

City of Poulsbo  
SPECIAL PLANNING COMMISSION

Tuesday, September 7, 2010

MINUTES

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

Jim Coleman  
Gordon Hanson  
Kate Nunes  
Ray Stevens  
James Thayer  
Stephanie Wells

**STAFF**

Barry Berezowsky  
Edie Berghoff  
Mary McCluskey  
Lynda Loveday  
Karla Boughton, consultant

**GUESTS**

Sandy Kienholz  
Mark Kuhlman  
Paul Mott  
Ron Easterday  
Steve Smaaladen  
Steve Maddocks  
Gail Maddocks  
Luanne Hill  
Phil Colcord  
Sherry Colcord  
David Wymore  
Mike Regis  
Janine Dolezel  
Marsha Daltry  
Dan Foley

**MEMBERS ABSENT**

Bob Nordnes

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Stevens called the meeting to order at 7:00 pm

**2. FLAG SALUTE**

**3. MODIFICATIONS TO AGENDA - none**

**4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES - none**

**5. COMMENTS FROM CITIZENS - none**

Chairman Stevens explained the procedures that would be used for the public hearing in order to keep things running smoothly.

7:02 – Public Hearing opened

**6. PUBLIC HEARING – COMP PLAN AMENDMENTS 2010**

Edie Berghoff, Associate Planner, presented the 2010 Comprehensive Plan

Amendments, which include two site specific amendments, and 9 text amendments. She briefly described each amendment, and stated that CPA 2010-09, the Rindal Property, is being recommended for removal from consideration at the request of the family who is not interested in selling. Also, CPA 2010-10 is being recommended for approval with modification to remove the Rindal Property from the Capital Facilities Plan Table CFP-3

#### CPA 2010-01

Sandy Kienholz wanted to know if the amendment was legal and why it wasn't rezoned before the building was built.

Barry Berezowsky, Planning Director, explained the circumstances that led up to the need for rezoning.

CPA 2010-02 – no citizen input

CPA 2010-03 – no citizen input

CPA 2010-04 – no citizen input

CPA 2010-05 – no citizen input

#### CPA 2010-06

Ron Easterday discussed his concerns regarding roadway Z; the steep grade; the "s" curves; having a T on Forest Rock Lane is dangerous; FRL is closed a lot during the winter; congestion problems; the comp plan doesn't support the amendment; there are other commercial areas in the LU policies; it is ill advised and should be withdrawn.

Dan Foley, representing the FR HOA said they don't see the value to the neighborhood and are concerned about increased hazards.

Janine Dolezel is opposed to road "Z"; FRL is a residential street; the road is un-supportable for commercial access; it is dangerous going into the "s" curves; there is a site distance problem; it is an accident waiting to happen; the PC should reject the proposal.

Marsha Daltry doesn't understand the need for road "Z"; is opposed to the removal of trees and the park; there are no traffic jams that need to be resolved; it is foolish; current roads should be fixed instead; Central Market is on a good corner.

CPA 2010-07 – no citizen input

CPA 2010-08 – no citizen input

CPA 2010-09 – no citizen input

CPA 2010-10 – no citizen input

CPA 2010-11

Phillip Colcord lives on Vetter Road; the unincorporated area of Vetter is a narrow one lane road; it was stipulated at annexation time that it would maintain its country feel; access for the proposal should be from the highway; Vetter will be annexed in the future; the Master Plan needs to include the Vetter Road residents; use of city water and sewer are required at time of annexation.

LouAnn Hill talked about the annexation area; the 55 acres need an egress; asked if there would be sewer and stormwater hookups; the road is going to go up into their homes.

Barry Berezowsky explained that this is just a Master Plan overlay designation application; it allows the developer some creativity for a more unique development; the green line on the future road segment map is only a conceptual road alignment; the unincorporated island is going to stay that way; the road is only going to serve the Master Plan property; if the MP designation is approved by Council they also must review and approve the actual Master Plan; it will be a public participation process.

Paul Mott, Rose & Sons stated that this is not a typical development they are proposing; they don't "flip" their properties; they protect their investments; they work closely with the community.

This concluded the discussion on the applications.

Eddie Berghoff then made some final comments. She stated that utility extensions are not required at time of annexation; the proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and staff is recommending approval with modifications.

7:53 Public Hearing closed

Planning Commission discussion

CPA 2010-01 – no comments

CPA 2010-02 – no comments

CPA 2010-03 – no comments

CPA 2010-04 – no comments

CPA 2010-05 – no comments

CPA 2010-06

There was an extensive discussion between the commissioners and staff regarding road “Z”; the need for it; it’s location; access to the properties it is meant to serve.

CPA 2010-07 – no comments

CPA 2010-08

There was a discussion between the commissioners and consultant, Karla Boughton, regarding the memo from Edie Berghoff dated August 31, 2010 which includes changes in the acreage due to a BLA adjustment for the Olhava ball fields; addition of property to fish park; purchase of the park & rec building; the new table in the memo includes trails.

CPA 2010-09

The commissioners and staff discussed removal of the Rindal property from the amendments; making the wording in the amendment more generic; the Comprehensive Plan has policy language to only acquire property from willing sellers; land acquisition for parks and trails is a constant process; development of Indian Hills may become a joint venture as a regional park and it is city property within city limits.

The Commissioners concurred to change the language in amendment 2010-09 to remove reference to the Rindal property and insert language referring to “shoreline property on Fjord Drive”. Language in amendment 2010-10 would require the same kind of change.

CPA 2010-10 – no comments

CPA 2010-11

Discussion included the fact that the Vetter Road issue is similar to the Forest Rock Hills road "Z" issue, they are both possible plans for the future; the map proposal is not cast in stone; interaction between land owners; a Master Plan usually is attached to the land; the City Attorney said that the overlay will be in effect until they develop, if they don't pursue the MP development the overlay will sunset; the MP overlay gives the applicant the opportunity to propose a Master Plan development; there are only two owners for the 55 acres and they are contiguous; required minimum size for a Master Plan; the applicants won't pursue the MP development until they purchase all the property required; the city needs to be protected incase the overlay is approved but the MP itself is never applied for; the MP development will come to the PC for review; there is every expectation that there will be a successful acquisition by the proponents of the Master Plan overlay.

**MOTION: COLEMAN/HANSON.** Move to recommend approval to the City Council of CPA 2010-01, 02, 03, 04, 06, 07, 08 and 11 as written. 6 for. 1 absent.

**MOTION: COLEMAN/THAYER.** Move to recommend approval with modifications to the City Council of CPA 2010-05. 6 for. 1 absent.

**MOTION: COLEMAN/HANSON.** Move to recommend approval with modifications to the City Council of CPA 2010- 09 & 10. 6 for. 1 absent.

**MOTION: HANSON/NUNES.** Move to direct the Planning Director to prepare findings of fact in support of this decision for the Planning Commission Chairman's signature. 6 for. 1 absent.

**7. COMMISSION COMMENTS – none**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:09 pm

---

Ray Stevens  
Chairman, Poulsbo Planning Commission