

**City of Poulsbo
PLANNING COMMISSION
Tuesday, February 3, 2009**

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT

Ray Stevens
Jim Coleman
James Thayer
Gordon Hanson
Bob Nordnes

STAFF

Barry Berezowsky
Lynda Loveday
Karla Boughton, Consultant

GUESTS

Jan Wold
Molly Lee
Tom Foley
Linda Berry-Maraist
Becky Erickson
Dan Baskins
Art Castle
Bernie Johnston

MEMBERS ABSENT

Two vacancies

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. FLAG SALUTE

3. MODIFICATIONS TO AGENDA

There were no modifications.

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF JANUARY 13, 2009

**COLEMAN/NORDNES: MOVE TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF
JANUARY 13, 2009 AS CORRECTED. 5 FOR. 2 ABSENT.**

Commissioners, staff and consultant had a discussion regarding: (1) the need for a quorum at the meetings; (2) the process for making changes/modifications to the draft plan; (3) no point by point responses will be made to written comments received from citizens; (4) the PC will need to bring forward items from the written comments that they want to discuss; (5) the comments received from Councilmember Rudolph are not considered an "exhibit"; (6) a list of acronyms has been provided.

5. COMMENTS FROM CITIZENS

Molly Lee, resident outside the city limits discussed: (1) the timber designation of her property; (2) she does not want a road through her property; (3) she is not willing to give an easement to the city for utilities; (4) she wants her property removed from the UGA; (5) she thinks the city has over-allocated sewer and

water; (6) the map that the PC has doesn't show her property correctly.

Jan Wold, passed around a hand-out and read from it. It is on file in the Planning Department.

Dan Baskins also read from a prepared document but did not provide a copy. He discussed: (1) population allocation; (2) buildable lands; (3) OFM numbers; (4) not attracting urban development; (5) the plan is a good one, but it is not a 20 year plan; (6) this is a watershed time to do things right.

Tom Foley discussed: (1) there are a lot of natural resources that need to be protected; (2) re-arranging the UGA; (3) growth isn't just paid for by growth, it is also paid for by the city; (4) the cost of the new city hall building.

Art Castle, Home Builders Association, discussed how buildable lands and land capacity are not the same.

Commissioners, staff and consultant discussed: (1) the meeting schedule for the review process; (2) the schedule may change so they will be dated with a distribution date; (3) the process that will be used to notify the citizens of the meetings; (4) joint workshops with the Council are on the clerk's calendar; (5) exhibits will be numbered sequentially throughout the review process; (6) if comments from citizens contradict staff information the PC should ask staff to clarify.

6. 2009 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DRAFT REVIEW **OVERVIEW /LAND USE CHAPTER**

Karla Boughton, KB Consultants, discussed her Summary Memo which included: (1) there is no proposal to change the map; (2) new policies are being proposed for infill and redevelopment; (3) there is no proposal to increase densities; (4) some new concepts are being proposed; (5) neighborhood planning is emphasized; (6) a town center concept; (7) developing more mixed use; (8) annexations; (9) adjustments to the UGA are not planned at this time; (10) the city does not have a lot of discretion on some issues; (11) regional perspectives; (12) storm water; (13) urban forestry.

The PC then started discussing specific items in the plan.

Page 6 – visioning – the comp plan is a guide, it cannot be used to make changes to the UGA.

Page 8 – second bullet – a downtown center.

Public participation will continue what the PC is doing.

Page 25 – Viking Avenue – how to go about changing it to a mixed use area.

Page 34 – LU-1.6 - Special Study areas for mixed use.

Page 38 – LU-3.4 & LU-3.9 - Special Study areas for mixed use. The city's previous overlay area for Viking Avenue ended at Lindvig.

The possible boundary area for the Town Center Neighborhood Plan is from downtown to Poulsbo Village, but the exact boundary won't be identified through the comprehensive plan; it'll be part of the neighborhood plan study.

Viking Avenue is like another community. It has always been different. It is like a ghost town. It is at a point where it can be changed. It is surprising how quickly it changed. There might be support to look at a general neighborhood design plan. Whether or not a new policy should be written for Viking or whether Viking should be added to LU-1.6 on page 34. A Town Center Neighborhood Plan ~~for~~ versus a neighborhood plan for Viking could create a dilemma of which area to do first.

Viking Avenue is more important. Both areas are worthy of a special plan. A Town Center Plan is different from what Viking needs. How to entice redevelopment of Viking. A Master Plan may be needed for Viking. Maintenance of a neighborhood is different from a redevelopment.

On page 34 - LU-1.6 is similar to what is needed but the intent is different. Redevelopment needs to be explored. A neighborhood plan would look different. Viking needs an identity. It needs to be used as a tool to get market interest. Which area should go first needs to be identified. Viking needs to be done first. The two areas may complement each other as part of a larger plan. If the same consultant was used there might be a cost savings. The initial review of the two areas should be combined. The Master Plan overlay for Poulsbo Place was not done by the city. Poulsbo Place and Olhava both had single owners. Viking Avenue has multiple owners so the master plan would have to be initiated by the city.

Viking Avenue is currently all zoned commercial. The zoning can be expanded. North Viking should not be changed. A portion of multi-family area is already platted through vested projects. The south area could be opened up to mixed use. An overlay is still a valid option for that area. It needs to be a general, big picture overlay. A policy can be added for Viking Avenue. There isn't enough information yet to recommend the town center concept. It should be looked at like in-fill property. Change the zoning so that owners can make changes to the property individually.

Fish Park is in a light industrial zone. Parks are allowed in industrial zones. Parks are a type of use, not a zoning district. It doesn't skew the numbers for

industrial use because it is not used as available land.

Page 41 – LU-6.2 - Needs to be clarified. One sentence negates another one. Currently utility extensions are not provided to property that is not annexed, unless there is septic failure or other extenuating circumstances. Property has to be annexed if the owners want the city's services. Kitsap County never adopted the city's development standards so annexation is the only way to ensure future development is approved and constructed to the City's standards.

Page 35 – LU-2.1 – The land use designations listed are the same as the ones that are in the current zoning ordinance. Table 14-1 on page 257 was discussed. The city must achieve urban densities. The City must monitor future developments to ensure urban densities and to confirm trends. Increasing the densities in the RL zones is not being recommended. Currently the lot sizes are 7500 s.f. Increasing density would mean smaller lots. The Residential Low designation is 4-5 units per acre. Some developers want larger lots. Other ways need to be looked at to maximize density.

Page 36 – LU-2.2 – Development at the higher range of each designation is desirable. Everything should be maximized. Ranges give the developers options. The Policy encourages higher densities. Not everyone provides ranges. Increased future development is desired in the RM and RH zoning districts. The amendments to the zoning code in 2007 should help maximize density in these zones. There may not be a strong housing market for multi-family development. Areas that were designated residential high may be wrong now. They are outside ~~the~~ some amenities and services the city provides now. With a PUD a developer could build a 4-plex. With the high price of land the home is also going to be expensive.

Page 38 & 39 – LU-3.9 & LU3.10 – the difference between them was discussed. One is for current development one is for new development. Needs to be clarified.

Page 40 – Master Plan – needs more description and responsibilities for when it is applicable.

Page 48 - LU-13.2 – residential access streets do not require trees because the streets are narrower. This is the current standard.

Page 45 - LU-10.1 – there was discussion regarding who would identify the land outside the UGA for future city expansion, the city's role in helping to identify the area, and what criteria would be used to identify it. It is a good tool for later expansion of the UGA. The city is constrained by geography, the reservation and highways.

Page 47 – LU-12.5 – Low Impact Development – how it works, what it does and the need for a technical manual which is being developed were discussed.

Page 48 – LU-13.3 – Street Trees - an update to the clearing and grading ordinance is needed. A tree canopy in developments is desirable. Keep trees in new developments as long as it is not used as a reason to stop development. Taking down the existing trees and planting a residentially friendly canopy is also an option. The buffer of existing trees that was left at Meredith Heights has become a problem. Affordable housing can be impacted by lower densities due to tree preservation. There currently are no requirements for tree preservation.

Timber Designation is a program that Kitsap County has. It offers lower taxes on land that is preserved for timber. It is an agreement between the land owner and the County. The city is not part of the agreement or discussion. The agreement affects the city's land capacity. A forest designation could be added to the current map. The 2025 map should stay as it is.

7. CONTINUED COMMENTS FROM CITIZENS

Molly Lee continued her discussion regarding: the maps don't identify her boundary line adjustment. The comp plan contains incorrect data. The state designates timber lands. She has filed a petition to be withdrawn from the UGA. The PC is not getting all the data being submitted. The majority of the people want to be removed from the UGA.

Art Castle discussed: low impact development. Keeping trees counts towards open space. It can be cost prohibitive to remove them.

Dan Baskins continued reading from his document: This is not a 20 year plan it is a 10 year plan and it is late. There are 17 areas in Poulsbo that shouldn't be in the city limits.

Jan Wold continued to read from her prepared document which is on file in the Planning Department.

8. AUTOMATIC ADJOURNMENT – 8:30 PM

8:32 PM - NORDNES/COLEMAN: MOVE TO CONTINUE THE MEETING UNTIL DONE WITH THE AGENDA. 4 FOR. 1 AGAINST. 2 VACANT.

Karla Boughton then discussed: they will continue with the land use chapter at their next meeting. They need to consider public and written testimony. If they have any comments they can send them to her in advance so she can prepare her responses.

9. COMMISSION COMMENTS

Items discussed included: Getting a condensed version of citizens comments. Clarification of comments made by Mr. Baskins. The HOV lanes on Hwy 305 should be open to everyone. It is going to be hard to consider public comments if they aren't presented in writing for review.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:39 pm

Ray Stevens
Chairman, Poulsbo Planning Commission