

APPENDIX A

UPDATED LAND CAPACITY ANALYSIS

KITSAP COUNTY 2005 UPDATED LAND CAPACITY ANALYSIS (ULCA)

Prepared For:

**Kitsap County
Department of Community Development**



Prepared By:

**Mark Personius, AICP,
Growth Management Consultant**

**Kitsap County Geographic Information Systems,
Cindy Read
David Nash**

October 2005

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

KITSAP COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Chris Endresen, Chair, District 1 North Kitsap
Jan Angel, District 2 South Kitsap
Patty Lent, District 3 Central Kitsap

KITSAP COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Cindy Baker, Director
Cindy Read, GIS Analyst
Dave Nash, GIS Analyst

KITSAP COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION

REPRESENTING NORTH KITSAP:

John S. Ahl
Deborah "Deb" J. Flynn
Thomas E. Nevins

REPRESENTING CENTRAL KITSAP:

Dean Jenniges
Frank Mahaffay
John Taylor

REPRESENTING SOUTH KITSAP:

Lary Coppola
Michael A. Gustavson
Monty Mahan

ULCA Citizens Advisory Group

William Palmer
Edie Berghoff
Richard Brown
Fred Depee
Tom Donnelly
Art Castle
Betsy Cooper
Sara Currow
Byron Harris
Vivian Henderson
Chris Hugo
Joanne Long-Woods
Jeff McCormick
Tom Nevins
Ron Ross
Doug Skrobut

URBAN LANDS

Introduction

This document illustrates the rationale and assumptions used for determining the current residential and commercial/industrial capacity of urban and rural zoned lands in Kitsap County. The actual land capacity analysis worksheets with reported outcomes for all parcels were prepared by Kitsap County GIS.

The purpose of the Updated Land Capacity Analysis (ULCA) is to establish an objective approach by which to determine the current supply of land and how much population and development Kitsap County can expect to accommodate under current zoning and development regulations in the existing rural lands and urban growth areas (UGAs).

Analysis of UGA land capacity is required by the Growth Management Act (GMA) in two different sections of the Act: 1) RCW 36.70A.130(3) requires it as a part of a County's Comprehensive Plan 10-year update when expanding UGAs to accommodate additional population allocations; and 2) RCW 36.70A.215(3)(a), the so-called "Buildable Lands" provision, requires a determination of "... *whether there is sufficient suitable land to accommodate the county-wide population projection...*".

The Kitsap County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs) provide further guidance on how land capacity analyses should be implemented by the County and its cities as a part of their respective on-going growth management planning efforts in Element B. Urban Growth Areas, *Policy 1—Land Capacity Analysis Program*:

- a. *The County and the Cities shall maintain a Land Capacity Analysis Program to monitor land supply and trends for residential, commercial, and industrial lands to determine the success of implementation of their respective comprehensive plans. This Program is intended to fulfill the state requirement for a Buildable Lands Program.*
- b. *The County and the Cities shall participate in the Land Capacity Analysis using a consistent methodology for review and evaluation.*
- c. *The County and the Cities shall develop strategies from the Land Capacity Analysis to efficiently use the available capacity of residential, commercial and industrial uses within Urban Growth Areas, reducing the need to expand the urban growth boundaries.*
- d. *The County and Cities shall establish procedures for resolving inconsistencies in collection and analysis of land capacity data. In the event a resolution cannot be achieved, the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council shall be a forum to review and if possible facilitate any disputes between parties.*

The County was also in the process of developing new and updated subarea plans for several UGAs during the development of the ULCA. The ULCA provided updated capacity analysis for those efforts in South Kitsap, Port Orchard, Kingston and Silverdale consistent with the CPPs Element B. UGAs, Policy 2.h.(i-iii). Staff also provided ULCA framework updates to each of the citizen advisory committees for their respective subarea planning efforts.

Kitsap County examined four different optional approaches as a part of the Urban Lands ULCA development process. These included review and evaluation of the rationale used in two previous GMA-related land capacity analysis efforts in the County—the 1998 Comprehensive Plan and the 2002 Buildable Lands Report—as well as two new alternative approaches developed in concert with a public involvement program to solicit input from interested individuals and stakeholders in the process. An additional private-initiated alternative land capacity analysis performed by a local real estate company was also evaluated.

Public Involvement Process

The County established a Citizen Advisory Group (or CAG) comprised of interested citizens, developers, builders, realtors, local residents and growth management advocates to help develop the Updated Land Capacity Analysis. The CAG also included staff from the County and local municipalities who provided technical advice and expertise in the development of the ULCA. The CAG met intensely over a period of 7 months to develop and evaluate the alternative approaches. The final CAG recommendations—with a focus on incorporating a heightened sense of “reality” to the land capacity analysis—were made to staff in early 2005.

The staff then prepared a draft recommended ULCA framework that incorporated many of the CAG recommendations. The draft ULCA framework was presented to the Kitsap County Planning Commission in early 2005. The Planning Commission reviewed the ULCA alternative approaches and recommended selection of a preferred ULCA framework that was presented to the Kitsap Board of County Commissioners (Board) and the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council (KRCC). After significant review and evaluation by the Board and the KRCC and subsequent public input, the Board of County Commissioners (Board) recommended a preferred Urban Residential Lands ULCA methodology on April 25, 2005. That preferred approach is presented in this document. It also provides the basis for the subsequent Urban Commercial/Industrial Lands and Rural Lands ULCA presented herein.

A chronology of public involvement steps during development of the ULCA is presented in the following table.

2004-2005 ULCA Public Involvement Program Chronology

<i>Public Meeting</i>	<i>Date</i>	<i>Topic</i>
Citizen Advisory Group	September 29, 2004	Land Capacity Analysis Overview
Citizen Advisory Group	October 6, 2004	Critical Area Reduction Factors
Citizen Advisory Group	October 13, 2004	Underutilized Lands and Redevelopment Constraints
Citizen Advisory Group	October 20, 2004	Public Purpose Lands Reduction Factors and Sewer Service Constraints
Citizen Advisory Group	October 27, 2004	Sewer Service Constraints
Citizen Advisory Group	November 3, 2004	ULCA Alternative Approaches
Citizen Advisory Group	November 10, 2004	Water Service Constraints
Citizen Advisory Group	November 17, 2004	Unavailable Land Factors & Alternative ULCA Approaches
Citizen Advisory Group	December 15, 2004	Sewer Service Constraints, Underutilized Lands and Unavailable Lands Reduction Factors
Planning Commission	January 11, 2005	ULCA Briefing
Board	January 12, 2005	ULCA Update briefing
KRCC Board	January 13, 2005	ULCA Briefing & Discussion
Citizen Advisory Group	January 19, 2005	Sewer Service Constraints and Wetlands Reduction Factors
Citizen Advisory Group	January 26, 2005	Preliminary ULCA UGA Outcomes & Discussion of Rural Lands and Commercial/Industrial ULCA
KRCC Board	February 1, 2005	ULCA Briefing & Discussion
Planning Commission	February 8, 2005	ULCA Review
Citizen Advisory Group	February 9, 2005	Draft CAG-recommended ULCA Framework
KRCC Planning Directors	February 10, 2005	ULCA Briefing & Discussion
Board	February 16, 2005	ULCA Update briefing
Kingston Subarea CAC	February 22, 2005	ULCA Briefing & Discussion
Silverdale Subarea CAC	February 24, 2005	ULCA Briefing & Discussion
KRCC Board	March 1, 2005	ULCA Briefing & Discussion
Port Orchard Subarea CAC	March 2, 2005	ULCA Briefing & Discussion
KRCC Planning Directors	March 10, 2005	ULCA Briefing & Discussion
Board	March 21, 2005	ULCA Work Study
Board	April 11, 2005	ULCA Work Study
Planning Commission	April 12, 2005	ULCA Public Hearing/Recommendation
Board	April 18, 2005	ULCA Work Study
Board	April 25, 2005	ULCA Public Hearing/Final Framework Recommendation
Kitsap Commercial Real Estate Brokers	August 10, 2005	Commercial/Industrial ULCA Briefing

Applicability

Land capacity analysis is an “*inexact science*” and jurisdictions have discretion in choosing their methodology but its assumptions should be based on best available data and actual conditions to the maximum extent practical. Assumptions made about particular factors affecting development are often subject to debate or interpretation¹. Lively CAG meetings provided ample opportunity for such discussions to occur. Where assumptions are made as a part of the preferred ULCA rationale, consideration was given to alternative viewpoints and the evaluation of those issues is documented to the extent practical and applicable in this paper. Detailed discussion of alternative approaches, background information and rationale regarding particular land capacity factors are contained in the footnotes in this paper.

The preferred ULCA approach outlines a step-by-step process by which the land supply is analyzed and “reduction factors” applied to “gross” acres of land in particular zones in order to eliminate lands presumed to be unbuildable for the purposes of accommodating additional housing and employment (e.g., lands needed for public purposes, environmentally sensitive or critical areas, land held off the real estate market, etc.). Ultimately the ULCA derives the number of “net” acres available for development in each respective zone and converts those net acres into available capacity for new housing units, population and commercial/industrial development.

¹ Assumptions made in the 2005 preferred ULCA approach are documented in the text and/or footnotes accompanying the step-by-step methodology. However, there are also several significant criteria or factors that were discussed and *not included* in the preferred approach. The most significant of those are documented here.

- The impact of CC&Rs (Covenants, Conditions & Restrictions) on land capacity is not included in the preferred methodology. These are private deed restrictions that often preclude further subdivision of platted lots even if allowed by zoning. They are not enforceable by cities or counties. If they had been utilized, the net effect would likely be to reduce existing development capacity.
- Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) are not included in the analysis. These are small “Mother-in-Law” units allowed on parcels with existing homes. ADUs typically only account for 1%-2% of total housing stock, so they are not considered to have a significant impact on total housing capacity in most communities. If they had been utilized, the net effect would be to increase existing development capacity.
- Consideration of Concurrency-Restricted Roadways was not utilized in the land capacity analysis. These are areas potentially subject to development restriction due to inadequate existing or anticipated future roadway capacity. If utilized, the net effect would potentially reduce existing development capacity.

Urban Residential Lands ULCA Approach

This section illustrates the rationale and assumptions used in the preliminary updated land capacity analysis (ULCA) for urban residential zoned lands in Kitsap County. It is intended as a guide to understanding the background and rationale for assumptions made in determining the current residential capacity of the Urban Growth Areas (UGAs) in Kitsap County. The actual residential land capacity analysis worksheets with reported outcomes for all UGAs were prepared by Kitsap County GIS.

The urban residential zones and their *minimum* dwelling unit densities included in the Urban Lands ULCA include:

- Urban Restricted (1 DU/Acre)
- Urban Low (5 DUs/Acre)
- Urban Medium (10 DUs/Acre)
- Urban High (18 DUs/Acre)
- Urban Village Center²

The rationale and assumptions for the Urban Residential land capacity analysis were reviewed and recommended by the Kitsap County Board of Commissioners on April 25, 2005. The Urban Residential ULCA seeks to identify both *vacant* and *underutilized* lands in the inventory. The methodologies for the *vacant* and *underutilized* residential land capacity analyses are each presented separately. “Reduction factors” applied in the analysis are indicated by the symbol (-). The summary totals of vacant and underutilized urban residential lands by zone for the unincorporated UGAs based on this approach is illustrated in Table 1.1. Detailed individual unincorporated UGA housing capacity analysis is contained in Appendix A.

² The Urban Village Center (UVC) zone is a mixed use commercial/residential zone found only in the Kingston UGA. It requires a more complex set of assumptions to determine vacant land capacity since both residential and commercial use capacity have to be estimated on the same parcel. Vacant parcels can only be geo-coded once—meaning that they can only be identified (i.e., mapped) in the GIS database in one category of land use—as either vacant residential or vacant commercial. Since the ULCA applies some reduction factors on a site-specific basis (e.g., critical areas) this prevents double counting the capacity of the zone. The zoning code specifies a maximum residential density of 18 dwelling units per acre in the UVC zone. There is no minimum residential density specified. For purposes of the ULCA all vacant UVC zoned parcels are evaluated for capacity purposes in the residential ULCA at the *maximum* density assuming coverage of one-half of the parcel. Therefore no vacant UVC acres are identified in the Kingston UGA commercial/industrial ULCA outcome worksheets. Nevertheless some commercial capacity remains on the other one-half of those same vacant net acres. See footnotes on the Kingston UGA Commercial/Industrial Vacant Lands Worksheet in the Appendix of this report for the specific estimate of vacant UVC zoned land that is assumed to remain available for commercial development but is unaccounted for due to geo-coding protocols. Underutilized UVC parcels, on the other hand, can be classified as either residential or commercial based on their current use Assessors code. Therefore, no “split zoning” assumptions are needed to calculate capacity. Residential capacity is calculated—consistent with all other zones—assuming a *minimum* density (10 units per acre is the assumed minimum density for purposes of the ULCA) applied to all remaining net acres of underutilized UVC acres in current (single-family) residential use. Similarly, underutilized UVC lands in current non-residential use are accounted for in the commercial/industrial ULCA.

VACANT LANDS METHODOLOGY

Step 1: Identify All Vacant Parcels Zoned for Residential Use

The first step is to identify all *vacant* parcels (Assessors Code 9100) in each of the five urban residential zones. This step is further refined by eliminating all vacant tax-exempt and current use tax parcels within these zones³. The result can be considered the inventory of “gross acres” for all *vacant* urban residential zoned lands in the respective UGAs⁴.

Step 2: Identify Critical Areas Affecting Vacant Parcels Zoned Residential (-)

The second step measures critical areas ordinance (CAO) impacts on all *vacant* urban residential parcels identified in the first step. First it identifies *unencumbered* acres (i.e., acres of vacant residential zoned parcels *without* CAO coverage or impact). Then it identifies the acres with CAO coverage and estimates the net impact of those critical areas on the parcel’s development potential by deducting the portions of the affected parcels assumed to be unavailable for development due to the provisions of the CAO.

These calculations are based on the CAO “reduction factor” assumptions recommended by the Board for use in the Urban Residential ULCA on April 25, 2005⁵.

³ The vast majority of parcels enrolled in *current use* are in rural and resource land designated areas of the county. However, there are some located within UGAs. The ULCA assumes that those parcels voluntarily enrolled in the current use program—that nonetheless have an urban residential zone designation—are not likely to develop or redevelop to minimum urban standards during the planning period. And so those parcels are removed from the urban land supply. There are several reasons for this: First, the current use designation is a technique whereby we can actually identify owner intent **not** to develop property. Whether that remains the case for the next twenty years is, of course, unknown. But at least for the present—and in the case of open space general lands at least for ten years—we have some measurable means to identify property owners who do not intend to develop; Secondly, properties enrolled in the program must meet strict criteria for enrollment to ensure that the “open space” benefit is reflective of actual parcel characteristics. Many of these parcels are already characterized by the presence of critical areas that significantly impair their development potential, such as stream buffers, steep slopes and wildlife habitat areas or have conservation easements recorded on them that preclude further development—even if they were not enrolled in the current use program. Both the agricultural and timber open space programs have strict economic criteria that parcels must meet demonstrating that they are indeed producing income from the current agricultural or timber use. This precludes derelict properties being included in the program as a “holding” zone until considered ripe for development.

⁴ There is no minimum lot size exclusion applied to vacant lands. All vacant residentially zoned parcels—regardless of size or location within the UGA—are included in the residential land supply, except for tax-exempt and current use tax parcels.

⁵ The recommended methodology assumes *adopted* CAO definitions and buffers for streams, wetlands, floodplains and geologic hazard areas. Stream buffers are per the current adopted CAO and include the 200 foot HMP buffers on salmon-bearing streams. Wetlands are mapped in the GIS database but are not classified by type. Therefore, an average 75’ wetland buffer is used based on recommendations from the Kitsap County DCD wetland biologist for NWI wetlands that are not classified in the database. This is based on review of delineated wetlands identified on preliminary plats from 1998-2004 where most unclassified wetlands were determined to be Type 2 (100 foot buffer) and Type 3 (50 foot buffer) wetlands. Some areas of CAO-encumbered parcels will be unbuildable due to environmental constraints.

Step 3: Identify Vacant Residential Zoned Lands that are Sewer Constrained (-)

This step recognizes the sewer constraint approach recommended by the Board for use in the Urban Residential ULCA. Such a constraint analysis is authorized by state buildable lands guidelines, but does not appear to have been implemented by any other jurisdictions to date⁶. The application of a sewer constraint is intended to acknowledge that due to the unique topography of the County, some small, low density (hence relatively low value) residential zoned lots in fragmented ownership located in close proximity to critical areas and steep slopes may be unfeasible to develop at urban densities when located at significant distances from existing sewer mains⁷.

However, the County's adopted CAO allows for buffers and portions of critical areas outside of open water to be included in the density calculation for a particular parcel (i.e., density transfer from the CAO-encumbered portions of parcels—outside of open water areas—is allowed). It is presumed that developers seeking to maximize their return-on-investment will utilize this policy to the maximum extent practicable. Even though all CAO buffers may allow for some development potential (for purposes of avoiding “takings” and to allow for reasonable uses), it is clearly the practical intent of the CAO to discourage, if not prevent development altogether, within the buffers. Studies of approved plats in Snohomish County, noted in the Kitsap County 1998 Comp Plan, indicated, on average, that 60% of density was lost on CAO-encumbered plats.

The County's wetlands are mapped primarily on the basis of the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI). The NWI utilizes aerial photography to identify wetlands which often fails to adequately identify forested wetlands. This typically means that the NWI data undercounts wetland acres, especially where forested wetlands are prevalent. However, according to Kitsap County GIS analysis, soil types associated with forested wetlands lie mostly in the rural areas of the county. The developed areas of the UGAs actually contain the most accurately mapped wetlands data in the county based on surveyed wetlands from pending and approved plats. Consequently, for the purposes of the 2005 ULCA, an additional (unaccounted for) wetland factor is not recommended. *However, the overall recommended approach utilizes a 75% density reduction figure for CAO-encumbered acreage from the minimum zone density to account both for some unaccounted for wetlands and density transfer from the buffer areas to other portions of parcels intended for development.*

The impact of “*areas of geologic concern*” (AOCs) which comprise slopes less than 30% with unstable or highly erodable soils, slopes less than 15% with springs or groundwater present, etc., were also evaluated. The AOCs are buildable under the CAO but their site characteristics present challenges to development which often results in developments avoiding these areas altogether or resulting in loss of density to the overall site. The recommended ULCA methodology utilizes a 50% density reduction factor on the AOCs.

⁶ The Washington Department of Community, Trade and Economic Development (CTED), Buildable Lands Program Guidelines notes that “*land assumed to not have water and sewer infrastructure available within the 20-year planning period*” should be deducted from the buildable land supply and that all assumptions should be well documented. In addition, both Snohomish County and King County recognized that such constraints should be incorporated in their Buildable Lands Program methodologies. The King County Buildable Lands Program, Reference Guide II: Land Supply Inventory, report specifically pointed out that “*an additional and optional step in the land inventory analysis is to deduct from the inventory land for which the provision of basic utility services (e.g., sewer and water) is judged to be infeasible or otherwise very unlikely within the planning horizon*”. Although it appears that no jurisdictions in King County actually took that step in their buildable lands analysis. It appears that no other county subject to the buildable lands requirements of the GMA had included an infrastructure constraint factor in their land capacity analyses.

⁷ The ULCA Citizen Advisory Group (CAG) discussed addition of an “infrastructure constraint” reduction factor in the 2005 ULCA to more accurately address the issue of development infeasibility on small lots due to lack of efficient sewer access. In instituting such a factor for consideration, the CAG discussed and evaluated overall infrastructure constraints in the County's UGAs (e.g., prevalence of small lots which are less efficient to develop, sewer and water service constraints based on remaining vacant lands site location related to availability of infrastructure or impact of topography and critical areas that makes development of these sites infeasible due to the cost of providing expensive pump stations, utility extensions having to cross or avoid critical areas, and the constraint associated with developer extension and ULID financing mechanisms, etc.).

Sewer service constraint criteria examined several different parameters including: 1) distance from sewer main; 2) size of parcel; and 3) zoning density as surrogate variables to assess development feasibility based on lack of sewer availability or the excessive cost of extending sewer at developer expense to reach undeveloped or re-developable lots, given distance, topography, critical area, and small lot size constraints⁸.

The recommended sewer constraint reduction factor analysis is applied to all urban residential zones except the urban restricted zone.⁹

The sewer service constraint formula includes application of a tiered set of (%) reduction factors based on distance of the parcel from the sewer main and the zoning density of the property in each UGA. The percentage reduction factor applies to the actual acreage of particular affected parcels—not to parcels in total.

The CAG took testimony from all the sanitary sewer service providers in the UGAs as to capacity and their 6-year and 20-year facility and conveyance improvement plans. The sewer providers all indicated that they had adequate *treatment capacity* for the 20-year planning period but the issue of concern about the ability to accommodate new growth was *conveyance* of sewage. The only existing viable mechanisms to extend sewer mains into currently unsewered areas of the UGAs to accommodate growth is through ULID formation or by developer extension. The former of which is extremely difficult to do in areas of fragmented land ownership (often the case in areas with a prevalence of small lots) and the latter of which is often infeasible, according to testimony from developers, due to the lack of remaining large vacant parcels in the UGAs where sufficient density is available to make sewer extension feasible based on development economies-of-scale.

⁸ Staff and the CAG prepared and evaluated numerous options for measuring sewer constraint based on available GIS data. Consensus was that the selected option that included “tiered” reduction factors based on zoning and distance of the parcel from the sewer main best utilized the existing data and was the most reflective of actual constraint, insofar as the ULCA can accurately assess without site-specific parcel analysis. The recommended methodology is designed to reflect the impact of lack of sewer on otherwise buildable lands while acknowledging:

- the need to plan for a 20-year land supply;
- the presumption that as land values increase over the planning period, sewer extension will become more feasible; and
- consideration of “reasonable measures” that could be taken to increase feasibility of sewer extension within the current UGAs (e.g., upzoning, public subsidy of sewer construction, etc.).

A “ground truthing” exercise was incorporated in the analysis that included average cost assumptions to construct sewers as a means to better define the actual sewer feasibility threshold based on “real world” data in the current UGAs. The average cost assumptions for sewer and pump station construction were based on actual developer experience and were reviewed by the Kitsap County Department of Public Works. The “ground truthing” analysis incorporated parcel size as a third component of the feasibility analysis. The analysis identified the various parcel sizes needed in each respective residential zone (based on distance from the closest sewer main in 500 foot intervals) in order to maintain the feasibility threshold of developing and sewer 20 lots at a distance of at least 2500 feet from the closest existing sewer main. Minimum parcel sizes needed to maintain feasibility are reduced equally by 25% for each of the four 500-foot intervals (i.e., ¼ reduction in minimum parcel size needed to maintain feasibility for each of the four subsequent 500 foot ‘distance from sewer main’ intervals in each zone from 500-2500 feet). There is no minimum parcel size constraint applied if the parcel is less than 500 feet from an existing sewer main.

⁹ The recommended approach removes the Urban Restricted (UR) zone parcels from the sewer constraint analysis since at the minimum density of 1 du/acre in the UR zone, no sewer is required. Sewer would only be required to achieve the maximum 5 du/acre density allowed in the zone. The ULCA assumes the minimum density in each zone.

Sewer Constraint Reduction Factors (%) Applied to Parcel Acreage in Existing UGAs based on Distance of Parcel from Sewer Main in each Residential Zone		
<u>Urban Low Zone</u>	<u>Urban Medium Zone</u>	<u>Urban High Zone</u>
0% = less than 500 feet 20%= 500-1000' 40%= 1000-1500' 60%= 1500-2500' 75%= >2500'	0% = less than 500 feet 15%= 500-1000' 30%= 1000-1500' 45%= 1500-2500' 60%= >2500'	0% = less than 500 feet 10%= 500-1000' 20%= 1000-1500' 30%= 1500-2500' 40%= >2500'

Vacant acres in the three urban residential zones noted above, remaining to this point in the inventory, that meet the criteria identified in this step are removed from the supply of land considered buildable to this point in the land capacity analysis.

Step 4: Identify Vacant Residential Lands that are Water Constrained (-)

Consistent with the recommendation of the Board on April 25, 2005 this reduction factor is **not** applied to either the Urban Residential or Urban Commercial/Industrial land capacity analyses¹⁰. In the accompanying ULCA worksheets prepared by GIS staff, the reader will observe that this step is labeled as “not applicable” in the land capacity analysis.

Step 5: Identify Vacant Residential Lands Needed for Future Roads & Rights-of-Way (-)

This step identifies urban residential zoned *vacant* lands remaining in the inventory to this point that are likely to be needed for future roads and/or as dedicated rights-of-way.

This step is based on the 20% Roads/R-O-W “reduction factor” recommended by the Board for use in the Urban Residential ULCA on April 25, 2005¹¹.

¹⁰ Analysis of public water constraints focused on water purveyors’ ability to provide fire flow, water rights and water supply availability based on the 20 year planning period. Evaluation indicated that no development constraint was likely at the present time based on current and anticipated water availability based on review of the Kitsap County Coordinated Water System Plan. Although fire flow and water availability remain constraints to achieving higher urban densities within the UGAs, uncertainty about water issues means that no *measurable* development constraints are identified at the present time in terms of land capacity

¹¹ This is based on discussions with development review engineers at the Department of Public Works, experience of local developers with recent plats, and discussions among CAG members based on the needs of new development and future road rights-of-way in the UGAs.

Step 6: Identify Vacant Residential Lands Needed for Future Public & Quasi-Public Facilities (-)

This step identifies urban residential zoned *vacant* lands remaining in the inventory to this point that are likely to be needed for future public and quasi-public facilities. These include needs for regional public facilities such as schools, parks, stormwater treatment facilities, utilities and transmission facilities as well as internal lands within new development devoted to similar purposes. It also includes quasi-public land needs for facilities such as churches, community centers, clubhouses and fraternal organizations, etc. that could occupy lands otherwise intended for residential development.

A 15% Public Facilities “reduction factor” was recommended by the Board for use in the Urban Residential ULCA on April 25, 2005¹².

Step 7: Identify Vacant Residential Lands Likely to be Unavailable for Development (-)

This step seeks to identify urban residential zoned *vacant* lands remaining in the inventory to this point that are likely to be unavailable for development over the planning period due to legal constraints or factors related to landowner intent (e.g., property owners who withhold land from sale, property subject to legal encumbrances, easements that preclude development, etc.).

These calculations are based on a 5% “reduction factor” applied to vacant lands as recommended by the Board for use in the Urban Residential ULCA on April 25, 2005¹³.

Step 8: Report Remaining Net Acres of Vacant Residential Zoned Parcels Available for Development

This step calculates the remaining supply of *vacant* land (in “net” acres) able to accommodate new residential development in each urban residential zone within the applicable UGAs after all the preceding *reduction factors* have been accounted for in Steps 2-7.

¹² Maintains the same 15% reduction factor for public purpose lands used in the 2002 Buildable Lands Report.

¹³ This is a significantly smaller reduction factor than was applied in the 1998 Comprehensive Plan land capacity analysis since new sewer infrastructure-constraint and larger defined critical area reduction factors are incorporated in the 2005 ULCA. This should more accurately reflect lands deducted from the land supply solely for “market” reasons or due to landowner intent—which is the sole intent of this reduction factor.

Step 9: Calculate Total Housing Unit and Population Holding Capacity for each Residential Zone by UGA

This is the last step in the *vacant* urban residential lands analysis. This step first calculates the total new housing unit capacity in each zone by multiplying the net remaining vacant acres in each zone by the *minimum density* allowed in each zone. Total population capacity for each zone and UGA is then derived by multiplying the housing unit capacity in each zone by the average household size for applicable single-family and multi-family zones.

UNDERUTILIZED LANDS METHODOLOGY

Step 1: Identify All Developed but Underutilized Residential Parcels

The first step is to identify all developed but *underutilized* residential parcels in each of the five urban residential zones. *Underutilized* parcels are identified as all developed residential parcels with the ability to accommodate at least one additional housing unit under existing zoning (based on a comparison of parcel size, zoning density and the number of existing units on the parcel). This step excludes all tax-exempt parcels, all shoreline parcels less than one acre and all otherwise underutilized parcels that are 0.5 acres or smaller in size¹⁴.

¹⁴ The CAG agreed to maintain the basic 1998 Comp Plan methodology of defining underutilized parcels with a few exceptions (noted below) aimed at getting a more accurate assessment of truly underutilized lands. The CAG discussed and agreed to exclude *small* shoreline parcels since the County's residential developed shorelines were almost exclusively platted and the potential for redevelopment (where density increase was potential) was negated by the high land and improvement values (i.e., redevelopment was occurring on shoreline lots but not in a manner that increased density on existing parcels, it merely replaced one home with another, usually larger structure).

The CAG also discussed increasing the minimum parcel size threshold for consideration as underutilized from 0.5 acre to 2.5 and even 5 acres due to the development feasibility constraints placed on small parcels. However, the group decided this was inappropriately large and excluded too many potentially redevelopable albeit small parcels. The ½ acre exclusion only applies to underutilized parcels (parcels that already have a home on them but are large enough to accommodate at least one additional home). The Urban Low Zone (5-9 units per acre) is the predominant residential zone in all UGAs. In the Urban Low zone, the minimum lot area needed to accommodate one unit at the minimum zoning code-mandated density of 5 units/acre is approximately 1/5 acre (or 2/10th acre). Therefore to accommodate an additional unit (assuming the parcel already has one home on it occupying 1/5th of an acre) one would need, at a theoretical minimum, a parcel at least 2/5th of an acre in size (or 4/10th acre). Even to reach this theoretical minimum size, the existing home would have to be situated on the lot in such a way that would allow for a new home to be built and still meet all required setbacks, utility and driveway access conditions. As well as any private covenants, codes and restrictions that might restrict further subdivision or blockage of existing views. These *in situ* issues typically have a dampening effect on further subdivision of small parcels. This is why the ½ acre exclusion is applied—because ½ acre parcels with a home already on them are almost exclusively located in the Urban Low zone and are not expected to accommodate a significant amount of future urban growth.

Existing dwelling units on underutilized parcels will be removed in the final step prior to calculation of net available dwelling unit capacity for each UGA. This will prevent any potential for double-counting density on underutilized parcels.

Step 2: Identify Underutilized Residential Parcels that are Likely to Redevelop (-)

The second step is to identify *underutilized* lands (from Step 1) that are likely to redevelop over the course of the planning period. This is done by evaluating the residential parcel size-to-density ratio and the existing assessed home value on the parcel. This step attempts to identify residential parcels of land within an Urban Growth Area (UGA) that:

1. Are larger than minimum zoning size
2. Contain building improvements, and
3. Have re-development potential

Minimum *zoning size* indicates the lot area necessary to accommodate additional development at the minimum density in each particular zone—where a home already exists on the parcel. In the **Urban Low Zone**, for example, the minimum density is 5 dwelling units per acre (approx. 1/5th acre per unit), therefore the minimum parcel ‘zoning size’ necessary to accommodate at least one additional unit is at least 2/5th acre (i.e., 1/5th acre each for the existing home and the potential new dwelling unit). For purposes of the capacity analysis the *zoning size* figure is estimated to be approximately one-half (0.5) acre for the **Urban Low Zone**. It is of course correspondingly different for the **Urban Medium** and **Urban High** residential zones based on their respective minimum densities.

Determining which existing residential parcels are likely to redevelop is based on two factors: the value of existing building improvements (based on the median assessed home value within each UGA); and the size of the parcel¹⁵. This particular approach does not take into account the value of the land or the age of the home already existing on the parcel in determining which lands are likely to redevelop¹⁶. However, it adds an additional large parcel size screen to recognize that especially large parcels (based on zoning) within the UGAs may have redevelopment potential regardless of the value of the existing home¹⁷.

¹⁵ This factor seeks to differentiate between all underutilized lands (identified in the previous step) from those underutilized lands with the most potential to redevelop over the next 20 years. These are lands identified as underutilized but due to the value and age of the existing building improvements, size of the parcel, or layout of existing development on the site, are not likely to redevelop over the course of the planning period. A general rule of thumb regarding redevelopment analysis indicates that between 20%-80% of relatively *lower value* underutilized lands can be expected to further subdivide, depending on local market conditions. This set of criteria does not include examination of redevelopment constraint based on the availability or feasibility of infrastructure needed for urban development (e.g., sewer and water). See infrastructure constraint criteria discussion in previous section.

¹⁶ Empirical studies in other areas indicate that improvement value is generally a more accurate indicator of redevelopment potential than land value for residential development. The age of the existing home on the parcel was reviewed and evaluated during development of the ULCA—the idea being that recent home construction (e.g., homes built in the last 10 years) would be less likely to be redeveloped during the next 20 years. However, this screen was not recommended for inclusion in the final methodology.

¹⁷ This step assigns assessed improvement value thresholds to underutilized parcels based on an appropriate value (based on standard variation from the median home values in each UGA rather than arbitrary assumed home value thresholds) cross-referenced to parcel size. The general idea is that the more expensive the improvements already on the property the less likely the parcel is to redevelop during the planning period.

- Redevelopment potential is assumed to not exist if the parcel size is less than 2.5 X (times) the minimum zoning size¹⁸.
- Between 2.5 and 4X zoning size, redevelopment potential is assumed to not exist unless the assessed value of the onsite buildings are less than one-half (0.5X) the assessed median home value in that UGA.
- Between 4X and 5X zoning size, the building value must be less than median home value in the particular UGA for the parcel to have redevelopment potential.
- Between 5X-10X zoning size, the value of the home must be less than 1.5X median home value in the UGA for the parcel to have redevelopment potential.
- If the parcel is greater than 10X zoning size, then redevelopment is assumed likely regardless of existing home value on the parcel.

For example, in the *Urban Low Zone*, if median UGA home value is \$100,000, redevelopment potential would be calculated on the following basis:

Building Value	Parcel Size	Redevelopment Potential?
	Less than 2.5 X 'zoning size' (0.5 acre X 2.5= 1.25 acre)	No—parcel must be at least 1.25 acres to have redevelopment potential
Less than \$50,000	Between 2.5 X and 4X 'zoning size' (1.25-<2 acres)	Yes
More than \$50,000	Between 2.5 X and 4X 'zoning size' (1.25-<2 acres)	No
Between \$50,000 and \$100,000	Between 4 X and 5X 'zoning size' (2-2.5 acres)	Yes
More than \$100,000	Between 4 X and 5X 'zoning size' (2-2.5 acres)	No
Between \$100,000 and \$150,000	Between 5X and 10X 'zoning size' (>2.5 acre-<5 acres)	Yes
Greater than \$150,000	Between 5X and 10X 'zoning size' (>2.5 acre-<5 acres)	No
	Greater than 10 X 'zoning size' (0.5 acre X 10= 5 acres)	Yes—parcels 5 acres or larger likely to subdivide regardless of existing home value

¹⁸ The first step in this analysis was to identify developed parcels that could accommodate additional dwelling units based on adopted zoning and size of parcel. The Kitsap County 2002 Buildable Lands Report utilized an existing/zoned density ratio of 2 (i.e., the allowed density is more than twice the existing parcel density) as a first step to identify the likelihood of “underutilized” parcels actually being redeveloped. This ratio provides an indicator of subdivision potential that is fundamental to redevelopment. However, the King County Buildable Lands Program Reference Guide II: Land Supply Inventory report, noted that “...a threshold of 2 is probably, for many jurisdictions, overly inclusive of parcels that have little realistic subdivision potential over the remainder of the planning horizon. The infill potential of many parcels between 2 and 3 times the minimum lot size is hindered by numerous factors, such as the position of the existing house on the lot and parcel shape. A recommended threshold ratio of between 2.5 and 3 will, in most cases, provide a more realistic estimate of the number of single-family parcels with infill potential.” Therefore, the 2005 Kitsap County ULCA increases the minimum underutilized parcel size threshold to 2.5X current zoning.

Underutilized parcels identified in Step 1 of the ULCA that meet the criteria identified in Step 2 are the parcels considered to have *potential* for redevelopment over the 20-year timeframe. The worksheets calculate an estimate of the “gross acres” of *underutilized* parcels considered likely to redevelop over the course of the planning period in each of the respective UGAs.

Step 3: Identify Critical Areas Affecting Underutilized Residential Parcels Likely to Redevelop(-)

This step measures critical areas ordinance (CAO) impacts on all *underutilized* urban residential parcels identified in Step 2. First it identifies *unencumbered* acres (i.e., acres of underutilized urban residential zoned parcels *without* CAO coverage or impact). Then it identifies the acres with CAO coverage and estimates the net impact of those critical areas on the parcel’s development potential by deducting the portions of the affected parcels’ assumed to be unavailable for redevelopment due to the provisions of the CAO.

These calculations are based on the CAO “reduction factor” assumptions recommended by the Board for use in the Urban Residential ULCA on April 25, 2005.

Step 4: Identify Parcels Likely to Redevelop that are Sewer Constrained (-)

This step recognizes the sewer constraint approach recommended by the Board for use in the Urban Residential ULCA. The application of a sewer constraint acknowledges that due to the unique topography of the County, some small, low density (hence relatively low value) residential zoned lots in fragmented ownership located in close proximity to critical areas and steep slopes may be unfeasible to develop at urban densities when located at significant distances from existing sewer mains.

See discussion of how the criteria were developed and are applied in the previous *Vacant Land* section.

Step 5: Identify Parcels Likely to Redevelop that are Water Constrained (-)

The water constraint reduction factor is *not* recommended for use in the Urban Residential ULCA. In the accompanying ULCA worksheets prepared by GIS staff, the reader will observe that this step is labeled as “not applicable” in the analysis. Refer to the rationale for the applicability of this reduction factor in the *Vacant Land* section previously discussed.

Step 6: Identify Land Needed for Future Roads and Rights-of-Way (-)

This step identifies urban residential zoned *underutilized* lands remaining in the inventory to this point that are likely to be needed for future roads and/or as dedicated rights-of-way.

These calculations are based on the 20% Roads/R-O-W “reduction factor” recommended by the Board for use in the Urban Residential ULCA on April 25, 2005.

Step 7: Identify Land Needed for Future Public & Quasi-Public Facilities (-)

This step identifies urban residential zoned *underutilized* lands remaining in the inventory to this point that are likely to be needed for future public and quasi-public facilities such as parks, utilities, stormwater management facilities, schools, churches, etc. Meaning that lands devoted to these uses will not otherwise be available for residential development.

These calculations are based on the same (15%) Public Facilities “reduction factor” recommended by the Board for use on vacant lands in the Urban Residential ULCA on April 25, 2005.

Step 8: Identify Land Likely to be Unavailable for Redevelopment (-)

This step seeks to identify urban residential zoned *underutilized* lands remaining in the inventory to this point that are likely to be unavailable for development over the planning period due to legal constraints or factors related to landowner intent (e.g., property owners who withhold land from sale, property subject to legal encumbrances, easements that preclude development, etc.).

These calculations are based on the 15% “reduction factor” recommended by the Board for use on *underutilized* lands in the Urban Residential ULCA on April 25, 2005¹⁹.

Step 9: Report Remaining Net Acres of Underutilized Residential Zoned Parcels Available for Redevelopment

This step calculates the remaining supply of *underutilized* land (in “net” acres) able to accommodate new residential development within the applicable UGAs after all the preceding *reduction factors* have been accounted for in Steps 2-8.

¹⁹ Unavailable lands factors are typically higher for underutilized lands than vacant lands (i.e., in general, a vacant parcel is more likely to develop than an underutilized parcel is to redevelop).

Step 10: Calculate Total Housing Unit and Population Holding Capacity for each Residential Zone by UGA

This is the last step in the *underutilized* urban residential lands analysis. This step first calculates the total new housing unit capacity in each zone by multiplying the net remaining *underutilized* acres in each zone available for development by the minimum density allowed in each zone. Total population capacity for each zone and UGA is then derived by multiplying the housing unit capacity in each zone by the average household size for applicable single-family and multi-family zones.

Urban Commercial/Industrial (C/I) Lands (ULCA) Approach

This section illustrates the rationale and assumptions used in the preliminary updated land capacity analysis (ULCA) for urban commercial and industrial (C/I) zoned lands in Kitsap County. It is intended as a guide to understanding the background and rationale for assumptions made (including alternative assumptions in some cases) in the methodology for determining the current supply (inventory) of commercial and industrial (C/I) lands in Kitsap County. The actual land capacity analysis worksheets with reported outcomes for all urban commercial and industrial zoned parcels were prepared by Kitsap County GIS.

The overall structure of the C/I ULCA generally follows the same approach used in the Urban Residential land capacity analysis and recommended by the Kitsap County Board of Commissioners on April 25, 2005. However, the C/I methodology differs from the urban residential analysis approach in some ways necessary to address the unique nature of commercial/industrial lands.

The urban commercial/industrial zones included in the Urban Lands ULCA include:

- Highway Tourist Commercial
- Neighborhood Commercial
- Urban Commercial
- Urban Village Center
- Regional Commercial
- Business Park
- Business Center
- Industrial

Similar to the Urban Residential ULCA, the C/I approach seeks to identify both *vacant* and *underutilized* lands in the inventory. The approaches for the *vacant* and *underutilized* C/I land capacity analyses are each presented separately. “Reduction factors” applied in the analysis are indicated by the symbol (-).

The summary totals of vacant and underutilized urban commercial/industrial lands by zone for the unincorporated UGAs based on this approach is illustrated in Table 1.2. Detailed individual unincorporated UGA commercial/industrial land capacity analysis results are contained in Appendix A.

VACANT LANDS METHODOLOGY

Step 1: Identify All Vacant Parcels Zoned Commercial or Industrial

The first step is to identify all *vacant* parcels (Assessors Tax Code 9100) in each of the commercial/industrial zones²⁰. This step is further refined by eliminating all vacant tax-exempt parcels within these zones. The result can be considered the inventory of “gross acres” for all *vacant* urban C/I zoned lands in the respective UGAs.

Step 2: Identify Critical Areas Affecting Vacant Parcels Zoned Commercial/Industrial (-)

The second step measures critical areas ordinance (CAO) impacts on all *vacant* C/I parcels identified in the first step. First it identifies *unencumbered* acres (i.e., acres of vacant C/I zoned parcels *without* CAO coverage or impact). Then it identifies the acres with CAO coverage and estimates the net impact of those critical areas on the parcel’s development potential by deducting the portions of the affected parcels assumed to be unavailable for development due to the provisions of the CAO. These calculations are based on the same CAO “reduction factor” assumptions recommended by the BoCC for use in the Urban Residential ULCA on April 25, 2005.

Step 3: Identify Vacant C/I Lands that are Sewer Constrained (-)

This step was intended to recognize the same sewer constraint approach recommended by the Board for use in the Urban Residential ULCA. However, upon analysis of C/I zoned parcels, this approach appeared problematic for several reasons. First many of the characteristics noted for its application to the Urban Residential ULCA are not present in regards to commercial/industrial zoned parcels—namely, that small, low density (hence relatively low value) residential zoned lots in fragmented ownership located in close proximity to critical areas and steep slopes were considered likely to be unfeasible to develop at urban densities when located at significant distances from existing sewer mains. Most of the C/I parcels are more concentrated, of higher value and located in closer proximity to existing sewer mains than the more prevalent residential parcels. Second, during GIS analysis, very few C/I parcels were actually found at distances from existing sewer mains that would have triggered the sewer constraint reduction factors recommended by the Board in the urban residential portion of the ULCA. Of those parcels that were, most were already developed C/I parcels with existing uses that do not require sanitary sewer service for their operation (e.g., warehouses, storage, etc.). Hence the need for sewer extension in these areas is not considered as critical a requirement to foster development (or redevelopment) of existing C/I lands.

²⁰ See Footnote #2 for explanation of how C/I land capacity is calculated in the ULCA for parcels in the Urban Village Center (UVC) zone.

Therefore, the sewer constraint reduction factor is *not* recommended for use in the Urban C/I ULCA. In the accompanying ULCA worksheets prepared by GIS staff, the reader will observe that this step is labeled as “not applicable” in the C/I analysis worksheets.

Step 4: Identify Vacant C/I Lands that are Water Constrained (-)

Consistent with the recommendation of the Board on April 25, 2005 this reduction factor is not applied to either the Urban Residential or Urban C/I land capacity analyses. In the accompanying ULCA worksheets prepared by GIS staff, the reader will observe that this step is labeled as “not applicable” in the land capacity analysis.

Step 5: Identify Vacant C/I Lands Needed for Future Roads and Rights-of-Way (-)

This step identifies C/I zoned *vacant* lands remaining in the inventory to this point that are likely to be needed for future roads and/or as dedicated rights-of-way. These calculations are based on the same (20%) Roads/R-O-W “reduction factor” recommended by the Board for use in the Urban Residential ULCA on April 25, 2005²¹.

Step 6: Identify Vacant C/I Lands Needed for Future Public & Quasi-Public Facilities (-)

This step identifies C/I zoned *vacant* lands remaining in the inventory to this point that are likely to be needed for future public and quasi-public facilities such as parks, utilities including stormwater management facilities, schools, churches, etc. Meaning that lands devoted to these uses will not otherwise be available for C/I development. These calculations are based on the same (15%) Public Facilities “reduction factor” recommended by the Board for use in the Urban Residential ULCA on April 25, 2005²².

²¹ Two alternatives for the Roads/R-O-W reduction factor were developed and evaluated by staff. The first option was the same 20% reduction factor applied to the Urban Residential ULCA. The second option applied a smaller 10% reduction factor based on the rationale that most of the land needed for new roads or roadway lanes in the UGAs will have already been accounted for in the aforementioned Urban Residential ULCA (20%) Road/R-O-W reduction factor—since most—but certainly not all—of the demand for new roads will likely come from new residential rather than new commercial development. Those new lanes needed exclusively for commercial development should consume commensurately less land (especially considering that at least some underutilized C/I lands may already have adequate roadway access). However off-street parking requirements for C/I uses typically require more land be set-aside for on-site parking than is needed for public rights-of-way (compared to residential uses). For this reason, the recommended Urban C/I ULCA approach maintains the same 20% road reduction factor as the Urban Residential ULCA. Staff made presentation of these alternatives and evaluated their applicability with the Kitsap County Commercial Real Estate Brokers Group on August 10, 2005. After review and discussion, the commercial real estate professionals also suggested maintaining the 20% figure to account for greater parking, truck turning and storage requirements of C/I development which result in less land area being available to accommodate actual building square footage.

²² Two alternatives for the Public Facilities reduction factor were also developed and evaluated by staff. The first option was the same 15% reduction factor applied to the Urban Residential ULCA. The second option applied a smaller 10% reduction factor based on the rationale that most of the land needed for new public and quasi-public facilities in the UGAs will have already been accounted for in the aforementioned Urban Residential ULCA (15%) Public Facilities reduction factor—since most—but not all—of the demand for new public facilities will likely come from new residential not new commercial development. However, owing to the lack of public or regional stormwater treatment

Step 7: Identify Vacant C/I Lands Likely to be Unavailable for Development (-)

This step seeks to identify C/I zoned *vacant* lands remaining in the inventory to this point that are likely to be unavailable for development over the planning period due to legal constraints or factors related to landowner intent (e.g., property owners who withhold land from sale, property subject to legal encumbrances, easements that preclude development, etc.).

This step applies the same 5% “reduction factor” recommended by the Board for use in the Urban Residential ULCA on April 25, 2005 for *vacant* lands.

Step 8: Report Remaining Net Acres of Vacant C/I Zoned Parcels Available for Development

This is the final step in the C/I ULCA methodology. It calculates the remaining supply of *vacant* land (in “net” acres) able to accommodate new commercial and industrial development within the applicable UGAs after all the preceding *reduction factors* have been accounted for in Steps 2-7.

UNDERUTILIZED LANDS METHODOLOGY

Step 1: Identify All Developed Parcels Zoned Commercial or Industrial

The first step is to identify all developed parcels in each of the six commercial/industrial zones. This step is then refined by eliminating: 1) all “unavailable” developed parcels in the non-residential zones—essentially multifamily residential units, mobile home parks, streets and rights-of-way and current use tax parcels within these zones; and 2) all developed tax-exempt parcels within these zones.

facilities in the County, all stormwater treatment must be provided on-site. The increased impervious surfaces associated with C/I development (e.g., for off-street parking) means that more land is usually required to be set-aside for on-site stormwater treatment (compared to residential uses). For this reason, the recommended Urban C/I ULCA approach maintains the same 15% public facilities reduction factor as the Urban Residential ULCA. Staff made presentation of these alternatives and evaluated their applicability with the Kitsap County Commercial Real Estate Brokers Group on August 10, 2005. After review and discussion, the commercial real estate professionals also suggested maintaining the 15% figure to account for greater land area needed for stormwater treatment, setbacks and buffer requirements of C/I development which result in less land area being available to accommodate actual building square footage.

Step 2: Identify Developed Parcels Zoned Commercial or Industrial that are Likely to Redevelop (-)

The second step is to identify already developed lands (from Step 1) that are likely to redevelop over the course of the planning period. This is done by examining the relationship between a parcel's improvement (i.e., building) value and its land value. The primary assumption is that a developed C/I parcel is considered to be *underutilized* when the parcel's improvement value is less than its corresponding land value (i.e., the land is worth more than the buildings on it). Put another way, developed parcels are most often considered *underutilized* when the improvement-to-land value ratio is less than 1.0. Most communities use improvement-to-land value ratios generally ranging from 0.25 to 1.5 to identify redevelopment opportunities among non-residential parcels, depending on local market conditions and characteristics²³. In this C/I approach, parcels with improvement to land value ratios greater than 0.5 are deducted from the C/I inventory identified in Step 1—leaving an estimate of the “gross acres” of developed C/I parcels considered *underutilized* or likely to redevelop over the course of the planning period in each of the respective UGAs.

Step 3: Identify Critical Areas Affecting C/I Developed Parcels Likely to Redevelop(-)

This step measures critical areas ordinance (CAO) impacts on all *underutilized* C/I parcels identified in Step 2. First it identifies *unencumbered* acres (i.e., acres of vacant C/I zoned parcels *without* CAO coverage or impact). Then it identifies the acres with CAO coverage and estimates the net impact of those critical areas on the parcel's development potential by deducting the portions of the affected parcels' assumed to be unavailable for redevelopment due to the provisions of the CAO. These calculations are

²³ Kitsap County used a 1.0 improvement-to-land value ratio threshold to identify underutilized C/I lands in the 2002 Buildable Lands Report. King County, however, noted in its Buildable Lands methodology that “[a] threshold of 0.5 has historically been most widely adopted by King County jurisdictions (although significant variation exists within the county).” Unfortunately, there is little empirical evidence to support one universal ratio in determining redevelopment potential. King County notes that the 0.5 improvement to land value ratio figure is based more on “*professional judgment rather than data analysis*”. In theory, the ratio reflects the potential profitability of more intensive uses of a site relative to the revenue-generating potential of the existing use. The widely acknowledged professional judgment is that, in general, as the improvement-to-land value ratio decreases, the confidence of predicting potential redevelopment in most communities increases. Staff review of preliminary C/I methodology included discussion of situations where a high revenue-generating business that would otherwise appear to be underutilized based purely on a 1.0 improvement-to-land value ratio would, in reality, **not** be likely to redevelop owing to its presumed profitability. Individual business revenues are private information. However the Washington State Department of Revenue (DOR) does track retail sales by business type—but these records are typically collated and published at the Standard Industrial Classification (SIC) code level. Again, for privacy reasons, individual business sales tax records are not published by DOR. So we cannot directly connect state sales tax revenue to C/I parcels in the Kitsap County Assessors database. As an alternative, however, the improvement-to-land value ratio can be adjusted downward to account for or acknowledge such situations where relatively low building value but “high revenue generating” businesses are discounted from the inventory of available C/I lands assumed likely to redevelop over the course of the planning period. The C/I ULCA uses a threshold improvement-to-land value ratio of 0.5 (rather than 1.0) to identify underutilized C/I lands. The 0.5 ratio is the same used by the majority of King County jurisdictions in their land capacity analyses. Staff discussed this approach with the Kitsap County Commercial Real Estate Brokers Group on August 10, 2005. After review and discussion, the commercial real estate professionals concurred with using the 0.5 improvement-to-land value ratio to more accurately identify underutilized C/I lands in the ULCA.

based on the same CAO “reduction factor” assumptions recommended by the Board for use in the Urban Residential ULCA on April 25, 2005.

Step 4: Identify Parcels Likely to Redevelop that are Sewer Constrained (-)

The sewer constraint reduction factor is *not* recommended for use in the Urban C/I ULCA. In the accompanying ULCA worksheets prepared by GIS staff, the reader will observe that this step is labeled as “not applicable” in the C/I analysis. Refer to the rationale for the applicability of this reduction factor in the *Vacant Land* section previously discussed.

Step 5: Identify Parcels Likely to Redevelop that are Water Constrained (-)

The water constraint reduction factor is *not* recommended for use in the Urban C/I ULCA. In the accompanying ULCA worksheets prepared by GIS staff, the reader will observe that this step is labeled as “not applicable” in the C/I analysis. Refer to the rationale for the applicability of this reduction factor in the *Vacant Land* approach previously discussed.

Step 6: Identify Land Needed for Future Roads and Rights-of-Way (-)

This step identifies C/I zoned *underutilized* lands remaining in the inventory to this point that are likely to be needed for future roads and/or as dedicated rights-of-way. This step utilizes the same (20%) Roads/R-O-W “reduction factor” recommended by the Board for use in the Urban Residential ULCA on April 25, 2005.

Step 7: Identify Land Needed for Future Public and Quasi-Public Facilities (-)

This step identifies C/I zoned *underutilized* lands remaining in the inventory to this point that are likely to be needed for future public and quasi-public facilities such as parks, utilities including stormwater management facilities, schools, churches, etc. Meaning that lands devoted to these uses will not otherwise be available for C/I development. This step utilizes the same (15%) Public Facilities “reduction factor” recommended by the Board for use in the Urban Residential ULCA on April 25, 2005.

Step 8: Identify Land Likely to be Unavailable for Redevelopment (-)

This step seeks to identify C/I zoned *underutilized* lands remaining in the inventory to this point that are likely to be unavailable for development over the planning period due to legal constraints or factors related to landowner intent (e.g., property owners who withhold land from sale, property subject to legal encumbrances, easements that preclude development, etc.).

This step applies the same 15% “reduction factor” recommended by the Board for use in the Urban Residential ULCA on April 25, 2005 for *underutilized* lands.

Step 9: Report Remaining Net Acres of Underutilized C/I Zoned Parcels Available for Redevelopment

This is the final step in the C/I ULCA methodology. It calculates the remaining supply of *underutilized* land (in “net” acres) able to accommodate new commercial and industrial development within the applicable UGAs after all the preceding *reduction factors* have been accounted for in Steps 2-8.

Comparison of 2005 ULCA to Previous Land Capacity Analysis Approaches

The attached summary tables compares the major criteria, assumptions and rationale used in the 2005 Urban Residential and Urban Commercial/Industrial ULCA's with those used in the 1998 Kitsap County Comprehensive Plan Land Capacity Analysis and the 2002 Buildable Lands Report.

URBAN RESIDENTIAL LANDS

LAND CAPACITY ANALYSIS CRITERIA	COMPARISON OF APPROACHES TO DEFINING LAND CAPACITY ANALYSIS CRITERIA		
	<i>Updated Land Capacity Analysis (2005)</i>	<i>Buildable Lands Report (2002)</i>	<i>Comprehensive Plan (1998)</i>
Vacant Land	GIS-identified parcels with the Kitsap County Assessor Property Tax Code “91000”. The code “91000” is used specifically to denote undeveloped land.	✓	✓
Underutilized Land	<p>All residential parcels with ability to accommodate at least one additional dwelling unit under the current adopted zoning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Excludes all shoreline parcels <i>less than one acre</i> ○ Excludes underutilized parcels 0.5 acre and less 	<p style="text-align: center;">✓</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Excludes all shoreline parcels ○ Excludes underutilized parcels 0.5 acre and less 	<p style="text-align: center;">✓</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Includes all shoreline parcels ○ Excludes underutilized parcels 0.5 acre and less

LAND CAPACITY ANALYSIS CRITERIA	COMPARISON OF APPROACHES TO DEFINING LAND CAPACITY ANALYSIS CRITERIA		
	<i>Updated Land Capacity Analysis (2005)</i>	<i>Buildable Lands Report (2002)</i>	<i>Comprehensive Plan (1998)</i>
Identify Underutilized Lands Likely to Redevelop	<p>Residential properties are evaluated based on two factors: the parcel size-to-density ratio and the building improvement value compared to the specific UGA median building improvement value.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If parcel is less than 2.5x zoning size, it is assumed that it will <i>not</i> redevelop • If parcel is between 2.5x and 4x zoning size, it will only redevelop if building value is less than 50% of the median home value in that UGA • If parcel is 4x-5x zoning size it will only redevelop if building value is less than the UGA median home value • If parcel is 5x-10x zoning size it will only redevelop if building value is less than 1.5x UGA median home value • If the parcel is >10x zoning size, it will redevelop regardless of building value. 	<p>Residential properties are evaluated based on two factors: the parcel size-to-density ratio and a fixed building improvement value.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If parcel is less than 2x zoning size, it is assumed that it will <i>not</i> redevelop. • If parcel is 2x zoning size, it will only redevelop if building value is \$100,000 or less. • If parcel is 3x-4x zoning size, it will only redevelop if building value is \$250,000 or less. • If parcel is >5x zoning size, it only redevelop is building value is \$500,000 or less. • Redevelopment won't occur if building value is greater than \$500,000 	<p>Assumed 20% reduction factor applied uniformly to underutilized lands in all UGAs</p>

LAND CAPACITY ANALYSIS CRITERIA	COMPARISON OF APPROACHES TO DEFINING LAND CAPACITY ANALYSIS CRITERIA		
	<i>Updated Land Capacity Analysis (2005)</i>	<i>Buildable Lands Report (2002)</i>	<i>Comprehensive Plan (1998)</i>
Critical Areas	<p>Actual by UGA.</p> <p>GIS-identified actual gross acreage + buffers by UGA according to <i>adopted</i> CAO standards</p> <p>Assumed 75% density loss on wetland and stream buffer affected portions of parcels</p> <p>Assume 50% density loss on areas of geologic concern affected portions of parcels.</p>	<p>Actual by UGA.</p> <p>GIS-identified actual gross acreage + buffers by UGA according to <i>adopted</i> CAO standards</p> <p>Assumed 50% density loss on all CAO-affected parcels</p>	<p>Assumed 15% of land remaining in the inventory in each UGA to this point to be impacted by critical areas</p> <p>Assumed 50% density loss on affected acreage</p>

LAND CAPACITY ANALYSIS CRITERIA	COMPARISON OF APPROACHES TO DEFINING LAND CAPACITY ANALYSIS CRITERIA		
	<i>Updated Land Capacity Analysis (2005)</i>	<i>Buildable Lands Report (2002)</i>	<i>Comprehensive Plan (1998)</i>
Sewer Constrained Lands	<p>GIS-application of tiered set of (%) acreage reduction factors based on distance of the parcel from the closest sewer main and the zoning.</p> <p><u>Urban Low Zone</u> 0% = less than 500 feet 20% = 500-1000' 40% = 1000-1500' 60% = 1500-2500' 75% = >2500'</p> <p><u>Urban Medium Zone</u> 0% = less than 500 feet 15% = 500-1000' 30% = 1000-1500' 45% = 1500-2500' 60% = >2500'</p> <p><u>Urban High Zone</u> 0% = less than 500 feet 10% = 500-1000' 20% = 1000-1500' 30% = 1500-2500' 40% = >2500'</p>	No Reduction Factor Applied	No Reduction Factor Applied

LAND CAPACITY ANALYSIS CRITERIA	COMPARISON OF APPROACHES TO DEFINING LAND CAPACITY ANALYSIS CRITERIA		
	<i>Updated Land Capacity Analysis (2005)</i>	<i>Buildable Lands Report (2002)</i>	<i>Comprehensive Plan (1998)</i>
Water Constrained Lands	No Reduction Factor Applied	✓	✓
Future Roads/ROW	<i>20%</i> of acreage remaining to this point in the inventory assumed to be needed for future roads/ROW	<i>17%</i> of acreage remaining to this point in the inventory assumed to be needed for future roads/ROW	<i>17%</i> of acreage remaining to this point in the inventory assumed to be needed for future roads/ROW
Future Public Facilities	<i>15%</i> of acreage remaining to this point in the inventory assumed to be needed for future public facilities	✓	✓
Unavailable Lands <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Vacant</u> • <u>Underutilized</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>5%</i> of acreage remaining in the <i>vacant</i> land inventory to this point is removed to account for lands likely to be held off the market ○ <i>15%</i> of acreage remaining in the <i>underutilized</i> land inventory to this point is removed to account for lands likely to be held off the market 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No Reduction Factor Applied ○ No Reduction Factor Applied 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>15%</i> of acreage remaining in the <i>vacant</i> land inventory to this point is removed to account for lands likely to be held off the market ○ <i>30%</i> of acreage remaining in the <i>underutilized</i> land inventory to this point is removed to account for lands likely to be held off the market

URBAN COMMERCIAL/INDUSTRIAL LANDS

LAND CAPACITY ANALYSIS CRITERIA	COMPARISON OF APPROACHES TO DEFINING LAND CAPACITY ANALYSIS CRITERIA		
	<i>Updated Land Capacity Analysis (2005)</i>	<i>Buildable Lands Report (2002)</i>	<i>Comprehensive Plan (1998)</i>
Vacant Land	GIS-identified parcels with the Kitsap County Assessor Property Tax Code “91000”. The code “91000” is used specifically to denote undeveloped land.	✓	✓
Identify Developed Commercial/Industrial (C/I) Parcels Considered Underutilized & Likely to Redevelop	<p style="text-align: center;">Identify <i>developed</i> commercial/industrial parcels in each C/I zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Excluding all <i>unavailable</i> developed parcels (i.e., C/I zoned parcels Assessors coded as multifamily units, mobile home parks, or streets and ROW; and ○ Excluding current use tax parcels and tax-exempt parcels in all C/I zones <p style="text-align: center;">All remaining developed C/I parcels with an improvement-to-land value ratio less than 0.5 are considered <i>underutilized and likely to redevelop</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Identify <i>developed</i> commercial/industrial parcels in each C/I zone:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Excluding all <i>unavailable</i> developed parcels (i.e., C/I zoned parcels Assessors coded as multifamily units, mobile home parks, or streets and ROW; and ○ Excluding tax-exempt parcels in all C/I zones <p style="text-align: center;">All remaining developed C/I parcels with an improvement-to-land value ratio less than 1.0 are considered <i>underutilized and likely to redevelop</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">NA</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No analysis of <i>underutilized</i> C/I lands appears to have been included in the 1998 Comprehensive Plan land capacity analysis</p>

LAND CAPACITY ANALYSIS CRITERIA	COMPARISON OF APPROACHES TO DEFINING LAND CAPACITY ANALYSIS CRITERIA		
	<i>Updated Land Capacity Analysis (2005)</i>	<i>Buildable Lands Report (2002)</i>	<i>Comprehensive Plan (1998)</i>
Critical Areas	<p>Actual by UGA.</p> <p>GIS-identified actual gross acreage + buffers by UGA according to <i>adopted</i> CAO standards</p> <p>Assumed 75% density loss on wetland and stream buffer affected portions of parcels</p> <p>Assume 50% density loss on areas of geologic concern affected portions of parcels.</p>	<p>Actual by UGA.</p> <p>GIS-identified actual gross acreage + buffers by UGA according to <i>adopted</i> CAO standards</p> <p>Assumed 50% density loss on all CAO-affected parcels</p>	<p>Assumed 15% of land remaining in the inventory in each UGA to this point to be impacted by critical areas</p> <p>Assumed 50% density loss on affected acreage</p>

LAND CAPACITY ANALYSIS CRITERIA	COMPARISON OF APPROACHES TO DEFINING LAND CAPACITY ANALYSIS CRITERIA		
	<i>Updated Land Capacity Analysis (2005)</i>	<i>Buildable Lands Report (2002)</i>	<i>Comprehensive Plan (1998)</i>
Sewer Constrained Lands	No Reduction Factor Applied	✓	✓
Water Constrained Lands	No Reduction Factor Applied	✓	✓
Future Roads/ROW	<i>20%</i> of acreage remaining to this point in the inventory assumed to be needed for future roads/ROW	<i>17%</i> of acreage remaining to this point in the inventory assumed to be needed for future roads/ROW	<i>17%</i> of acreage remaining to this point in the inventory assumed to be needed for future roads/ROW
Future Public Facilities	<i>15%</i> of acreage remaining to this point in the inventory assumed to be needed for future public facilities	✓	✓
Unavailable Lands <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Vacant</u> • <u>Underutilized</u> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>5%</i> of acreage remaining in the <i>vacant</i> land inventory to this point is removed to account for lands likely to be held off the market ○ <i>15%</i> of acreage remaining in the <i>underutilized</i> land inventory to this point is removed to account for lands likely to be held off the market 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ No Reduction Factor Applied ○ No Reduction Factor Applied 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>15%</i> of acreage remaining in the <i>vacant</i> land inventory to this point is removed to account for lands likely to be held off the market ○ <i>NA</i>. No analysis of underutilized C/I lands appears to have been included in the 1998 Comprehensive Plan land capacity analysis

RURAL LANDS

This section illustrates the rationale and assumptions used for determining the current residential capacity of rural and resource land zoned lands in Kitsap County. The actual land capacity analysis worksheets with reported outcomes for all rural zoned parcels were prepared by Kitsap County GIS. The assumptions and rationale used for the Rural Lands ULCA are consistent with those utilized in the 2002 Buildable Lands Report for determining rural land capacity.

Due to the very low residential densities and relatively large parcel sizes in rural areas, the overall structure of the Rural Lands ULCA is less complex and more straightforward than that prepared for the Urban Lands ULCA analysis. Parcel size and zoning in the rural areas are the prime determinant of density. In most cases in rural zones—unlike urban zones—the stated residential density is both a minimum and a maximum. The Rural Lands ULCA approach only identifies vacant land capacity—since rural residential density is limited to one single-family unit per parcel—it is not necessary to identify underutilized lands. Furthermore the use of “reduction factors”—as applied in the Urban Lands analysis—are not necessary here since densities in the rural areas are based on gross (not net) parcel size. As an example, even if a rural residential parcel were non-conforming to the zoning—meaning that it was smaller than the minimum parcel size required by the zone—and were completely covered by critical areas, the County’s non-conforming parcel use regulations and “reasonable use” exceptions in the Critical Areas Ordinance would still likely allow for the minimum density development allowed under the applicable zone.

The Rural Lands ULCA is based on a parcel method analysis—meaning capacity is determined by first identifying all rural parcels by zone, then determining whether there is additional capacity based on the parcel size comparison to allowed zoning density. Non-conforming parcel capacity is identified first based on parcel size class, then as existing parcel size increases and begins to exceed the minimum zoned parcel size (i.e., conforming zoned parcels), density is calculated based on how many new parcels could be created by subdivision (assuming one new unit of residential capacity per parcel).

Additional assumptions affecting the Rural Lands ULCA include: 1) accessory dwelling units are not considered in this approach (same assumption as used in the Urban Lands ULCA); 2) clustering provisions in the Rural Wooded zone are not considered (since these regulations are currently being re-evaluated per order from the Western Washington Growth Management Hearings Board); and 3) Resource land residential capacity—Forest and Mineral Resource designated parcels—are included in the Rural Lands analysis (Kitsap County has no designated agricultural lands of long-term commercial significance).

The rural and resource land zones and their stated residential densities included in the Rural Lands ULCA include:

- Rural Residential (1 DU/5 Acres)
- Rural Protection (1 DU/10 Acres)
- Rural Wooded (1 DU/20 Acres)
- Forest Resource Lands (1 DU/40 Acres)
- Mineral Resource Lands (1 DU/20 Acres)
- Urban Reserve (1 DU/10 Acres)

The four-step approach for the rural residential land capacity analysis is presented below.

Rural and Resource Land (ULCA) Approach

Step 1: Identify All Rural and Resource Land Zoned Parcels by Size

The first step is to identify all parcels in their respective zones. Parcels in each zone are then classified by size. Parcel size ranges are developed in order from smallest to largest to identify the range of non-conforming parcels (i.e., those parcels which are of insufficient size to further subdivide) and conforming parcels (i.e., those parcels which are large enough to further subdivide) in each respective zone.

Step 2: Identify the Use of Parcels in Each Zone

The second step identifies the range of parcels by type of existing use. All parcels are classified as either:

- Vacant (undeveloped),
- Developed,
- Underutilized (developed but large enough to further subdivide),
- Current use tax parcels,
- Miscellaneous non-residential uses, or
- Tax-exempt.

Vacant parcels are coded as vacant in the Assessors parcel database. *Developed* parcels are those with an existing dwelling unit that are of insufficient size to further subdivide (i.e., they are not able to accommodate any additional residential density). *Underutilized* parcels are those with an existing dwelling unit that are of sufficient size to further subdivide. *Miscellaneous non-residential use* parcels are those with an Assessors code indicating it is in public use or subject to an easement preventing further development. *Current Use/Exempt* parcels are those either enrolled in the current use tax program or in tax-exempt status.

Step 3: Calculate Residential Capacity in each Zone for Conforming and Non-conforming Parcels

The ULCA methodology calculates residential capacity in each rural zone by adding the sum of the total *vacant* parcels and *underutilized* parcels (including current use parcels due to their prevalence in the rural areas) for each parcel size class in each zone. These are the parcels considered “available for development”. All other parcel types, including developed, miscellaneous non-residential use, tax-exempt and developed current use tax parcels within these zones are not considered available for development and are excluded from the residential capacity calculation. The result is the inventory of all undeveloped rural zoned parcels in each respective parcel size class by zone.

For *non-conforming* parcel size classes (and conforming parcels unable to further subdivide), housing unit capacity is assigned at the rate of one dwelling unit per undeveloped parcel. For *conforming* parcel size classes larger than 2X the minimum density zoned parcel size, the housing unit capacity is derived by dividing the total acres of undeveloped parcels by the minimum zone density (indicating the resulting capacity of the larger parcels to further subdivide and accommodate additional density).

Step 4: Report the Total Number, Gross Acres, and Housing Unit Capacity of Undeveloped Parcels Available for Development by Rural and Resource Land Zone

This is the final step in the Rural Lands ULCA methodology. It calculates the **total** residential capacity in each zone by summarizing the undeveloped parcel housing capacity derived by both the (non-conforming) parcel-count method and the (conforming) acreage method for each parcel size class range. Population capacity is then derived by multiplying the total dwelling unit capacity figure in each zone by the County’s average household size.

The summary total of the 2005 rural residential land capacity analysis (excluding residential LAMIRDS) is shown in Table 1.3. Detailed rural and resource land housing capacity analysis results pertaining to the range of parcel sizes by rural zone and identification of conforming and non-conforming parcels are contained in Appendix A.

Rural Commercial/Industrial Zoned Land (ULCA) Approach

The rationale and assumptions used for determining the supply of rural commercial/industrial lands are the same as those used for the Urban Lands Commercial/Industrial ULCA. The summary total of the 2005 rural commercial/industrial land capacity analysis is shown in Table 1.3.

Limited Areas of More Intense Rural Development (LAMIRD) Land Capacity Analysis Approach

There are three residential LAMIRDS designated according to RCW 36.70A.070(5)(d) in Kitsap County: 1) Manchester; 2) Suquamish; and 3) Port Gamble. Georges Corner is the fourth LAMIRD in the County but it is comprised exclusively of commercial lands and is included in the Rural Commercial/Industrial land capacity analysis in Table 1.3.

LAMIRDS by their definition contain higher density zoned residential lands than their surrounding (non-LAMIRD) rural zones. Subarea Plans have been adopted by the County for each of the three LAMIRD communities which spell out the particular minimum density standards allowed in each zone. Many of these LAMIRDS constitute the legacy of small historic settlements from the late 19th or early 20th centuries. They almost always contain antiquated or very small lots that do not meet modern minimum lot size planning requirements. Lot consolidation is required in most instances for small non-conforming contiguous parcels in common ownership in order to meet the minimum lot sizes specified by the Subarea plans. However, for lots legally created prior to adoption of the particular Subarea Plan (and not in common ownership), residential density is assigned at the rate of one dwelling unit per lot.

For *conforming* vacant parcels in each LAMIRD residential zone, dwelling unit capacity is calculated by dividing the amount of vacant residentially zoned acres by the minimum developable lot size designated in the applicable Subarea Plan and/or Zone. For *non-conforming* parcels (those smaller than the minimum lot size established in the Subarea Plan), housing unit capacity is assigned at the rate of one dwelling unit per undeveloped parcel subject to particular development restrictions on non-conforming contiguous lots in common ownership as specified in each particular Subarea Plan. GIS analysis compared cadastral ownership with parcel size characteristics to determine non-conforming contiguous lots in common ownership for each LAMIRD. Lot consolidation estimates were made for the affected parcels as required by the particular LAMIRD Subarea Plan to determine the probable housing unit capacity.

Underutilized parcels are either: 1) developed *conforming* residential parcels at least 2X the minimum lot size; or 2) developed (*conforming or non-conforming*) parcels that have a Kitsap County Assessor property class which indicates potential for redevelopment or more intense rural development based on the applicable zoning designation. For example, parcels in residential zones with current uses such as sheds, garages, mobile homes, cabins, etc. are identified and analyzed for their ability to accommodate additional dwelling units based on the adopted minimum lot size in each LAMIRD zone.

The summary total of the 2005 LAMIRD residential land capacity analysis is shown in Table 1.4. Detailed housing capacity analysis results for each LAMIRD, including the particular minimum lot size requirements and non-conforming lot standards and development restrictions for each applicable zone are contained in Appendix A.

Appendix A

- A-1 Unincorporated Urban Growth Area Residential Land Capacity Analysis (Detailed)**

- A-2 Unincorporated UGA Commercial/Industrial Land Capacity Analysis (Detailed)**

- A-3 Unincorporated Rural and Resource Land Residential Land Capacity Analysis (Detailed)**

- A-4 Residential LAMIRD Land Capacity Analysis (Detailed)**

**Unincorporated Urban Growth Area Residential Land Capacity
Analysis (Detailed)**

Table 1.1

Kitsap County Unincorporated Urban Growth Areas (UGA) Residential Land Capacity Analysis 2005

	VACANT					Vacant Total	UNDERUTILIZED					Underutilized Total	Total by Row
	Urban Low (5 Du/Ac)	Urban Medium (10 Du/Ac)	Urban High (19 Du/Ac)	Urban Restricted (1 Du/Ac)	Urban Village Center (Up to 18 Du/Ac)		Urban Low (5 Du/Ac)	Urban Medium (10 Du/Ac)	Urban High (19 Du/Ac)	Urban Restricted (1 Du/Ac)	Urban Village Center (Up to 18 Du/Ac)		
Bremerton East													
Net Developable Acres	60.71	0.00	0.39	0.00	0.00	61.10	61.80	0.50	0.26	0.00	0.00	62.56	123.66
Dwelling Unit Capacity	304	0	7	0	0	311	186	4	4	0	0	194	505
	2.5 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph		2.5 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph		
Population Capacity	759	0	13	0	0	772	465	10	7	0	0	482	1,254
Bremerton West													
Net Developable Acres	20.58	0.22	0.00	0.00	0.00	20.80	15.82	0.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.23	37.03
Dwelling Unit Capacity	103	2	0	0	0	105	59	0	0	0	0	59	164
	2.5 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph		2.5 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph		
Population Capacity	257	5	0	0	0	262	148	0	0	0	0	148	410
Central Kitsap													
Net Developable Acres	147.40	6.60	2.38	111.40	0.00	267.78	226.58	14.89	0.00	62.52	0.00	303.99	571.77
Dwelling Unit Capacity	737	66	45	111	0	959	801	135	0	39	0	975	1,934
	2.5 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph		2.5 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph		
Population Capacity	1,843	165	82	279	0	2,369	2,002	337	0	96	0	2,435	4,804
Kingston													
Net Developable Acres	19.75	8.43	0.00	71.39	1.60	101.17	20.77	4.52	0.00	7.34	4.26	36.89	138.06
Dwelling Unit Capacity	99	84	0	71	14	268	70	35	0	3	14	122	390
	2.5 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph		2.5 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph		
Population Capacity	247	211	0	178	26	662	175	88	0	8	25	296	958
Port Orchard													
Net Developable Acres	72.75	3.88	1.54	19.00	0.00	97.17	106.82	2.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	109.02	206.19
Dwelling Unit Capacity	364	39	29	19	0	451	376	17	0	0	0	393	844
	2.5 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph		2.5 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph		
Population Capacity	909	97	53	48	0	1,107	940	43	0	0	0	983	2,090
Silverdale													
Net Developable Acres	121.35	0.37	11.51	7.56	0.00	140.79	128.62	3.07	4.64	11.19	0.00	147.52	288.31
Dwelling Unit Capacity	607	4	219	8	0	838	477	29	78	6	0	590	1,428
	2.5 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph		2.5 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph		
Population Capacity	1,517	9	394	19	0	1,939	1,193	72	141	15	0	1,421	3,360
Total*													
	Vacant						Underutilized						
Net Developable Acres	442.54	19.50	15.82	209.35	1.60	688.81	560.41	25.59	4.90	81.05	4.26	676.21	1,365.02
Dwelling Unit Capacity	2,214	195	300	209	14	2,932	1,969	220	82	48	14	2,333	5,265
	2.5 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph		2.5 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph	2.5 pph	1.8 pph		
Population Capacity	5,532	487	542	524	26	7,111	4,923	550	148	119	25	5,765	12,876

*See South Kitsap UGA/ULID#6 adopted Sub-Area Plan for Summary Land Capacity Analysis - December 8, 2003
 *See Draft Sub-Area Plan/DSEIS for detailed Land Capacity Analysis by zone within the South Kitsap UGA/ULID#6 - October 26, 2001

Net Developable acres are calculated using the approved Updated Land Capacity Analysis as approved by the Board of County Commissioners, April 2005



**Unincorporated UGA Commercial/Industrial Land Capacity Analysis
(Detailed)**

Table 1.2

**Kitsap County
Unincorporated Urban Growth Areas (UGA)
Commercial/Industrial Land Capacity Analysis
2005**

	VACANT									Vacant Total	UNDERUTILIZED									Underutilized Total	Total by Row
	Highway Tourist Commercial	Neighborhood Commercial	Urban Commercial	Regional Commercial	Business Park	Business Center	Industrial	Urban Village Center	Highway Tourist Commercial		Neighborhood Commercial	Urban Commercial	Regional Commercial	Business Park	Business Center	Industrial	Urban Village Center				
Bremerton East																					
Net Developable Acres	1.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.76	0.99	0.26	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.25	3.01		
Bremerton West																					
Net Developable Acres	1.76	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.77	0.00	5.53	2.14	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.41	0.00	3.55	9.08		
Central Kitsap																					
Net Developable Acres	32.72	4.57	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	37.29	10.26	0.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.35	0.00	16.17	53.46		
Kingston																					
Net Developable Acres	11.44	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	5.07	0.00	16.51	6.41	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.27	8.68	25.19		
Port Orchard																					
Net Developable Acres	56.74	4.01	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	2.01	0.00	62.76	50.73	0.56	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.61	0.00	55.90	118.66		
Silverdale																					
Net Developable Acres	0.00	1.81	0.00	22.69	17.29	0.00	159.22	0.00	201.01	0.00	4.91	0.00	33.67	8.38	0.00	21.98	0.00	68.94	269.95		
Gorst																					
Net Developable Acres	3.93	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	3.93	7.07	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.26	0.00	8.33	12.26		
SK Industrial Park (SKIA)																					
Net Developable Acres	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	106.88	43.03	0.00	149.91	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	582.05	185.13	0.00	767.18	917.09		
Total*																					
Net Developable Acres	108.35	10.39	0.00	22.69	17.29	106.88	213.10	0.00	478.70	77.60	6.29	0.00	33.67	8.38	582.05	219.74	2.27	930.00	1,408.70		

*See South Kitsap UGA/ULID#6 adopted Sub-Area Plan for Summary Land Capacity Analysis - December 8, 2003
 *See Draft Sub-Area Plan/DSEIS for detailed Land Capacity Analysis by zone within the South Kitsap UGA/ULID#6 - October 26, 2001

Net Developable acres are calculated using the approved Updated Land Capacity Analysis as approved by the Board of County Commissioners, April 2005

Vacant Urban Village Center (UVC) zoned parcels in the Kingston UGA are unaccounted for on this sheet due to geo-coding protocols in the GIS database. However, UVC zoned vacant lands in the Kingston UGA have an estimated commercial land capacity of 0.8 net acres (50% of the 1.6 net available vacant acres calculated in the residential ULCA). See the ULCA Report for further explanation.

**Unincorporated Rural and Resource Land Residential Land Capacity
Analysis (Detailed)**

Unincorporated Residential Rural Lands Capacity Analysis

VACANT Parcels												
	Parcels of 1 acres or less	Parcels greater than 1 acre to 2.5 acres	Parcels greater than 2.5 acres to 4.99 acres	Parcels from 5.00 acres to 9.99 acres	Parcels from 10.00 acres to 19.99 acres	Parcels from 20.00 acres to 39.99 acres	Parcels from 40.00 acres to 79.99 acres	Parcels greater than and equal to 80.00 acres	Total by row	Vacant Dwelling Unit Capacity by row	Total Vacant Population Capacity	
Rural Residential (1 DU/5 Ac)	Non-Conforming		Conforming		Conforming - Subdividable						2.5 pph	
Parcels	3321	1547	1343	746	147	57	4	2	7167	6957	17393	
Acreage	1359.10	2844.11	4834.26	4863.53	2030.56	1680.67	162.30	200.22	17974.75	815	2037	
Rural Protection (1 DU/10 Ac)	Non-Conforming		Conforming		Conforming - Subdividable						2.5 pph	
Parcels	336	452	486	319	108	37	9	0	1747	1701	4253	
Acreage	171.26	8600.42	1824.82	2042.53	1511.69	1011.52	380.54	0.00	15542.78	139	348	
Rural Wooded (1 DU/20 Ac)	Non-Conforming		Conforming		Conforming - Subdividable						2.5 pph	
Parcels	50	31	73	45	19	19	5	4	246	237	593	
Acreage	31.13	55.11	313.67	322.72	291.55	618.37	253.67	449.19	2335.41	35	88	
Forest Resource Lands (1 DU/40 Ac)	Non-Conforming		Conforming		Conforming - Subdividable						2.5 pph	
Parcels	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Acreage	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	
Mineral Resource Lands (1 DU/20 Ac)	Non-Conforming		Conforming		Conforming - Subdividable						2.5 pph	
Parcels	8	8	11	12	4	1	1	0	45	44	110	
Acreage	4.53	11.60	36.63	95.04	59.61	29.72	40.95	0.00	278.08	2	5	
Urban Reserve (1 DU/10 Ac)	Non-Conforming		Conforming		Conforming - Subdividable						2.5 pph	
Parcels	431	162	68	50	20	8	1	0	740	731	1828	
Acreage	152.13	262.80	258.12	335.81	263.52	228.78	79.67	0.00	1580.83	31	77	
Vacant Parcels											2.5 pph	
Parcels	4146	2200	1981	1172	298	122	20	6	9945	9670	24175	
Acreage	1718.15	11774.04	7267.50	7659.63	4156.93	3569.06	917.13	649.41	37711.85	1022	2555	

Developed/Underutilized Parcels												
	Parcels of 1 acres or less	Parcels greater than 1 acre to 2.5 acres	Parcels greater than 2.5 acres to 4.99 acres	Parcels from 5.00 acres to 9.99 acres	Parcels from 10.00 acres to 19.99 acres	Parcels from 20.00 acres to 39.99 acres	Parcels from 40.00 acres to 79.99 acres	Parcels greater than and equal to 80.00 acres	Total by Row	Underutilized Dwelling Unit Capacity by row	Total Underutilized Population Capacity	
Rural Residential (1 DU/5 Ac)	Non-conforming		Conforming		Conforming - Subdividable					Subdividable acres (f) zoning (c) existing dwelling units	2.5 pph	
Parcels	13877	7314	4185	1374	177	32	1	0	26960	0	0	
Acreage	6628.88	13334.99	14328.93	8868.39	2345.92	873.47	41.03	0.00	46421.61	407	1018	
Rural Protection (1 DU/10 Ac)	Non-conforming		Conforming		Conforming - Subdividable					Subdividable acres (f) zoning (c) existing dwelling units	2.5 pph	
Parcels	1613	1676	1230	635	148	22	2	0	5326	0	0	
Acreage	902.94	3073.03	4295.70	4139.32	1967.32	554.11	124.91	0.00	15057.33	43	107	
Rural Wooded (1 DU/20 Ac)	Non-conforming		Conforming		Conforming - Subdividable					Subdividable acres (f) zoning (c) existing dwelling units	2.5 pph	
Parcels	27	50	96	40	13	9	2	1	238	0	0	
Acreage	14.24	108.78	392.31	244.54	156.84	277.68	84.71	113.48	1392.58	5	12	
Forest Resource Lands (1 DU/40 Ac)	Non-conforming		Conforming		Conforming - Subdividable					Subdividable acres (f) zoning (c) existing dwelling units	2.5 pph	
Parcels	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Acreage	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0	0	0	
Mineral Resource Lands (1 DU/20 Ac)	Non-conforming		Conforming		Conforming - Subdividable					Subdividable acres (f) zoning (c) existing dwelling units	2.5 pph	
Parcels	30	30	12	9	0	1	0	0	82	0	0	
Acreage	12.69	41.51	41.49	55.05	0.00	29.69	0.00	0.00	180.43	0	0	
Urban Reserve (1 DU/10 Ac)	Non-conforming		Conforming		Conforming - Subdividable					Subdividable acres (f) zoning (c) existing dwelling units	2.5 pph	
Parcels	2462	386	123	62	9	3	0	0	3045	0	0	
Acreage	953.62	572.08	450.18	389.81	114.93	92.39	0.00	0.00	2573.01	6	16	
Underutilized Parcels												
Parcels	18009	9456	5646	2120	347	67	5	1	35651	0	0	
Acreage	8512.37	17130.39	19508.61	13697.11	4585.01	1827.34	250.65	113.48	6776.48	461	1153	

Non-conforming Parcels (1 unit per parcel)

Conforming Parcel (1 unit per parcel)

Subdividable Parcels (Acreage divided by allowed dwelling units per acre)

Dwelling unit capacity is based on the current adopted zoning

Residential LAMIRD Land Capacity Analysis (Detailed)

Manchester
Limited Area of More Intense Rural Development
(LAMIRD)
Land Capacity Analysis

Residential Lands		Manchester Village Low Residential		Manchester Village Residential		Total by Row	
		Platted Lot .20 acres	Non-Platted Lot .25 acres	Platted Lot .20 acres	Non-Platted Lot .25 acres		
Underutilized	<i>Dwelling unit capacity calculation: Acres divided by minimum lot size by zone - minus existing units</i>	Redevelopable Parcels	176	124	53	54	407
		Acres	104.13	188.77	32.01	25.89	350.80
		Dwelling Unit Capacity	344	631	107	49	1131
Underutilized Parcels		176	124	53	54	407	
Total Acres		104.13	188.77	32.01	25.89	350.80	
Dwelling Unit Capacity Total (Underutilized)		344	631	107	49	1131	

Vacant		Manchester Village Low Residential		Manchester Village Residential		Total by Row	
		Platted Lot .20 acres	Non-Platted Lot .25 acres	Platted Lot .20 acres	Non-Platted Lot .25 acres		
Vacant	<i>Non Conforming capacity calculation: Dwelling units = number of parcels Conforming parcel capacity calculations: Acres divided by minimum lot size by zone</i>	Non Conforming Parcels	78	6	56	8	148
		Acres	8.66	0.88	8.71	1.35	19.60
		Dwelling Unit Capacity	78	6	56	8	148
		Conforming Parcels	84	49	65	5	203
		Acres	42.75	82.31	20.88	1.40	147.34
		Dwelling Unit Capacity	213	329	104	5	651
Vacant Parcels		162	55	121	13	351	
Total Acres		51.41	83.19	29.59	2.75	166.94	
Dwelling Unit Capacity Total (Vacant)		291	335	160	13	799	

Total Number of Parcels	517	241	758
Total Acres	427.50	90.24	517.74
Dwelling Unit Capacity Total	1601	329	1930

	MVR	MVLZ
Minimum Developable Lot Size <i>(the smallest size existing lots may be to be developed)*</i>	.25 acres (10,890 sq ft)	.25 acres (10,890 sq ft)
Minimum Divisible Lot Size <i>(the smallest size in which parcels can be divided after the adoption of the Plan)</i>	.25 acres (10,890 sq ft)	.50 acres (21,780 sq ft) w/ Clustering .25 acres (10,890 sq ft)
Minimum Lot Width	60 feet	60 feet
Minimum Lot Depth	60 feet	60 feet
Frontyard Setback	20 feet	20 feet
Sidyard Setback	5 feet	5 feet
Rearyard Setback	5 feet	5 feet

***Nonconforming Lots exceptions**

Lots currently exist within the Manchester Village that do not meet the minimum requirements of these residential zones. These lots are considered nonconforming and are addressed as follows:

Nonconforming Lots in Single Ownership. If a single lot of record, legally created before the adoption of the Manchester Community Plan, is less than 8,712 square feet in size or does not meet dimensional requirements of its zone, said lot may be occupied by any use permitted within its zone subject to all other requirements of this Plan.

Nonconforming Lots in Common Ownership. If there are contiguous lots of record held in common ownership, each legally created before adoption of the Manchester Community Plan, and one or more of these lots is less than 8,712 square feet in size or does not meet the dimensional requirements of its zone, said lots shall be combined to meet these minimum lot requirements. After the adoption of this Plan, lots sold and taken out of common ownership will not be eligible for the single ownership regulations of this Plan.

*Manchester Community Plan

Kitsap County Department of Community Development

March 18, 2002

Suquamish Limited Area of More Intense Rural Development (LAMIRD) Land Capacity Analysis

			Suquamish Village Low Residential		Suquamish Village Residential		
			Platted Lot .10 acres	Non-Platted Lot .50 acres	Platted Lot .08 acres	Non-Platted Lot .50 acres	Total by Row
Residential Lands	<i>Dwelling unit capacity calculation: Acres divided by minimum lot size by zone - minus existing units</i>	Redevelopable Parcels	59	4	352	0	415
		Acres	34.97	6.87	96.12	0.00	137.96
		Dwelling Unit Capacity	290	9	849	0	1148
Underutilized Parcels			59	4	352	0	415
Total Acres			34.97	6.87	96.12	0.00	137.96
Dwelling Unit Capacity Total (Underutilized)			290	9	849	0	1148

			Platted Lot .10 acres	Non-Platted Lot .50 acres	Platted Lot .08 acres	Non-Platted Lot .50 acres	Total by Row
Vacant	<i>Non Conforming capacity calculation: Dwelling units = number of parcels Conforming parcel capacity calculations: Acres divided by minimum lot size by zone</i>	Non Conforming Parcels	2	0	54	3	59
		Acres	0.12	0.00	2.74	0.68	3.54
		Dwelling Unit Capacity	2	0	54	3	59
		Conforming Parcels	40	2	159	0	201
		Acres	14.03	4.54	24.23	0.00	42.80
		Dwelling Unit Capacity	140	9	302	0	451
Vacant Parcels			42	2	213	3	260
Total Acres			14.15	4.54	26.97	0.68	46.34
Dwelling Unit Capacity Total (Vacant)			142	9	356	3	510

Total Number of Parcels	107	568	675
Total Acres	60.53	123.77	184.30
Dwelling Unit Capacity Total	450	1208	1658

Suquamish Rural Village		
	SVLR	SVR
Minimum Developable Lot Size <i>(the smallest size existing lots may be to be developed)*</i>	4,500 sq ft .10 acres	3,600 sq ft .08 acres
Minimum Divisible Lot Size <i>(the smallest size in which parcels can be divided after the adoption of the Plan)</i>	21,780 sq ft .50 acres	21,780 sq ft .50 acres
Minimum Lot Width	50 feet	40 feet
Minimum Lot Depth	90 feet	75 feet
Frontyard Setback	20 feet	20 feet
Sideyard Setback	5 feet	5 feet
Rearyard Setback	5 feet	5 feet

***Nonconforming Lots exceptions**

Nonconforming lots in single ownership

If a single lot of record, which was legally created, is smaller in total square footage than that required in this plan, or if the dimensions of the lot are less than required, said lot may be occupied by any use permitted within the zone subject to all other requirements of this plan.

Nonconforming contiguous lots in common ownership

If there are contiguous lots of record held in common ownership, and each of the lots was legally created, and one or more of the lots is smaller in total square footage than required by this plan, or the dimensions of one or more of them are less than required, said lots shall be combined to meet the minimum lot requirements for size and dimension.

Suquamish Rural Village Subarea Plan
April 19, 1999

Port Gamble Limited Area of More Intense Rural Development (LAMIRD) Land Capacity Analysis

			Rural Historic Town Residential		Rural Historic Town Waterfront		Total by Row
			Acres < 5.00 2.5 Du/Ac	Acres >= 5.00 5 Du/Ac	Acres < 5.00 2.5 Du/Ac	Acres >= 5.00 5 Du/Ac	
Residential Lands							
Underutilized	<i>Dwelling unit capacity calculation: Acres divided by minimum lot size by zone - minus existing units</i>	Redevelopable Parcels	0	1	1	0	2
		Acres	0.00	19.97	2.65	0.00	22.62
		Dwelling Unit Capacity	0	116	5	0	121
Underutilized Parcels			0	1	1	0	2
Total Acres			0.00	19.97	2.65	0.00	22.62
Dwelling Unit Capacity Total (Underutilized)			0	116	5	0	121
			Acres < 5.00 2.5 Du/Ac	Acres >= 5.00 5 Du/Ac	Acres < 5.00 2.5 Du/Ac	Acres >= 5.00 5 Du/Ac	Total by Row
Vacant	<i>Parcel capacity calculations: Acres divided by minimum lot size by zone</i>	Vacant Parcels	15	2	0	0	17
		Acres	16.27	16.98	0.00	0.00	33.25
		Dwelling Unit Capacity	40	99	0	0	139
Vacant Parcels			15	2	0	0	17
Total Acres			16.27	16.98	0.00	0.00	33.25
Dwelling Unit Capacity Total (Vacant)			40	99	0	0	139
Total Number of Parcels			18		1		19
Total Acres			53.22		2.65		55.87
Dwelling Unit Capacity Total			255		5		260

17.321B.050 Density.

RHTR Zone: Residential development no greater than 2.5 units per acre. Total acreage in the zone is approximately 69.76 acres. The cemetery is estimated at approximately 1.33 acres. The maximum number of dwelling units allowed in the zone, therefore, will be calculated based on the acreage determined for the zone following a survey establishing the exact area, less acreage dedicated to county or state right-of-way. Residential lot size minimums and maximums apply as set forth in Section 17.321B.055.

RHTW Zone: Residential mixed-use development no greater than 2.5 residential units per acre is allowed. Waterfront development is not subject to an intensity or floor area ratio limit, but structure size for certain uses is limited as noted in Table 17.321B.040. Total acreage for the zone is approximately 32.01 acres, with developable acreage limited by shoreline setbacks and the bluff area. (Ord. 236 (1999) § 2 (part), 1999)

17.321B.055 Lot size.

A. In the RHTR zone, the following regulations apply to any development proposing densities in excess of one dwelling unit per five acres.

1. Minimum lot size: 3,500 square feet;
2. Maximum lot size: 7,500 square feet;
3. Excess area from acreage used to support proposed densities but not devoted to residential lots and public improvements such as streets and alleys shall be permanently dedicated and reserved for community open space, park land, and similar uses.

B. For developments proposing densities in the RHTR zone no greater than one dwelling unit per five acres, the minimum and maximum lot sizes noted above shall not apply, except that existing dwelling units shall be allocated lot area between 3,500 and 7,500 square feet. New proposals may then proceed using the five-acre lot requirements of Section 17.310.030 for the rural residential (RR) zone. All other provisions of this chapter will continue in effect. (Ord. 236 (1999) § 2 (part), 1999)