

**City of Poulsbo  
PLANNING COMMISSION**

**Tuesday, October 4, 2011**

**MINUTES**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:** Jim Coleman, Gordon Hanson, Bob Nordnes, Kate Nunes, Ray Stevens, James Thayer, Stephanie Wells

**STAFF PRESENT:** Keri Weaver, Edie Berghoff

**GUESTS PRESENT:** Kirk Stickels, Jim Groh, Tony DeCarlo, Fred Springsteel

**1. CALL TO ORDER**

Chairman Stevens called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm.

**2. MODIFICATIONS TO AGENDA – none**

**3. COMMENTS FROM CITIZENS – none**

**4. SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM UPDATE (Continued from September 27, 2011)**

Discussion began at Section V, Shoreline Modifications on page 41 of the SMP draft with (1) boulders are included as soft shore stabilization; (2) Federal, state and local layers of regulation; (3) an introduction to the SMP and regulations document will have a disclaimer indicating the Shoreline Act as amended or as current is the authority to be sure the regulations continue to reference currently-effective state law; (4) section 16.08.390, Piers, Docks and Boat Launches is for existing and new uses, and do not impact ports and marinas which are addressed in a different code section; (5) Geotechnical report reference is from WAC 173-26-231(3)(a)(iii) (A), (B)(I), and (D); and (6) Geotechnical report is in definitions section.

The Port questioned the timeframe requirement for a structure to be damaged within 3 years before hard shoreline stabilization could be approved. Commissioners and staff responded that the 3-years indicated in 16.08.400 (C)(2)(a) is found in WAC 173-26-231(3)(a)(iii) (B)(I) and (D); there are ways to make an emergency repair and come for a permit after the fact; and some maintenance work MAY be covered under the existing Port JARPA. The port specifically questioned applicability to the existing shoreline wall to which staff responded that if a new wall is necessary, the reports reviewing replacement must show other forms of wall maintenance is not a workable solution. The Fjord Drive slide repair is a soil nail wall, classified as hard armoring, is replacing a soft armoring solution which failed as well as previously unarmored shoreline.

Commissioners discussion then continued with (7) breakwaters, jetties and groins require a permit; (8) need to require hard or soft armoring in permit text; (9) most shoreline work \$5,000 or less is exempted in WAC and 16.09; and (10) 16.09 covers the permit process.

The Port then questioned 16.08.410 (D) only allowing floating or open pile designs. Staff responded the Department of Ecology indicates there is a minor modification that can be made for consistency with WAC 220-110-330(3) which allows other designs where floating or open pile designs

are infeasible. Discussion then ensued around the correct professional to design a breakwater being a Civil Engineer, or Civil Engineer with coastal endorsement, and if the US Army Corps of Engineers indicates a specialization. Staff indicated any permit to construct a breakwater would require peer review by a city consultant to ensure appropriate design.

Commissioners continued discussion with (11) significant tree definition; (12) maintenance and pruning of native trees; (13) Tree Board and Critical Area Ordinance definition of significant trees should be the same as SMP; (14) removal of non-native or invasive vegetation by non-mechanical device; (15) significant tree removal would require a specific permit; and (16) need to address removal of 'non-significant' trees.

The Port requested information regarding how the Port fits into permitted uses and conditionally permitted uses indicating possible future changes such as an additional story on one or more existing buildings, moving existing floating buildings, or expansion of the docks to increase capacity. Staff responded that any permit must look at cumulative impacts, however, the state requires an additional permit when on or over state lands. The Port then questioned how the city reviews classroom use of a boathouse. Staff responded that it is not a water dependant use and would likely not be permitted and DNR is currently in discussion with the Yacht Club regarding this type of use on state leased lands. The Port then requested information on building height in parks and a conference center use including a classroom. Staff responded that the current SMP draft identifies building height in parks at 25 feet, and that a conference center with or without a classroom is not a water dependant use.

Commissioners discussion then continued with (17) 16.08.470 B through D are directly from the WAC.

Commissioners review discussion then continued with PMC 16.09 and (18) need to include the same disclaimer regarding the WAC, as updated, is the authority; and (19) exemptions are determined by the Planning Director according to the exemption criteria in WAC 173-27-040, not the individual or applicant.

Commissioners briefly noted the Final Inventory and Characterization and Draft Cumulative Impacts and Analysis, Restoration Plan, & No Net Loss Summary are the documents on which the City's SMP update is based.

The Draft Restoration Plan was the Commissioners next topic of discussion with (20) Fish Park and Liberty Bay Waterfront Trail need better more detailed future planning; (21) the city has a tentative plan of next steps for restoration but there is no timeline or funding, and priority is not set; (22) no capital investment plan is included with the restoration plan; (23) the public access plan identified in earlier meetings by the Commission may be able to tie into the restoration plan and provide additional direction for priority setting; (24) every update of the SMP under the regular cycle is an opportunity to review the status and how well the city is meeting goals and ideals of the SMP; (25) NE-7.8 discusses hard armoring on the shoreline; (26) these goals are currently in the Land Use Comprehensive Plan (LUCP) and will be removed from the LUCP and put into the SMP; (27) Goal 7.3 will be refined to reference future updates with others modified as well; (28) Goal 7.7 encouraging community docks goal will be removed; and (30) the goals and policies of the restoration plan, which are from the LUCP, will be revised based on the goals and policies document reviewed during the first few meetings the Planning Commission reviewed the SMP documents.

Commission members then expressed how well done the maps are and expressed appreciation that the maps would be revised for the next meeting based on revisions to the text already discussed. Members of the Commission then verified that the Public Access Plan would be done following the adoption by Council of the SMP, if Council determines such a plan is desirable.

The next workshop reviewing the SMP is compiled draft and final review of public comment letters will be scheduled for October 25, 2011 at beginning at 6:00 pm in the Council Chambers. The Planning Commission public hearing will be determined following final modifications identified at the October 25 workshop. It is tentatively scheduled for November 15.

5. **COMMENTS FROM CITIZENS** – none

6. **COMMISSIONER COMMENTS** – none

The meeting was adjourned at 8:28 pm

---

Ray Stevens  
Chair, Poulsbo Planning Commission