

**City of Poulsbo
PLANNING COMMISSION
Tuesday, July 28, 2009**

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT

Jim Coleman
Jim Henry
Gordon Hanson
Bob Nordnes
Ray Stevens
James Thayer
Stephanie Wells

STAFF

Karla Boughton, Consultant
Lynda Loveday
Linda Mueller
Edie Berghoff

GUESTS

see sign in sheets

MEMBERS ABSENT

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Stevens called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM

2. FLAG SALUTE

3. MODIFICATIONS TO AGENDA - none

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF - none

5. COMMENTS FROM CITIZENS - none

6. 2009 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DRAFT REVIEW

Chairman Stevens thanked everyone for coming to the meeting and explained the procedures for the evening.

Karla Boughton, Consultant, gave some background on the comp plan, had a power point presentation and summarized each of the site specific applications.

7:30 open public hearing

Application #09-1 – Finn Hill Owners

Molly Lee – discussed: (1) Johnson creek flows through several of the parcels; (2) it is a fish stream; (3) sites should not be zoned urban; (4) they should be set

aside, bought by the city and used as passive park lands; (5) areas containing wetlands should be subject to an EIS to substantiate any use; (6) why is the city proliferating commercial mix areas in creeks and not focusing on enhancing already commercial areas like Viking Way and leave the creeks alone.

Rick Cadwell – discussed: (1) initially wanted to change all the properties to commercial; (2) the applicants met with staff; (3) there were concerns about taking that much industrial land out of use; (4) permitted industrial uses could be harmful to the creek; (5) tried to create a winning situation by eliminating some of the more obnoxious industrial uses; (6) they want to use some of the more wider commercial uses; (7) they want to offer incentives for low impact development; (8) there is also a proposal for mixed use on the site; (9) they are trying to take some of the traffic off the roads.

Jan Wold – discussed: (1) the area contains many critical areas that are supposed to be removed from developable areas; (2) there is no gravity sewer covering a portion of the proposal; (3) there is a lack of domestic water in the Finn Hill area unless additional supply is acquired from PUD; (4) the area lies in the upper portion of the salmon stream drainage; (5) all the properties supposedly have sewer; (6) she doesn't think that is true; (7) some of the portions may require a very expensive pump station; (8) it will be a threat to Johnson Creek and its salmon; (9) new zoning that allows many types of things is not necessarily in the public's best interest; (10) the applicant should present a specific proposal for the site and look at any zoning changes that may be required; (11) during the approval of Olhava an environmental engineer testified on impacts to Johnson Creek; (12) Council ignored the expert testimony and approved the development; (13) the predictions have come true; (14) the headwaters of Johnson Creek are in this area; (15) fish eggs are being washed out; (16) different decisions need to be made in the future.

Steven Smith – wanted to know who the “we” is that Mr. Cadwell was talking about.

Rick Cadwell named the property owners that are involved in the Finn Hill site application.

Application #09-2 – Jim Laughlin

Jim Laughlin – discussed: (1) he submitted the property for rezone two years ago; (2) there is a large traffic flow; (3) usually doesn't try to rezone sites; (4) it was impossible to get anyone interested in residential development for the site; (5) there is constant traffic, it has good visibility and great access; (6) there is not a lot of traffic on the north end of Viking; (7) the intersection is fully signalized; (8)

he thanked the commissioners for considering his request.

Application #09-3 – Kitsap County Road Shop

No comments.

Application #09-4 – Little Valley Road Property Owners

Skip Uhring – representing Mr. Chumbley - discussed: (1) started process in January of 07; (2) staff recognizes that there is merit to expanding the commercial designation; (3) the staff report's utility and infrastructure concerns would exist regardless of what kind of development proposals are suggested; (4) LDR allows 4-5 units per acre; (5) most of the lots are fairly large so there would be a substantial amount of residential development which would require expansion of utilities; (6) he asks that the designation not be delayed any longer; (7) allow the applicants and staff to get together and figure out some solutions; (8) Mr. Chumbley is prepared to participate in the improvements necessary; (9) it takes a lot of time to get into the development process.

Mark Kuhlman, Team 4 – representing Jabber LLC - discussed: (1) agrees with the previous speaker; (2) there is no reason to delay; (3) all issues of concern will be project specific; (4) he doesn't think there is a concern about lack of planning for infrastructure; (5) the Comp Plan has a Capital Facilities Element that deals with those issues; (6) Little Valley Road has been identified as a commercial sub-collector road; (7) the planning issues related to road and transportation are already part of the city's comp plan; (8) they don't need to be re-studied; (9) they have already been told what kind of road they have to build; (10) the 1994 comp plan already identifies the use as being compatible with the surrounding land uses; (11) Little Valley Road is commercially designated; (12) staff has always indicated that they will support the rezone; (13) now the staff report indicates that they will not; (14) the applicant's were not asked to bring forth a study, agreement or recommendation; (15) he thinks it is unfair to not allow them to proceed due to the lack of something they were never asked to provide; (16) they have been at this for four year for an existing use that was deemed incompatible when the city changed the zoning; (17) their status of non-conforming use is not their fault; (18) this process is meant to correct this kind of issue.

Byron Harris, owner of ProGuard Self Storage – discussed: (1) agrees with what Mr. Kuhlman had to say; (2) this is an existing use on the site; (3) this process is what should be used to correct the non-conforming issue; (4) there are horror stories about insurance companies and banks not wanting to help replace a structure that burns down; (5) he doesn't want to be in that position since the zoning can be corrected; (6) it is an existing use and the only thing that changed

is that the site was annexed into the city; (7) they want to come into compliance.

Bill Palmer, representing Jean Sherrard – discussed: (1) he is opposed to the application; (2) the comments in the staff report are elements he supports; (3) the staff's request to look at a larger area encompasses about 42 acres; (4) there are three different properties in the proposed rezone area; (5) it may be one application but as staff points out it is a piece meal approach to planning for the area; (6) staff indicates that there is another remedy to solve the problem of the mini-storage; (7) he is concerned about environmental issues in the area; (8) there are hydric soils and steep slopes which will limit the amount of usable area; (9) there should be additional study of the area; (10) the community should be involved; (11) look at all the commercial land that already exists in the city; (12) look at whether increase in commercial areas is warranted, especially with the current vacancy rate of commercial sites.

Jean Sherrard, owner of Reliable Storage – discussed: (1) the commercial zone line is on the other side of his property and ends at Little Valley Road; (2) there is a serious traffic problem at Little Valley Road; (3) there is an attempt by three different people for spot zoning; (4) they don't take into consideration the 47 acres; (5) it is going to confuse the area; (6) it is going to make it difficult for the city to handle the properties he has developed; (7) there needs to be a traffic study performed; (8) there needs to be a study on the water that is available; (9) Little Valley must be widened; (10) there are a lot of wetlands and steep soils; (11) there needs to be a wetland and critical areas analysis; (12) Forest Rock Lane is always busy at the light; (13) Viking Avenue is an empty space now; (14) 10th Avenue has empty commercial space; (15) this rezone is not necessary right now.

Dan Baskins, representing his family that owns property on Little Valley – discussed: (1) they are concerned about the over-reach in terms of the size and scope of what staff is recommending; (2) he has no problem with the request for the mini-storage rezone, it makes sense for it to be zoned commercial; (3) the problem with including other parcels is that there are extreme environmental constraints; (4) it also has an awkward infrastructure basis on it; (5) there are no roads conducive to traffic; (6) there are four speed bumps and they are trying to get the road closed; (7) it is an old fashioned country road; (8) the properties dead end out of the commercial zone that is yet to be developed down 10th Avenue; (9) Viking Avenue is being opened up to bring traffic over there; (10) this rezone would open up land that would compete with Viking for development; (11) Caldart Avenue is scheduled to be continued to the North to Gene's Way, but it won't work because it is too wet, so circulation through there is not possible; (12) he hopes the commissioners will take a critical look at this request; (13) this kind

of spot zoning is the kind of evil that GMA was supposed to fix.

Application #09-5 –Sing / PeeWee

Will Miller – discussed: (1) he is concerned about impacts to residents on First Avenue; (2) functions in downtown Poulsbo cause traffic to back up; (3) First is not a very wide street, it is hard for two cars to pass; (4) high density apartments will make it worse; (5) traffic will be a problem all the time not just on certain occasions; (6) he has lived on First since 1988 and takes objection to the increase; (7) when he moved to Poulsbo there were 4,000 people.

Stan Jorgensen – discussed: (1) if anyone was in the area when the power pole got hit, they don't need any more traffic; (2) there were 10 cars at a time trying to make a u-turn on the dead end of First Avenue; (3) he described the few ways of getting out of that area and ended by saying that this was not a good proposal.

Steve Murray – discussed: (1) has a petition of 114 signatures; (2) he read from the cover sheet on the petition; (3) the petition opposes the rezone; (4) he read the city's mission statement; (5) the high density would create a burden; (6) he also read the city's goals #6 & #9; (7) the proposal would not do either of the goals; (8) he bought his house in 1977 because it was a nice neighborhood, it has grown too much already.

Michael Dunfee – discussed: (1) he agrees with the last speaker; (2) there are steep slopes, unstable soils, difficult access; (3) high density requires two access points; (4) the Sing property only has a 91/2 foot access right now; (5) If it is going to be joined with the Pee Wee field there is still not enough access off of First Avenue; (6) the access isn't wide enough for high density.

Jim Laughlin – representing Mr. Sing, discussed: (1) has been developing real estate for 30 years; (2) he agrees that the Sing property has access issues; (3) part of any development application is to address traffic issues and site constraints such as storm water; (4) developers are required to collect storm water and deal with it; (5) there is usually less impact after the development than before; (6) the city has requested that it be zoned medium density rather than high density; (7) access can be achieved from 4th Avenue for a second access; (8) this would alleviate congestion that could have been created; (9) this is an in-fill parcel and is one of the priorities of GMA; (10) it is so close to downtown it is a waste of the property to only put 25 units on the parcel; (11) if it is combined with the PeeWee field all the congestion from that activity would go away.

Todd Gowan, president of PeeWee Association – discussed: (1) the concerns for the association are simple; (2) they have remained self sufficient as a whole; (3) the county has to use schools and other sites for their activities; (4) with the growth in Poulsbo there is more demand for activities; (5) as property owners they are concerned about the value of the property; (6) at some point they will have completely outgrown the property and will need to replace it; (7) as a prudent land owner they are trying to go after the highest zoning they can get; (8) they don't want to develop or sell now, but they have to look to the future of the organization; (9) there is high density on two sides and medium density on another; (10) they have no plans to sell or develop at this time; (11) they are trying to protect the association's single asset; (12) they have the lowest fees in the county; (13) if someone wants to buy them a piece of land to move to they would gladly vacate the site; (14) they want to protect the rights of the kids; (15) they try to help where they can with parking and the neighborhood.

Jeff Brown – discussed: (1) there are so many ways to do things, smart or not so smart; (2) when Poulsbo Place developed he did not mind because the area already has houses on it, they were torn down and the in-fill made sense; (3) other things don't make much sense; (4) storm water sent off the site in a pipe doesn't recharge the ground water.

Gary Nystul – discussed: (1) he is neither for nor against the issue; (2) he lives in the Poulsbo Place neighborhood; (3) it would seem that those who deal with the zoning would have logically the choices to pick a zone that is not more dense than the single family on one side and Poulsbo Place on the other, whatever the maximum number, that is what it should be; (4) he understands the PeeWee's wanting to relocate; (5) there is a 20 foot easement that the parcel behind the goal post has; (6) if the two 4-plexes that are approved get developed there would be a road easement there; (7) looking at the whole picture, what is the most logical solution for traffic and roads; (8) whatever allows the most reasonable return for the PeeWee's would be a win.

Laura Meinhart – discussed: (1) parking is a nightmare every summer; (2) she finally has the attention of the police trying to make it safe; (3) the joy of the ball field is a pleasant neighbor; (4) she would like to see PeeWee's do a swap with the city so they could get the maximum money that it is worth; (5) be smart about the use of the land; (6) the area is surrounded with residences; (7) there is no place for people to throw Frisbee's, run with their dog or play football on Thanksgiving; (8) the Poulsbo Place residents thought they had access to the park; (9) it is an ideal piece of property, the city should be careful about how it rezones it; (10) she would hate to see high density on the Sing property; (11) she can understand medium density; (12) she is extremely concerned about the runoff; (13) back yards get flooded every winter; (14) there are definite issues

that need to be addressed; (15) it would be ideal for overflow parking during Viking Fest; (16) take a serious look at balanced life style; (17) it isn't all about roof tops and paving; (18) there have to be trees; (19) we have to be careful with the environment.

Steven Smith – discussed: (1) the application is flawed in that it is tied to a future potential development that it totally unknown; (2) PeeWee's say they are going to stay there, which is fine; (3) there is no legal access except the 9 foot road; (4) the road shown on the topography map submitted with the application is a dream; (5) he agrees with Steve Murrays comments.

Bill King – discussed: (1) there has been talk about closing off the end of First Avenue; (2) to access the property from up high and come down First Avenue of not right; (3) we are not Seattle; (4) Kiwanis Park and Marty Martinsons Place he has horses on; (5) we need to make dead ends of several roads and live as a community again; (6) it doesn't make sense to keep going the way we are going; (7) Poulsbo is a community that respects each other; (8) there is comorodary; (9) this application is going to compromise that; (10) there is nothing better than going out on your deck in the middle of the summer or in the fall and hear kids at the PeeWee field; (11) if the traffic could be eliminated that would be great, but it is not possible.

Application #09-6 – Martha & Mary, Ebenezer and Day Care

John Wiencko – discussed: (1) he moved here because it is charming and cute; (2) he is concerned about what PPII has in mind; (3) they want to build the Great Wall of China cross the upper ridge; (4) this is a small village community; (5) tagging on with M&M is just an excuse for PPII to extend its project further; (6) developers should dedicate property and build parks.

Darrell Sesley – discussed: (1) chapter 18.40 Master Plan Combining District, 18.40.040.B states the following "...prior to submittal ..." he wanted to know if the neighborhood meeting was held, he doesn't think it was.

Chairman Stevens stated that there has not been a meeting yet, this application process, if approved would pave the way toward there being a meeting in the future.

Jean Ford – discussed: (1) she thanked the Commissioners for hearing them; (2) she implored them to deny the application; (3) when she bought her home in PPII she was told it was going to be a community of homes and cottages; (4) the only thing that has been consistent with the Master Plan is change; (5) this worries

her; (6) PPII already wants to put two 4-story condos up on the hill; (7) M&M wants to build a care center; (8) the hospital is going to come; (9) ambulances are going to come; (10) the students of Olympic College are going to come; (11) remember what the community of Poulsbo is; (12) the individual home owners are no longer thought of as a community.

Chad Solvie, CEO of M&M – discussed: (1) the application presented is from M&M for their own property; (2) he knows there are concerns about height, independent living, in the downtown business corridor; (3) their idea is for an innovative care campus which involves child care, state of the art rehab, students from OC, as well as a specialized assisted living facility, separate from the independent living that has been talked about in the past; (4) there is potential for all of them to be done and done well; (5) going forward with the specifics of a project is going to create questions; (6) M&M has been in the community for over 100 years; (7) they are asking the Commission to at least approve the overlay request; (8) they could then come back with specifics to make sure it works for everyone involved; (9) they could have the public meetings; (10) looking at the demographic needs of Poulsbo has created a lot of excitement for this kind of campus; (11) there may be stimulus dollars that would help plan for the campus; (12) they want to be good corporate neighbors.

Rosie Bennett – discussed: (1) she appreciates M&M; (2) she lives in PPII, on the speed way, Sunset Street; (3) the M&M development will increase traffic; (4) there are going to be lots of people flowing in and out; (5) they have been fighting to lessen the traffic on Sunset and have not been successful; (6) people first, money next; (7) we want to preserve the charm of Poulsbo and enrich our residential areas; (8) people want to know each other as neighbors.

Bob Johnson – discussed: (1) asked that the proposal submitted by M&M be tabled until they come up with a plan that makes sense; (2) it is a shotgun approach and doesn't seem clear what they want to do; (3) there are too many things in the plan that are not defined; (4) M&M has mentioned removing facilities, does that mean Ebenezer; (5) there is no reason to fold this into PPII, it should be independent; (6) asked that the Commission deny the proposal.

Tom Bennett – discussed: (1) according to the application, the Master Plan concept will allow more intensive development of the site; (2) there will be higher density mixed used with less environmental impact; (3) how does the applicant reason that when they are asking for a care campus; (4) more care givers will be needed for the expanded services; (5) visitors; (6) the widening of Sunset has increased traffic; (7) increase in density is very problematic; (8) the value of a community is not best expressed in dollars or investment opportunities; (9) the

charm and success of Poulsbo is very fragile; (10) the aging in place concept isn't something that we want Poulsbo to be known for; (11) many things have been re-evaluated by the health care professionals; (12) old people don't want to go to nursing homes, they want to stay home; (13) staying home means lesser medical expenses; (14) there would be more jobs for the community for home welfare and care.

Lori Gonzales – discussed: (1) how awesome M&M is; (2) it has been in existence for over 100 years; (3) they already have training facilities; (4) they already have families that come to visit; (5) they bring more money to this community that people realize; (6) her mother is at M&M; (7) they have been wonderful; (8) without the facility they would have to go to Seattle; (9) the care that they give and the training that they have is an asset to Poulsbo; (10) she knows about the traffic because she lives on Torval; (11) the traffic generated by the proposal would go on the other side of Iverson and Sunset and would go over the hill to Albertsons; (12) it is a great opportunity for Poulsbo; (13) they have a lot to offer; (14) it would bring more asset to the city; (15) for elderly people, no one wants to go there, but thanks goodness it is there when it is needed.

Don Chilcot – discussed: (1) agrees with the other speakers about too much traffic; (2) the willingness of old people to prefer to stay at home and not go to some place like M&M; (3) he urged the Commissioners to vote against the proposal.

Application #09-7 – Fish Park

Stan Jorgensen – discussed: (1) 13 private citizens submitted requests, since when is the city a private citizen (para 4, last sentence, 22 July letter); (2) instead of low density Fish Park should be changed to open space so it doesn't get sold off like some other parks are trying to be, and then turned into houses.

Ann Murin – discussed: (1) there are already a lot of changes, don't take the parks away; (2) don't put whatever designation the city wants so that later they can be turned into something else; (3) they are the citizens parks, they don't belong to the Mayor's office, they don't belong to the City Council, they belong to the people sitting behind her and the thousands of other people who live in the city; (4) she urged the Commission to think carefully before they take the parks away because they will be mad and them and won't vote for them.

Application #09-8 – Scandia Knoll Park & Klingel Property

Stan Jorgensen – discussed: (1) He used to feed the horses and the cows where

the park is; (2) the city bought the Klingel property to use as a park; (3) the barns are used to store the sail boats for P&R; (4) seeing the water on the site and how it drains the site should not be anything but open space; (5) the city stuck its neck out to build a new city hall, shame on them; (6) don't sell the parks off to pay for the city's fiasco.

Steve Murray – discussed: (1) this site is also included in the 114 person petition he submitted earlier; (2) the names were not obtained at the ferry terminal they were locals; (3) he read some issues that were written on the petition; (4) the city used to put signs up about people in the community that did outstanding things; (5) Poulsbo has been designated a tree city; (6) he doesn't want to see a sign that says Poulsbo the overgrowth capital of the world.

Steven Smith – discussed: (1) the application is wrong-headed at this time; (2) the rezone is wanted in order to pay for city hall; (3) the value of a property is only what it can be sold for; (4) there are no customers for the property; (5) in this economy there are no builders willing to speculate on any risky development area; (6) this is a very risky area; (7) it has soil problems; (8) it has land slide history; (9) it has wetlands; (10) it has springs and streams; (11) it has topography that makes it expensive to build on; (12) there are health issues because of the mosquito population; (13) effects need to be studied over time; (14) there are strong political liabilities for approving this kind of a development; (15) if the land were developable the city would be besieged with offers; (16) there are about 6,000 families zoned in for development; (17) there aren't 6,000 families looking to buy; (18) there are not 6,000 builders looking to build; (19) he talked to a banker who told him that if someone walked into the bank with ten million dollars in their pocket they could not get a spec house loan; (20) there is going to be a long term change in the economic realities; (21) he recommends that the application be rejected because it is not appropriate at this time.

Jackie Lee – discussed: (1) keep and protect the established Kiwanis park; (2) don't sell but keep the Klingle property; (3) it is a natural wetland and wild life corridor; (4) rezone is wrong; (5) it may be legal, but it is not moral; (6) just because the city can, that doesn't mean it should.

Linda Hylland – discussed: (1) at the Park Commission meeting the citizens were told that the city cannot afford to buy any more park land; (2) so, why are they trying to sell the ones they have; (3) why do they want to change the parks; (4) her neighborhood is very close; (5) everyone in the neighborhood uses the parks; (6) the neighbors all love the parks and want to keep them as open space; (7) the city should not be able to designate the change of a park to something else; (8) it is not a wise move.

Kristin Nelson – discussed: (1) last week a bus hit a telephone pole and cracked it into three pieces and put out a lot of people’s power; (2) traffic was an absolute mess in the canyon; (3) she had to plan her day in order to sit in line for a long time just to run an errand; (4) there is still a “not a thru street” sign up; (5) it seems that the city still has a right-of-way that can traverse the whole hill; (6) it should be given to the parks as a good faith sign; (7) she lives above Mr. Sing’s property and no one has lived in the house for years; (8) she believes this is a speculative issue; (9) there have been all kinds of problems due to the old farm house; (10) the city should buy it and use it; (11) it could be a tourist information center.

John Love – discussed: (1) he wanted to know if the PC is hearing what the citizens are saying; (2) he was at a park commission meeting a few years ago where things were steamrolled through; (3) last week the Mayor came to the Park Commission and said that things were just ideas; (4) the Commissioners need to think and act for themselves; (5) the city has stakeholders that have been here a long time; (6) businesses come and go; (7) do the Commissioners want a pretty Poulsbo or a big Ballard.

Michelle Love – discussed: (1) has lived on 2nd Ave. for 22 years; (2) her children played in Skandia Park; (3) that is why they bought the property; (4) they lived in many areas that grew out of hand; (5) she is angry about the changes; (6) she wants to know when it is going to stop, when is enough, enough; (7) keep this area as a nice place to live and raise children; (8) they don’t want to move somewhere else because things are growing and the parks are disappearing; (9) traffic is getting crazy; (10) it is really sad; (11) she hopes the PC really hears what has been shared.

John Lehne – discussed: (1) all the stop signs that the city installed around town to try and discourage people from coming through town; (2) he is affected by them every day; (3) they are incredibly annoying; (4) he agrees that they do have value by reducing the number of trips; (5) he likes to walk the neighborhood and see how many people are out enjoying their yards; (6) if anything is rezoned that will increase vehicle trips again will be contrary to the intended purpose of the stop signs.

Bill King – discussed: (1) the bus accident with the pole; (2) the neighbors that came out to help; (3) and the traffic mess that resulted; (4) he asked that the commissioners not take away their rights as citizens to have parks; (5) there is a big legal precedent that will be set; (6) when the apartments were built everyone thought there was a deal that included the park as a community property; (7) in January he heard that the city was looking at things to figure out how to get into the “pit”, the Klinge property; (8) he has heard from various sources that the

Klinge site has been discussed for several years around different options; (9) he wants to get the straight story; (10) he appreciates the amount of time that has been spent by the staff and commission in putting together the comp plan; (11) he was totally impressed even though it took an hour to download; (12) his solution is to put in a zip line and zip the elected officials into the bottom of the pit.

Wayne Hill, member of P&R commission – discussed: (1) they heard that putting the Kiwanis park into the mix was a way of keeping the city's options open; (2) tonight a number of people have stated that they don't like the option and the implications that go along with high residential zoning.

Becky Reber – discussed: (1) back in the 1980's when the park was going to be a soccer field neighbors went to the Park Commission and they listened to what the neighbors wanted to do with the site; (2) everyone got together as a community and helped build what is there; (3) it is a versatile park; (4) swapping the land around is a bad idea because it gets rid of the area where kids can throw Frisbees, toss a ball or sled; (5) last night the park commission walked the area along with some neighbors; (6) the way it is laid out right now the hill doesn't interfere with the playground; (7) it is a poor exchange because the Klinge site is too wet to play in; (8) she asked that the park be kept the way it is.

Larry Reber – discussed: (1) he thanked everyone for staying awake since it is such a hot night; (2) the park was put together by the service clubs of the community, which means the citizens of Poulsbo; (3) the park meets ADA handicapped accessibility requirements, he isn't sure if any others do; (4) when they went for their walk last night with the Park Commission there was a family having a picnic at the park; (5) the park does get used; (6) the overall impact, everyone is concerned about open space, which this is; (7) there was talk about designating Fish Park as open space; (8) the city has to designate areas so that everyone know what open areas the city has; (9) the Klinge site is a bad piece of property; (10) there are wetlands delineated; (11) it needs to be designated as open space; (11) everyone needs to be good stewards; (12) he thanked everyone for being at the meeting and working for them.

Briana Reber - discussed: (1) she helped build the pavilion when she was 6 years old; (2) she grew up with the park; (3) the P&R meeting last night where the Mayor discussed the possibilities for the site; (4) it isn't fair to the community to cause such a detriment because of bad choices a number of years ago; (5) a bad precedent will be set regarding the sale of park land; (6) what implications will it have to future generations; (7) it is not setting up a legacy; (8) she asked that the PC deny the petition.

Jeff Brown – discussed: (1) he wanted to clarify that he opposed the Sing property rezone; (2) many people have said it sets a bad precedent; (3) it is a park; (4) people don't think of parks as something temporary until something gets built; (5) it should stay that way; (6) he has lived here 19 years and his children played in the park; (7) no one wants to point at a building and say "that is where the park used to be"; (8) no new natural land is being created; (9) taking away park land is heading down the wrong direction; (10) he would rather have Kiwanis park and a hole in the ground that a new city hall and no park; (11) who is going to benefit from the sale of the park, not the neighbors; (12) developers don't live here; (13) some people would benefit, most people would suffer.

Hans Gilhart – discussed: (1) his family lived, grew up and played in the area also; (2) the park does get used; (3) he uses the park at least three times a week; (4) it is a bad precedent to set; (5) he is going to join his neighbors in asking that the application be turned down.

Tom Foley – discussed: (1) in the Capital Facilities Plan, in the park system, the city has a level of service for parks that is 20 acres short; (2) the city is going in the wrong direction by selling off parks to pay for the construction of city hall; (3) a new city hall is desperately needed, but not at 17 million dollars; (4) it is impacting core services, budgets, police services; (5) declining revenues have also been a major factor; (6) don't sell the parks to help pay for the new city hall.

Dan Baskins – discussed: (1) as a developer representative, he finds himself in a bizarre position; (2) he was involved in the discussions regarding the dedication of the park; (3) apartments tend to be overcrowded so they needed some open space; (4) it is necessary to find a balance between developments that exist and the ones that are coming; (5) the Klingle property was purchased for a park it was because of the deficiencies in city park lands; (6) the property is under developed as a park but is used at a very high rate; (7) the nice thing about them being parks is that they are hard to develop; (8) he agrees that the city should not sell parks to build city hall; (9) zoning should not be increased in order to get maximum value for the land; (10) there is demand for the property, so someone could develop it; (11) this doesn't make sense; (12) the city should have a park designation; (13) the parks should not be included in population densities; (14) there are other ways to raise funds for city hall.

Chuck Urdahl – discussed: (1) he is not a property owner, but he is a citizen; (2) he looks out on the park and uses it almost every day; (3) he sees people using the park for various purposes; (4) where are they going to go to participate in their various activities; (5) where are the people that move into the development going to go; (6) the Klingle property was acquired with the intent of making it a

park; (7) someone has pulled a bait and switch on the citizens; (8) commitments made by the city mean nothing; (9) the people who govern the city should want to leave a better legacy that “we sold the parks”; (10) he hopes that the PC has noticed that no one has spoken in favor of the proposal.

Joe Carr – discussed: (1) there was a vote a couple of years ago on where to locate the new city hall; (2) he doesn't remember the results of the vote; (3) he does remember that he doesn't think he voted on building a new city hall; (4) he doesn't think that selling a park to build city hall should even be considered.

Maria Marsalla – discussed: (1) she sleeps 10 feet from the only entrance to the Sing property; (2) having one family there is more than enough; (3) she lived in NY where homes became townhouses and then became apartments; (4) she left there because she didn't want to live with that anymore; (5) the beautiful community she moved to, Poulsbo, is now gone; (6) Poulsbo is turning into a mini Seattle; (7) it is not something that should be on this side of the water.

Ann Burin – discussed: (1) from where she lives, she can walk to five different parks; (2) there is no one here to talk for the children that are coming; (3) the parks need to be saved for the children and the people that live in Skandia Knoll; (4) the Klinge property is not a safe place for them to play; (5) they need to play where their parents can see them; (6) children need a safe place to play; (7) if the parks are gone there is no where for the kids to go; (8) the parks need to be kept; (9) everyone in the town agrees.

Helen Conor – discussed: (1) she doesn't want the park to be sold so that the city can have more money for city hall; (2) she has great grandchildren that she can take to the park; (3) she is thrilled about that; (4) she thanked the PC for staying up and listening to their concerns.

No name – discussed: (1) the neighborhood is in a transition point; (2) original owners are selling to new people; (3) his property is a rental, with no children but three young adults; (4) they will be making use of the park; (5) Skandia Knoll apartments are a continuous transition; (6) the neighborhood is not long before it will to a roll over and have young couples raising their children; (7) he asked whether Net Shed Park had ever been developed.

Application #09-09 – Curtis Property - no comments

Application #09-10 Powell Property

Steve Powell – discussed: (1) he is attempting to develop an office space on Bond Road; (2) the property consists of a single family rental home; (3) the home will be demolished and a medical/dental/professional building will be built; (4) the size of the property only allows for a small office space due to the nearby stream; (5) staff comments that commercial zoning is for more high intensity uses; (6) the number of car trips would be reduced to the proposal is actually less intense; (7) medical development will be congregating downtown more that on Bond Road; (8) professional uses in the downtown core would be displaced and moved out; (9) he would be happy to designate that professional office space would be the only kind they would use.

Application #09-11 – Sorensen Property - no comments

Application #09-12 – Soltero Property

Cliff Despeaux, representing Roberto Soltero – discussed: (1) the property is behind a strip of commercial property behind Hwy 305; (2) staff has decided it is not a good idea to have the site rezoned because it would be piece meal; (3) he pointed out that the property would not be an island by itself; (4) it is adjacent to a piece of commercial property that is very nice; (5) Mr. Soltero wants to do something very similar to what his neighbor has; (6) it would be an improvement in the neighborhood; (7) a lot of people have talked about the charm of some homes in the Poulsbo area; (8) this house has lost all of its charm; (9) to build a single family residence in this neighborhood is not conducive to use of the property for its highest value; (10) staff agrees that the site should be rezoned, but it is the piece meal issue; (11) staff has suggested that Mr. Soltero get together with neighbors and discuss rezoning the whole area; (12) Mr. Soltero does not have the means or the time to do that; (13) an objection from a neighbor is that it would make it easier for other neighbors to rezone their properties; (14) 9th Avenue is very narrow, but he has never had any problems passing another car when he drives down there; (15) only 18 feet of the road is paved; (16) if the site and others were rezoned and improved the road could be widened to accommodate traffic better; (17) trying to leave 9th Avenue onto Hostmark can become a bottle neck, but there is another exit south of that across from the park & ride; (18) it is noted that there is only one piece of property on that side of the street that is zoned commercial, however on the other side there are 11; (19) rezoning the site would be a big improvement to the neighborhood.

Application #09-13 – Lazanfame Property - no comments

NORDNES/HENRY: Move to continue the Planning Commission Public Hearing on the 2009 Draft Comprehensive Plan and the 13 site specific land

use re-designation applications to Tuesday, August 4, 2009 at 7:00 pm at the Poulsbo Sons of Norway, 18891 Front Street. 7 for.

7. COMMISSION COMMENTS

none

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 pm

Ray Stevens
Chairman, Poulsbo Planning Commission