard-type feel.
12. Keep and expand Park to include full SW corner of Tremont and Sidney, make sure to include boulevard feel with tree buffers for business and multi-family uses.
13. no round-about
14. same as above
15. Stay with the present system of lights, but make sure they are synchronized for better movement of vehicles
16. I like the low key atmosphere and the commercial buildings that already exist are for the most part attractive.
17. No roundabout at Tremont & Pottery.
18. Keep or require landscaping so it doesn't look like a industrial park

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11. What would you like to change about the Tremont Corridor?</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What would you like to change about the Tremont Corridor?
Open-Ended Response
1. The obvious - two lanes all the way to 16 and sidewalks on both sides of Tremont. Perhaps a Bicycle lane.
2. Of course, abandoned lots containing trash or unsightly buildings are not preferred. The chiropractic clinic is an unfortunate city permit error. It's "apparent" Violation of permitted setbacks and right of way has caused many problems in dealing with the future plans. We are in favor of considering the removal of part of that building rather than have the 20 foot shift of the coorifor to the north to avoid it.
3. MORE COMMERCIAL BUSINESSES
4. The city should listen to the fire and medical personnel.
5. I would like to see the traffic signal at Tremont and Pottery kept in place and this roundabout proposal tossed out the window. Anyone who has had experiences with roundabouts would realize that it will only further impede traffic and inconvenience pedestrians. Don't forget that there are two schools located on Pottery (Cedar Heights and Sidney Glen) whose students frequently walk to and from school. Additionally, with the number of senior housing facilities on Pottery, fire and police have expressed their concern in arriving in a timely fashion when called (which, from my understanding, is quite frequently). How can our city council ignore this?
6. Forget the roundabout and keep the traffic signal. I don't want to see this area become an "asphalt jungle" with plants and trees placed to mask the ugliness of what is being proposed. Additionally, aren't there enough businesses and strip malls sitting vacant in Port Orchard already? What is the purpose of destroying homes in an attempt to further commercialize Port Orchard? If downtown revitalization is so important to this community, why are you creating the Tremont Corridor so that people will
completely bypass the downtown area? Why aren’t you encouraging businesses to set up shop downtown? It is interesting to note that while you are giving private citizens an opportunity to speak at the city council meetings, several of your members are sitting in a manner that clearly indicates they are bored and disinterested in what their constituents have to say. These positions that you hold are not your God given right—they can be easily taken away if you do not listen to the public and that means the public that does not agree with this proposal.

7. **ALL WE NEED ARE SIDEWALKS LINING THE STREETS AND A FEW RESTAURANTS AND SHOPS. NO ROUNDABOUTS, NO LANDSCAPED ARTIFICIAL CENTER ISLAND IN THE ROAD. AND THE RIGHT MIX OF MEDICAL FACILITIES AND LAWYERS OFFICES AMONG RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY TO AVOID CRIME ZONES.**

8. Beautify along some of the properties. Hide the holding pond by Roland and Tremont with either hedges or trees.

9. Zoning to allow businesses that will create jobs and provide much needed services.

10. traffic flow and livability.

11. The traffic can be really bad through there.

12. Expand Condos so that more yard free living available. Condos are sparse but becoming a real option as our residents become older and interested in easy access to transportation, medical and more level walk way than is in many of the city's hilly neighborhood without transportation.

13. Traffic flow around 4-5 pm is terrible.

14. Be sure the multi-family uses are consistent with a Transit Development corridor.

15. more side walks

16. don't sacrifice those options for growth

17. A four lane boulevard style development with trees foliage along the rightaway, complete with arch or other announcement that you have arrived in Port Orchard.

18. Something needs to be done to increase traffic flow.

19. From the intersection of Tremont and Pottery to Sidney is somewhat unsightly.

20. Widening of the streets. 2 lanes each direction

21. More than one lane in each direction from Harrison Urgent care light up to Bethany Lutheran Church.

22. Would like to see a boulevard style of roadway to Port Orchard Boulevard with landscape island in the center
## 12. Commercial land use/economic goals (1 most important 5 not important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expand encourage small business</td>
<td>42.4% (14)</td>
<td>12.1% (4)</td>
<td>27.3% (6)</td>
<td>3.0% (1)</td>
<td>15.2% (5)</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encourage mixed-use commercial</td>
<td>33.3% (11)</td>
<td>12.1% (4)</td>
<td>18.2% (6)</td>
<td>9.1% (3)</td>
<td>27.3% (9)</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(commercial &amp; residential)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support the existence of a single-</td>
<td>38.7% (12)</td>
<td>19.4% (6)</td>
<td>19.4% (6)</td>
<td>6.5% (2)</td>
<td>16.1% (5)</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>family neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopt existing design guidelines for</td>
<td>16.1% (5)</td>
<td>22.6% (7)</td>
<td>19.4% (6)</td>
<td>16.1% (5)</td>
<td>25.6% (8)</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>all new development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create new design guidelines for all</td>
<td>41.9% (13)</td>
<td>9.7% (3)</td>
<td>22.6% (7)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
<td>22.6% (7)</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>new development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promote creation of new business</td>
<td>21.9% (7)</td>
<td>9.4% (3)</td>
<td>34.4% (11)</td>
<td>6.3% (2)</td>
<td>28.1% (9)</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>incubator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide high density multi-family</td>
<td>12.9% (4)</td>
<td>9.7% (3)</td>
<td>19.4% (6)</td>
<td>29.0% (8)</td>
<td>29.0% (9)</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dwelling units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What other Commercial land use/economic goals are important to you that are not listed above?</td>
<td>answered question</td>
<td>skipped question</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 13. Aesthetic design goals (1 most important 5 not important)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create new design guidelines for all new development that provide flexibility of design and architecturally varied buildings</td>
<td>30.0% (9)</td>
<td>6.7% (2)</td>
<td>26.7% (3)</td>
<td>13.3% (4)</td>
<td>23.3% (7)</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create new design guidelines that are strict so that structures have common designs and look similar</td>
<td>26.7% (8)</td>
<td>13.3% (4)</td>
<td>6.7% (2)</td>
<td>16.7% (6)</td>
<td>36.7% (11)</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require commercial buildings to not exceed the existing height limit of 33 feet</td>
<td>39.3% (11)</td>
<td>17.9% (5)</td>
<td>21.4% (5)</td>
<td>3.6% (1)</td>
<td>17.9% (5)</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow new commercial buildings to exceed the 33 feet up to 65 feet when certain conditions are met</td>
<td>26.7% (8)</td>
<td>6.7% (2)</td>
<td>13.3% (4)</td>
<td>16.7% (5)</td>
<td>36.7% (11)</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Require all parking to be at side or rear of commercial / residential buildings with minimal front setbacks</td>
<td>30.0% (9)</td>
<td>30.0% (9)</td>
<td>6.7% (2)</td>
<td>6.7% (2)</td>
<td>26.7% (3)</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preserve existing vegetation</td>
<td>45.2% (14)</td>
<td>6.5% (2)</td>
<td>22.6% (7)</td>
<td>12.9% (4)</td>
<td>12.9% (4)</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide new landscaping better suited for buffering complementing building design</td>
<td>51.7% (15)</td>
<td>17.2% (5)</td>
<td>6.9% (2)</td>
<td>6.9% (2)</td>
<td>17.2% (5)</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide pocket parks</td>
<td>31.3% (10)</td>
<td>21.0% (7)</td>
<td>21.9% (7)</td>
<td>9.4% (3)</td>
<td>15.6% (5)</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide pedestrian trails from the Tremont Corridor to the downtown waterfront</td>
<td>51.6% (16)</td>
<td>22.8% (7)</td>
<td>19.4% (6)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What other aesthetic design goals are important to you that are not listed above? **33**

*answered question*

*skipped question*
## Parks Survey

### 1. How long have you lived in Port Orchard?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>31.5%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>19.2%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 20 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>17.8%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't live in</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **answered question**: 73
- **skipped question**: 0

### 2. How long have you lived in Washington?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than one year</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 - 5 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 10 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 20 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>51.4%</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don't live in</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **answered question**: 72
- **skipped question**: 1
### 3. How many people live in your household?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Response Average</th>
<th>Response Total</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adults</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**answered question** 73

**skipped question** 0

### 4. In what city do you work?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Port Orchard</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bremerton</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Kitsap County, but not in Port Orchard or Bremerton</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierce County</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King County</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am retired</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not employed</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of the above. I work in:</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**answered question** 73

**skipped question** 0
5. Which City park did you last visit and why?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Van Zee Park at Sidney/Tremont</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Playfield at 915 Dwight</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Active Club Playground at 1025 Tacoma</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Powers Jr. Park at 2035 Sidney</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>50.8%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Why did you use the park? 61 answered question 65 skipped question

6. Please rate the following: 1 is we have too much; 3 is we have enough; 5 is we need more.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Focus</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on children’s recreational opportunities</td>
<td>1.4% (1)</td>
<td>1.4% (1)</td>
<td>7.1% (5)</td>
<td>8.6% (6)</td>
<td>80.0% (56)</td>
<td>1.4% (1)</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on teenagers’ recreational opportunities</td>
<td>1.4% (1)</td>
<td>1.4% (1)</td>
<td>5.7% (4)</td>
<td>17.1% (12)</td>
<td>57.1% (40)</td>
<td>17.1% (12)</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on adults’ recreational opportunities</td>
<td>1.5% (1)</td>
<td>2.9% (2)</td>
<td>19.1% (13)</td>
<td>16.2% (11)</td>
<td>57.4% (39)</td>
<td>2.9% (2)</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emphasis on senior citizens’ recreational opportunities</td>
<td>4.6% (3)</td>
<td>4.6% (3)</td>
<td>10.8% (7)</td>
<td>18.5% (12)</td>
<td>36.9% (24)</td>
<td>24.6% (16)</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>3.2% (1)</td>
<td>51.6% (16)</td>
<td>41.9% (13)</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify) 19 answered question 72 skipped question
7. Should the City construct more of the following facilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Yes (% (Count))</th>
<th>No (% (Count))</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Road shoulders for walking</td>
<td>90.3% (65)</td>
<td>9.7% (7)</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exercise trails</td>
<td>82.4% (56)</td>
<td>17.6% (12)</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks</td>
<td>87.1% (61)</td>
<td>12.9% (9)</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball fields</td>
<td>28.6% (16)</td>
<td>71.4% (40)</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian facilities</td>
<td>87.1% (54)</td>
<td>12.9% (8)</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>90.9% (60)</td>
<td>9.1% (6)</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball fields</td>
<td>40.4% (23)</td>
<td>59.6% (34)</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball courts</td>
<td>59.3% (35)</td>
<td>40.7% (24)</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer fields</td>
<td>57.4% (35)</td>
<td>42.6% (26)</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>46.3% (25)</td>
<td>53.7% (29)</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>80.0% (24)</td>
<td>20.0% (6)</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify) 31 answered question 73 skipped question 0

8. What is your favorite recreational activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>35.2%</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biking</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>40.8%</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 71 skipped question 2
9. Van Zee Park is near Tremont Street and Sidney Avenue. It has 2 ball fields, tennis courts, a playground, woods, and a picnic shelter. How often do you use this park?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardly ever or never</td>
<td>79.5%</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once a month</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How could it be improved, or should it be improved? 40

Answered question 73

Skipped question 0

10. Central Playfield is at 915 Dwight Street. It has a basketball court, a picnic area, playground, shelter, restroom and large field. How often do you use the park?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardly ever or never</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once a month</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How could it be improved, or should it be improved? 34

Answered question 71

Skipped question 2
11. Paul Powers Jr. Park is located at 2035 Sidney Avenue. It has a play field, limited playground equipment, and no restrooms. How often do you use this park?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How often</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hardly ever or never</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once a month</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than once a month</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How could it be improved, or should it be improved? 26 answered question 72 skipped question

12. Rate the City parks: 1 is unsatisfactory, 3 is average, 5 is excellent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>No opinion</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how would you rate the City parks?</td>
<td>35.2% (25)</td>
<td>36.6% (26)</td>
<td>16.9% (12)</td>
<td>4.2% (3)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>7.0% (5)</td>
<td>1.89</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall, how would you rate the other parks in the area?</td>
<td>10.8% (7)</td>
<td>24.6% (16)</td>
<td>36.9% (24)</td>
<td>20.0% (13)</td>
<td>3.1% (2)</td>
<td>4.6% (3)</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 72 skipped question 1
13. If our City had to concentrate on one park goal, what should it be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maintain what we have</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide more and better walking opportunities</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the cleanliness of the parks</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve access to waterfront</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve safety</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide shelter for larger groups</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve restrooms</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct outdoor pool</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve more teenager activities</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Provide more children activities</strong></td>
<td><strong>19.1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct more parks</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidate parks</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help our schools</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>answered question</strong></td>
<td><strong>68</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>skipped question</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14. Should we consider consolidating park services with the other agencies?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td><strong>62.5%</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**answered question** 72

**skipped question** 1
15. Due to budget constraints and guidance from the previous surveys, the City has maintained a modest parks program. In the next questions, please tell us if you agree or disagree with the policies:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGREE</th>
<th>DISAGREE</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The City purchases one piece of playground equipment annually to maintain its playgrounds.</td>
<td>66.2% (47)</td>
<td>33.8% (24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New subdivisions are usually required to have one small playground, owned by the homeowners association.</td>
<td>83.1% (59)</td>
<td>16.9% (12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Zee Park will not be leased to organized baseball leagues so that other people can have a place to play baseball.</td>
<td>48.5% (33)</td>
<td>51.5% (35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City does not have a recreational program with paid staff because there is not a strong demand for it.</td>
<td>20.3% (14)</td>
<td>79.7% (55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A goal of the City is to have parks that are no less than 1 to 2 acres in size in various parts of the community. This would be about as large as Central Playfield, which is 1.4 acres.</td>
<td>76.5% (52)</td>
<td>23.5% (16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>answered question</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>skipped question</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Please comment on the City’s First Priority needs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should this be First Priority?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No, it should be Second Priority</th>
<th>No, it should be Third Priority</th>
<th>No, it should not be a priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Consistently allocate a minimum of $5,000 for upgrade or repair of playground equipment:</td>
<td>74.6% (50)</td>
<td>10.4% (7)</td>
<td>13.4% (9)</td>
<td>1.5% (1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Establish a fund to purchase future park property:</td>
<td>37.7% (23)</td>
<td>34.4% (21)</td>
<td>16.4% (10)</td>
<td>11.5% (7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Construct a walkway that can accommodate bicycles along Bay Street for the full length of the City:</td>
<td>65.7% (46)</td>
<td>17.1% (12)</td>
<td>11.4% (8)</td>
<td>5.7% (4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Pottery Avenue &amp; Sidney Avenue, south of Tremont Street, should have wide shoulders or sidewalks for pedestrians:</td>
<td>54.4% (37)</td>
<td>20.6% (14)</td>
<td>13.2% (9)</td>
<td>11.8% (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Provide a park of 1 1/2 - 2 acres to serve future growth in the vicinity of Planning Areas 1 and 6:</td>
<td>39.7% (25)</td>
<td>28.6% (18)</td>
<td>11.1% (7)</td>
<td>20.6% (13)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answered question</th>
<th>Skipped question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17. Should the City change its First Priorities?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Response</strong></td>
<td><strong>Response Percent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If yes, list new priorities:</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Answered question</strong></td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Skipped question</strong></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Please comment on the City’s Second Priority needs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should this be a Second Priority?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No, it should be a First Priority</th>
<th>No, it should be a Third Priority</th>
<th>No, it should not be a priority</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Coordinate with road improvement projects to increase the amount of walking area along the roads:</td>
<td>54.5% (36)</td>
<td>34.8% (23)</td>
<td>9.1% (6)</td>
<td>1.5% (1)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Once the Open Space Plan of Kitsap County is adopted, coordinate future projects with that Plan:</td>
<td>75.0% (42)</td>
<td>1.8% (1)</td>
<td>16.1% (9)</td>
<td>7.1% (4)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Establish projects which would be compatible with the Mosquito Fleet Trail:</td>
<td>58.6% (34)</td>
<td>6.9% (4)</td>
<td>17.2% (10)</td>
<td>17.2% (10)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Should the City change its Second Priorities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>74.1%</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>25.9%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, list new priorities: 15

answered question 58

skipped question 15
20. Please comment on the City’s Third Priority needs:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Should this be a Third Priority?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No, it should be a First Priority</th>
<th>No, it should be a Second Priority</th>
<th>No, it should not be a priority</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Construct a viewing deck or educational area overlooking Blackjack Creek:</td>
<td>44.3% (27)</td>
<td>8.2% (5)</td>
<td>11.5% (7)</td>
<td>36.1% (22)</td>
<td><strong>answered question</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Improve waterfront access to the beach near Westbay Shopping Center:</td>
<td>60.6% (40)</td>
<td>9.1% (6)</td>
<td>15.2% (10)</td>
<td>15.2% (10)</td>
<td><strong>answered question</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Look for opportunities to provide a conference center in the downtown area:</td>
<td>37.1% (23)</td>
<td>6.5% (4)</td>
<td>9.7% (6)</td>
<td><strong>46.8% (29)</strong></td>
<td><strong>answered question</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

21. Should the City change its Third Priorities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>61.4%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If yes, list new priorities: 13

**answered question** 57

**skipped question** 16
### 22. If the City were to develop a new park, where should it be located?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Along the water or with a view of it</td>
<td>54.9%</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethel Corridor (Various areas)</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Along or near Blackjack Creek</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not develop a new park</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 71

skipped question 2

### 23. What would you want at the new park? (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walking opportunities</td>
<td>80.3%</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic tables and areas</td>
<td>83.1%</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>76.1%</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseball fields</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfront access or view</td>
<td>47.9%</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pool, indoor or out door</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skateboard or roller blade areas</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open field or areas</td>
<td>38.0%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basketball court</td>
<td>22.5%</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large shelter for group picnics</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salmon viewing area</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Running area for dogs</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean facilities</td>
<td>77.5%</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soccer field</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Horseshoe court
- Response: 12.7%
- Count: 9

### Volleyball court
- Response: 18.3%
- Count: 13

### Other (please specify)
- Response: 25.4%
- Count: 18

#### Answered question: 71

#### Skipped question: 2

---

24. These are more general questions: What do you like best in Port Orchard? (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Small town</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The waterfront and activities</td>
<td>61.1%</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Orchard’s location</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The people</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The quiet environment</td>
<td>48.6%</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown and the shopping area</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The library</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The City hall building and chimes</td>
<td>18.1%</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer’s market</td>
<td>38.9%</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Answered question: 72

#### Skipped question: 1
25. If you could change one thing about Port Orchard, what would it be?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Improve or revitalize the downtown area</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve waterfront access</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More aggressive code enforcement and improving the run down houses</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More visible policing of the City</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More and better sidewalks</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve retail core of City</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve downtown parking</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make the City prettier and cleaner</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paint the downtown</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create a walking or bike trail system</td>
<td><strong>23.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>17</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less City government</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better zoning</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve and enlarge the roads</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove the marquee</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More trees and landscaping</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve parking</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less traffic and less speeding</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improve the parks</td>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce the number of taverns</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slow growth</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less noise</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**answered question** 71  
**skipped question** 2
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More enforcement of junk cars and run down property</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>More and better sidewalks</strong></td>
<td><strong>21.9%</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More police emphasis on speeding cars, less crime</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wider streets</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove dangerous trees or those blocking views</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better maintenance</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less noise</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaner residential streets</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More street trees</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate neighborhood open space areas</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground power and telephone</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larger lots</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No more condos in single family neighborhoods</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smaller subdivisions</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Repair playground</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>answered question</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>skipped question</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
27. The City Council meetings are televised and replayed 2 or 3 times during the week on the local access channel, BKAT. Do you watch the program?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes, every one</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once in awhile</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I didn’t know it was televised</td>
<td>32.9%</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 70
skipped question 3

28. Do you use email or internet? If so, where do you access it? (Check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Response Percent</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>98.6%</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>37.5%</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t use email or internet</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (please specify)</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 72
skipped question 1

29. Now it is your turn. What are we doing wrong, could do better, or what would you like to see more of?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

answered question 45
skipped question 28
PART I. INTRODUCTION

Purpose

The purpose of the Kitsap County Campus Master Plan is to provide for the expansion of County facilities on the Port Orchard Campus over the next 40+ years. This Plan provides phased development scenarios to ensure that the County has options for expansion and includes recommended zoning changes to facilitate this expansion. This Plan offers suggestions for design guidelines that the City and community may want to pursue in order to further shape future public and private development.

Relationship to the Comprehensive Plan

This Master Plan includes recommendations for zoning amendments to the City of Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan. These amendments would allow changes in the zoning that would facilitate the expansion of community facilities, and allow uses that would buffer residential areas from the Campus.

Port Orchard Campus facilities are located in the City of Port Orchard and must comply with City regulations. In order to encourage planned, orderly growth of Kitsap County facilities, the plan suggests amendments to the City of Port Orchard Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code. These amendments will also give adjacent property owners a clear understanding of potential growth and land uses in their neighborhood.

Plan Objectives

The following objectives were developed based on the future needs of the County and the reassurance needed by the City and community that the County has a clear, necessary vision for expansion over time.

Objective 1: COORDINATE

Provide Space for Future Expansion
Provide adequate land to allow for future County expansion including office buildings, community facilities, parking lots and parking structures.

Objective 2: CONFIGURE

Balance growth with neighborhood concerns
Utilize the public process and community input to shape the development of County expansion to create a common plan.

Objective 3: CLARIFY

Legibility of Place and Physical Character
Find ways to make the Campus more appealing and easy to navigate for visitors and employees. Make the Campus an asset to the community through responding to the community’s desired aesthetic.
Planning Principles
The following principles were developed through discussions with the community, City and County staff. These are ideas and issues that arose early on in the process and had influence on the final plan.

1. Image of the County Seat
   • Landmark structure on Hill
   • Several focal structures around a courtyard
   • Neighborhood of small structures

2. Accessible County Functions
   • Triangulate major facilities
   • Create a legible campus

3. Where is the Front Door?
   • Cline is for County Functions or
   • Sidney is for County Functions
   • Cline is for Public Access, Sidney is Employee Access

4. Consolidate Departments and Civic Functions
   • County and Community

5. Connect County functions with Commercial Core/ Waterfront
   • Pedestrian Connections
   • Visual Connection

6. Campus Expansion Options (30-50 years)
   • Linear along Cline
   • Linear along Sidney
   • Core between Cline and Sidney to the south

7. Street Grid/ Circulation
   • Division to Taylor, one-way couplet or one-way to Austin
   • Division pedestrian plaza, Taylor goes to 2-way
   • Maintain two-way on Division but expand angle parking to both sides

8. Rational Parking Layout
   • Short term visitors closest to facility
   • Long-term visitors moderate walking distance
   • Employees moderate to long walking distance

9. Pedestrian System
   • Trail along ravine
   • Urban sidewalks

10. Neighborhood and County Integration – Buffer between single family and County facilities
    • Park, open space
    • Parking
    • Multifamily
    • Mixed professional office and residential

Improved Sidewalk System
Signature Community Facilities
Improved Pedestrian System
Study Area
In 1995, the City of Port Orchard passed a resolution limiting the development of County Facilities on the main campus between Cline and Sidney Avenues to the east and west, and Dwight and Sroufe Streets to the north and south. The Campus Master Plan respects these boundaries and shows development beyond 40 years within the boundary.

These boundaries are currently being revisited by the Port Orchard City Council.

Public Process
The public process for the Campus Master Plan began with the creation of a stakeholder group that included residents, business owners and land owners that are impacted by the Campus. Stakeholder meetings were also attended by City and County staff and officials. This group reviewed a variety of Campus expansion concepts, studied the impacts of design guidelines, and proposed zoning changes and gave input on different growth scenarios. This resulted in a Draft Master Plan that was then reviewed at a public meeting in which the community was invited to ask questions and make comments regarding the Plan. The zoning proposal and the Master Plan were then modified to reflect public feedback.
PART II. BACKGROUND AND EXISTING CONDITIONS

Planning and Land Use

With the passage of the Washington State Growth Management Act in 1990, developing communities are required to submit a comprehensive plan that outlines strategies to accommodate the needs of a growing population. It is intended for this comprehensive plan to be updated to reflect the changes in growth and boundaries of that growth including changes to zoning.

Existing Land Use

The Port Orchard Zoning Map south of Taylor Street shows parcels other than existing government properties zoned R-8, single family residential with a density limit of 8 units per acre. This zoning designation limits land use to residential though several businesses still operate in the area under Special Use Permits. Special Use Permits are currently under moratorium per the Port Orchard City Council. Most of the active Special Use Permit properties in the Campus Area are north and west of the Law and Justice Building.

The area south of Taylor Street to Kendall Street under consideration is currently single family residential use. There is one multifamily building with approximately 8 units and an American Legion building used for community gatherings. The streets are unimproved asphalt without curbs, gutters or sidewalks.

Campus Plan and Development Scenarios

The County and City have a long history of looking to the area south of Taylor for additional expansion of County buildings and at one time the City considered sharing a structure with the County in this area. This Plan builds on these ideas. The following chapter shows several development scenarios for incremental growth of County facilities that is in concert with private development.

Plan Assumptions Based on Existing Conditions

The Campus Plan assumes that the seat of Kitsap County government and its associated offices will stay in the City of Port Orchard.

Maintain the Campus Master Plan boundaries enacted by the City of Port Orchard. The Campus Plan aims to soften these boundaries by recommending zoning changes that will allow mixed use including professional office as a buffer to the residential neighborhood.

Parking has been an issue for the community. Several construction projects in 2002 have adversely impacted available on street parking in the Campus area. With the completion of the Jail Expansion parking should be back to normal. These short-term parking problems are not the focus of this long-term Master Plan. This Plan assumes that the combination of the restored parking at the completed jail expansion and the plan for the new Administration Building will satisfy current parking needs within the existing County properties and lease agreements.
Opportunities and Issues
The opportunities and issues of the Campus area are divided into sections.

Parking Issues
Parking (location, count, and peak demand) for:
- Juries
- Permit Counters
- Jail/court visitors/attorneys
- Community meetings and access to elected officials

Shared facilities based on timing and location of activities
Parking control through residential parking permitting, time limits, and meters
Improve pedestrian access to buildings from parking areas

Circulation
- Vehicular, access to and from the site and impacts on surrounding neighbors, street widths, turning lanes, one ways, visibility and sight distances are paramount
- Pedestrian, to and from the site, links to downtown, water and Givens Community Center/Park, possible pedestrian access to and through the ravine
- Bicycle lanes or wide shoulders, secure bike parking on or near the site
- Public Transit, links to other parts of the County, directions from bus stops to services
- Service access, loading
- Emergency vehicle access
- ADA parking and building access, drop off area(s)

Slopes and Views
- Orientation of building, plazas and walkways for optimal solar access and wind protection
- Ravine access and protection
- Stormwater improvements, curb, gutters, etc.
- Hydrology on site and former creek/ravine
- Maintaining and enhancing views to water on the north and west and to the park on the south
- Create visual link and orientation aid via views to water, downtown

Signage
- For vehicle and pedestrian circulation and
- Parking
- Building services

Land Use and Zoning
- Impact of government expansion on single family homes and businesses
- Codification of where and how County growth can occur in the future

Activities
- Timing of use for different facilities, jury selections, permit counter hours, use of recreation facilities and other offices off-site
- Compatible activities for shared parking
- Utilize potential space at community center
PART III. ANALYSIS
Analysis included a thorough review of City and County regulations including the Comprehensive Plan for both the City and County, current zoning and land use, and other applicable documents like the view corridor protection review for the City of Port Orchard.

Strategies
• Maintain street grid and two-way streets for ease of access for both vehicles and pedestrians, review with the City as needed.

• Change Zoning to accommodate Community Facilities in the blocks between Taylor Street and Kendall Street.

• Change Zoning to allow for a buffer area of mixed uses including professional office and residential for the parcels bordering the Campus on Cline and Sidney Avenues.

• Promote neighborhood scale and character through bulk and height restrictions and design guidelines.

• Provide adequate and accessible parking for visitors and employees.

Proposed Zoning
The County’s growth patterns are such that expansion south of Taylor in the next twenty years will probably not exceed the land shown zoned for Community Facilities. This zoning change will assure the County and the community of the intent of expansion.

Schedule
• Draft to County project manager
• Draft to County Commissioners
• Review with the Commissioners
• Revisions to Draft Plan
• Public Hearing
• Adoption of the Plan by County Commissioners
Campus Plan Alternatives Analysis

Within 5 years (2008)

With the completion of the new Administration Building and some currently planned relocations to Bremerton the County will have enough office space to meet its needs in the next five years.

Expansion shown: approx. 70k square feet of office, up to 238 parking stalls

1. Completion of the Kitsap County Administration Building and associated parking.
2. The County acquires parcels south of Taylor to Smith Street that are nearest to Austin. Development of surface parking for employees and include street improvements.
3. County leases or acquires parcels south of Division as a land bank and develops land into surface parking for visitors.

X-section A-A East West across Austin Avenue just south of Taylor Street. This section illustrates an improved streetscape along Austin and the buffering and landscaping for the two surface parking lots that would be developed within the next five years.
5-20 years (2023)
Requirements: 40k square feet of additional office space
200 additional parking spaces
Expansion shown: up to 123.8k square feet of office, up to 382 parking stalls
4. The County begins to acquire and develop office space in the remaining parcels of the two blocks south of Taylor including street improvements.
5. The County expands the existing Public Works Building with a parking and office wing northward; this may or may not include acquiring the Dwight Street right-of-way that is now used for parking.
6. Further development of government offices on the corner of Taylor and Sidney with a possible parking structure along Sidney Avenue.
20-40 years (2043)
Requirements: 40k square feet of additional office space
200 additional parking spaces (approx. 120 Employees and 80 Visitor stalls)
Expansion shown: up to 88.3k office space, up to 283 parking stalls
7. The County expands the Law and Justice Building with a wing to the south with parking underneath, this could end with a plaza, courtyard or other public open space on the corner of Taylor and Cline. This open space would be the center piece of a “green walk” from the future Administration Building to the City Park next to Givens Community Center.
8. Development of Government offices on the corner of Sidney and Division with a parking structure to the south.
9. Develop a parking structure on Austin in the first block south of Taylor that connects with the new Law and Justice wing and public open space.

X-Section BB This section shows the development of the Law and Justice expansion to the south with a public park and a below grade parking area.
Over 40 years
At current growth rates (2.03% per year), the full build-out of the Campus Area would support this rate of growth for x number of years.
Expansion shown: up to 181.3k square feet of office, up to 513 parking stalls
10. Begin acquiring and developing government office and associated parking in the two blocks between Smith Street and Givens Community Center.
11. Begin building a parking structure on the west side of Austin between Smith and Taylor

x-section C-C
This section shows the street development along Austin Avenue south of Smith Street. This scenario possibility shows additional sidewalks, lighting, street trees, planting strips and landscaping around buildings.
Street Development
The development of the two major access streets includes improvements to Cline that would emphasize the quieter nature of Cline and the residential character. Because of the steep grade north of the Campus, Cline would be difficult to widen to allow for more vehicular access. The incremental improvements in this scenario show public open spaces where Cline meets the City park, at the expanded Law and Justice Building and landscape improvements on the west side of the new Administration Building. It is intended that this “green link” could be continued down Cline to connect with the downtown.

Sidney Avenue development would include improved sidewalks and a future left turn lane to facilitate auto access to and from the Campus. With additional traffic on Sidney, improved pedestrian crossings with painted stripes and signage would need to correspond to auto improvements.
Timing of Redevelopment and Expansion

Timing of redevelopment and expansion is dependent upon several factors including County growth rates, County programming and space needs, property values, zoning amendments, and budgets. The building of the new Administration Building and the remodel of the Law and Justice Building are already in the planning phases and would be expected to be completed in the next few years.

The development contained within this Plan is a direction that the County would like to move in but the rate of this expansion and unforeseen issues that may arise in the future could modify the goals and issues affecting these decisions. Taking preliminary steps today such as modifying the zoning to allow for County development would put in place the building blocks necessary to move forward with County expansion in the future. By tempering zoning changes with specific design guidelines will ensure that the scale and character of new development will reflect the aesthetic values of the neighborhood.

Implementation Strategy

The first step toward implementation of this Plan will be to amend the City’s Comprehensive Plan to include new zoning code for the Campus, including buffer zones if any added by the City. This new zoning may take place as an overlay zone that would include design guidelines specific to the Campus area.

Implementation of this Master Plan will be dependent on several factors not the least of which is the growth rate of the County population and the incorporation of Cities within the County which will directly affect the County’s need for additional office and parking.

Design Guidelines

It is paramount that design guidelines reflect the neighborhood but also allow for freedom of expression and are not unduly restrictive so as to eliminate most development from occurring. It would be expected that the following list of elements would be addressed through design guidelines.

Site Design Elements:
- Retain significant features
- Buffers
- Vehicular Access
- Location and Layout of Parking
- Pedestrian Connections Offsite
- Garage Entry/Door Location
- Building Entry Location
- Setbacks
- Open Space Requirements
- Building’ Site Identity
- Weather Protection
- Street Trees
- Lighting
- Signage
- Site Utilities, Storage, Trash, and Mechanical Areas

Building Facade Elements:
- Windows
- Materials
- Accents/ colors/ trim

Building Form Elements:
- Height
- Massing
- Roof Modulation
- Wall Modulation
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## CITY OF PORT ORCHARD

### Land Capacity - Underutilized Land

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDERUTILIZED LANDS</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL 4.5 (R4.5)</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL 8 (R8)</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL 12 (R12)</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL 20 (R20)</th>
<th>GREENBELT (GB)</th>
<th>RESIDENTIAL 8 (R8)</th>
<th>MIXED USE (MXD)</th>
<th>GRAND TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.5 DU/AC</td>
<td>8 DU/AC</td>
<td>12 DU/AC</td>
<td>20 DU/AC</td>
<td>0.5 DU/AC</td>
<td>12 DU/AC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Gross Acres</td>
<td>358.45</td>
<td>1658.50</td>
<td>16.54</td>
<td>195.14</td>
<td>250.28</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>43.39</td>
<td>2531.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi - Family Dwelling (-)</td>
<td>34.26</td>
<td>21.94</td>
<td>8.95</td>
<td>54.16</td>
<td>10.91</td>
<td>8.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>139.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcels &lt; 0.50 Acres (-)</td>
<td>59.74</td>
<td>542.07</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>24.60</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>644.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public/Current Use/Utilities/Water/Developed (-)</td>
<td>90.88</td>
<td>928.69</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>65.14</td>
<td>232.49</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>35.85</td>
<td>1353.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoreline Parcel &lt; 1.00 Acre (-)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>173.57</td>
<td>165.80</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>51.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>393.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopable Acres</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Value $43682</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density &lt; 2.5 (-)</td>
<td>20.59</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>20.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density &gt;= 2.5 - &lt; 4.00 Value &gt; (-)</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>5.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Density &gt;= 4.0 - &lt; 5.00 Value &gt; (-)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>140.81</td>
<td>165.80</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>51.24</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>360.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remove 100% underutilized platted lots (total)</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>36.73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>67.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>121.98</td>
<td>129.07</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>293.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Areas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Redevelopable Acres</td>
<td>121.98</td>
<td>129.07</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>39.32</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>293.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unencumbered Acres</td>
<td>63.59</td>
<td>55.03</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>27.59</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>148.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres within Critical Areas</td>
<td>25.77</td>
<td>9.46</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>38.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Areas reduction 75% (-)</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>9.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres within Area of Concern</td>
<td>32.61</td>
<td>64.58</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>8.82</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>106.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of Concern reduction 50% (-)</td>
<td>16.31</td>
<td>32.29</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>4.41</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>53.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal</strong></td>
<td>86.34</td>
<td>89.69</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>32.72</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>211.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roads/Right-of-Way (Future)</td>
<td>69.07</td>
<td>71.75</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>26.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>168.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Facility (Future)</td>
<td>55.26</td>
<td>57.40</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>20.94</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>135.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unavailable Lands</td>
<td>46.97</td>
<td>48.79</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>17.80</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>114.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platted lots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underutilized Platted lots TOTAL</td>
<td>18.83</td>
<td>36.73</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>11.92</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>67.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underutilized Platted Lots (25%) (+)</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>16.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Net Developable Acres</td>
<td>51.68</td>
<td>57.97</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>20.78</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>131.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dwelling Unit Capacity</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>782</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 pph</td>
<td>1.8 pph</td>
<td>2.5 pph</td>
<td>1.8 pph</td>
<td>1.8 pph</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population Capacity</td>
<td>473</td>
<td>288</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>