

**City of Poulsbo
PLANNING COMMISSION
Tuesday, March 31, 2009**

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT

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

STAFF

Karla Boughton, Consultant
Barry Berezowsky
Lynda Loveday
Mary McCluskey, P&R Dir.

GUESTS

Tom Foley
Molly Lee
Jan Wold
Carlotta Cellucci
Mike Regis
Joan Hett
John Johnson
Dan Baskins
Becky Erickson

MEMBERS ABSENT

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. FLAG SALUTE

3. MODIFICATIONS TO AGENDA - none

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF - none

5. COMMENTS FROM CITIZENS

Molly Lee discussed: (1) her concerns about the city wanting to put a road through her property; (2) she supports the Parks & Recreation Commission's original document.

Jan Wold discussed: (1) growth rate in the county; (2) city projections for growth and (3) actual habitat conservation.

Joan Hett discussed: (1) the need to bridge the differences of opinion and (2) protection of wildlife.

6. 2009 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DRAFT REVIEW

Karla Boughton, Consultant, gave a power point presentation covering the Parks & Recreation Open Space chapter of the Comp Plan and the Parks & Recreation Capital Facilities section.

Commissioners and staff discussed: (1) the reason only four years are shown on the six year CIP table; (2) there are a lot of policies; (3) the zoning ordinance has limited relationship to the parks plan; (4) how some of the policies will be accomplished; (5) how the Planning Department can track so many policies; (6) the chapter's first draft was an edited version of the 2006 parks plan; (7) the Parks Commission wanted all the 2006 policies included; (8) whether it is an issue to have so many policies; (9) the Parks Plan is unique because it is a functional plan that also includes goals and policies and is due to be update in 2012; (10) some of the policies discuss the same issues only the words are changed around; (11) they are redundant; (12) it can be edited more; (13) it needs to be a usable document; (14) it is easy to lose focus of the real issues; (15) there should only be a small number of key policies with subsets to expand on the issues.

The discussion continued with: (16) numerous areas were identified for re-wording; (17) the location of the Audubon area and should it be placed on a map; (18) who is responsible for advertising the Audubon area; (19) there is a map with the ordinance that designated the area; (20) viewing stations should be created; (21) there is an area on Bond Road marked as a viewing area; (22) the city supports the area by having an ordinance that designates it as preserved; (23) maintenance of the parks; (24) the park CIP is a separate document; (25) goals and policies are supposed to be general statements; (26) the purpose of implementation, funding and development.

The discussion continued with: (27) the comp plan needs to be able to be read as a unit; (28) there is an inventory of the parks in appendix B; (29) the maps should list the park category type; (30) the difference between mitigation fees and impact fees; (31) some clarifications need to be made to the maps; (32) all annexations are reflected on the maps; (33) there are geographically under-served areas in newly annexed areas; (34) existing trails are on the map; (35) all open spaces are not necessarily trails, although they may have trails going through them.

The discussion continued with: (36) the CAO allows trails in buffers; (37)critical area stream buffers have been mapped as open space corridors; (38) Indian Hills Park used to be the city dump and the Health Department is still monitoring it; (39) some of the colors on the maps can be changed to make it easier to differentiate parks from open space; (40) the maps will serve as an important planning tool for future parks plan updates.

The discussion continued with: (41) the policies need identify items so that when development occurs the developers can be approached and encouraged to provide desired amenities; (42) the city can encourage developers to provide amenities; (43) open spaces in developments belong to the homeowners, they are not public; (44) the policies give the city permission

to pursue acquisition; (45) the city can work with the health department to develop a safe swimming area; (46) some policies may not be able to be implemented right away; (47) some policies have been carried over from the 2006 plan; (48) water quality enhancement is also addressed in the comp plan; (49) the acquisition portion of the chapter may not be the proper place for water quality discussion; (50) expand the water quality section to include a desired swimming area.

The discussion continued with: (51) the city needs to support water recreation areas; (52) there are not going to be swimming areas in developments; (53) water quality issues should be addressed in other appropriate section of the comp plan; (54) water quality is not a park issue; (55) if the swimming idea is moved to another section it will not be pursued; (56) the city already has a policy to clean the bay; (57) beach property can be acquired in the future; (58) the intent of the review is to have a workable document; (59) the city must be able to accomplish the policies in the plan; (60) there needs to be consistency throughout the whole plan.

The discussion continued with: (61) some issues were clarified regarding figure PRO-1, the reasons for the green lines on streets and holding ponds being identified as open spaces; (62) current trails and future linkage; (63) staff will check to make sure storm ponds are not being identified as open space; (64) some storm ponds in developments have been allowed to be identified as passive open space; (65) page 124 PRO-1.17 change “or” to “of”; (66) page 125 PRO-2.1 (a) definition of “strong”, (b) maybe use “ongoing”; (67) page 125 PRO 2.4 add “...but not limited to.” (68) page 126 PRO-2.9 (a) is there a liability issue, (b) maybe the city should be a partner, (c) getting the city attorney’s opinion, (d) a lot of service clubs build parks for public use, (e) ownership needs to be clear, (f) this is from the 2006 plan, (g) maybe it should be moved to Goal #4.

The discussion continued with: (69) page 126 PRO-2.10 (a) at what point in time should the city identify property it wants to acquire, (b) the PRD encourages open space retention, (d) incentives are offered to the developer, (e) the PRD has a public benefit provision that is a tool, (f) the open space in developments is owned by the homeowners, (h) there is confusion between public lands for parks and open space in developments, (i) the intent of the plan is to preserve public open space through city acquisition.

The discussion continued with: (70) the city would have to provide a legal nexus or would need to purchase property in a development for public use; (71) the developer could provide easements; (72) the only tool the city has is the PRD; (73) it is the developers job to look at the property he is going to develop and present his ideas to the planning department; (74) “identifying” vs. “acquisition” seems to be a sticking point in this review; (75) the parks department maintains city parks; (76)

The discussion continued with: (77) policy 2.10 has good intent, when the developer comes in with a proposal staff discusses possible alternatives and encourage location of open space; (78) the policy seems to be instructing the city to write a new ordinance; (79) it was agreed that staff would rewrite the policy to ensure that it identifies the legal constraints the city has in open space provisions in private developments; (80) page 128 PRO-3.12 (a) who pays the consultant, (b) who makes the decision, (c) "shall" is a strong word; (81) page 128 PRO-3.16 (a) environmentally sensitive based on what, (b) add a citation, (c) include 3.16 in 3.12, (d) trail standards are included in the park plan on page 21, (e) there is a citation in 3.9 (f) maybe 3.16 should be removed; (82) page 129 PRO-4.1 ad "...but not limited to"; (83) page 130 PRO-4.11 more groups should be listed.

There was a discussion regarding: (1) whether the Planning Commission was supposed to debate the differences between the Park Commission and the Planning Department; (2) who resolves the issues; (3) the Planning Commission can direct staff to change the document; (4) the City Council will make the final decision; (5) during the public hearing phase of the review the citizens can give their input; (6) the Planning Commission and Park Commission are both recommending bodies; (7) policies that have been removed from the Park Commission recommendations; (8) the Park Commission believes the CAO doesn't have a program for wildlife habitat conservation areas.

7. Continued Comments from Citizens

Dan Baskins discussed: (1) the large number of policies in the park element; (2) there are so many ways to get out of them; (3) economic choices don't make good neighbors; (4) the trail at old Hwy 3; (5) unreasonable takings; (6) trail dedications need incentives; (7) bike paths.

Jan Wold discussed: (1) conservation; (2) wildlife protection; (3) loss of fish in Johnson creek; (4) impervious pavement; (5) loss of woodpecker habitat.

Molly Lee discussed: (1) conservation of wildlife habitat; (2) seeing cougars on her property.

8. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS - none

The meeting was adjourned at 8:28 pm

Ray Stevens
Chairman, Poulsbo Planning Commission