

**City of Poulsbo
PLANNING COMMISSION
Tuesday, April 21, 2009**

MINUTES

MEMBERS PRESENT

Jim Henry
Gordon Hanson
Bob Nordnes
Ray Stevens
James Thayer

STAFF

Karla Boughton, Consultant
Lynda Loveday

GUESTS

Jan Wold
Dan Baskins

MEMBERS ABSENT

Jim Coleman
Stephanie Wells

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 March 31 & April 7, 2009

Move to approve the minutes of 3-31 & 4-7-2009 as corrected. 5 for. 2 absent

5. COMMENTS FROM CITIZENS

Jan Wold discussed: (1) under reporting of population; (2) there is wrong information throughout the whole document; (3) the numbers from OFM are wrong; (4) densities; (5) habitat management; (6) City Attorney Haney's memo; (7) there is evidence that fish are impacted on Johnson Creek; (8) Coho salmon have not returned; (9) the city is violating GMA's mandate "shall maintain" habitats.

6. 2009 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DRAFT REVIEW

Karla Boughton, consultant, introduced this week's review item, Implementation. She discussed: (1) this is a new section that is not required; (2) it is an important piece of the comp plan; (3) it is a tool for the department heads; (4) Council can gauge how the plan is working; (5) it will be modified based on PC recommended

changes during this review process; (6) only actionable policies are included in the table; (7) some policies support multiple goals; (8) it will be the PC's job to review the development regulations and zoning ordinance in relationship to the table;

Discussion began with: (9) if non-actionable policies should be listed separately; (10) should it show that every policy is dealt with somewhere in the table; (11) there is a lot to the table; (12) it is hard to track; (13) it won't be used if it is too cumbersome; (14) the individual rows should be numbered to make it easier to refer to them; (15) maybe the implementations should be listed at the end of each chapter; (16) the table will help with the work program; (17) is the PD going to be able to do all the tasks in one year; (18) some items will take longer than one year to complete; (19) some implementations are new; (20) most are already in place and just need to be refined.

The discussion continued with: (21) the implementation strategies are a best guess at what should happen; (22) what CC can prioritize; (23) how much money is available; (24) some strategies with one year goals should be re-looked at; (25) do the dates matter if everything can not be done in one year; (26) many can be done within one year unless the funds are not available; (27) the reality is that the CC will set the priorities so they can choose what gets more attention; (28) a caveat should be inserted that states that one year is a goal not a mandate; (29) that is how the government works, there are always delays; (30) the city has done its due diligence to reach an anticipated timeline.

The discussion continued with: (31) page 165, the annexation brochure is provided by the city not the applicant; (32) the petitioner is responsible for mailing the brochure but the brochures have the same boilerplate information on them; (33) page 166 contains some typo's; (34) page 168, what is considered a "public building" and a "gateway"; (35) page 169, delete the specifics for old town; (36) CC-7.6 isn't in the table because it is not actionable; (37) the policy itself is so specific it is an action; (38) the PD enacts this policy on a continual basis; (39) the city does not have a transportation system, it only has streets; (40) GMA requires that the comp plan include a transportation chapter.

The discussion continued with: (41) transportation is an important quality if life issue; (42) page 171 TR-5.3 needs to be re-written; (43) page 173, "relevant environmental data" is open to anyone's interpretation; (44) standards are provided by Federal, State, County, Tribe, DOE, F&W, and Health; (45) best management practices are well defined; (46) page 173 NE-2, who identifies the "professionals" and where do they come from; (47) the WAC's contain qualifications for Best Available Science; (48) the WAC should be cited in the table; (49) page 175 contains a typo; (50) page 183 PRO-6 is not listed so who has responsibility for incorporation.

The discussion continued with: (51) page 183, what is meant by “aggressive” (52) page 180, what is meant by “support”; (53) finding a way to link the table to the comp plan document itself would be helpful; (54) the continuous ones are already being tracked; (55) whether there is anything specific in the comp plan that staff wants the PC to pay special attention to; (56) the policies are the most important parts of the comp plan; (57) the PC will work with the policies when it comes to reviewing specific land use applications.

Ms. Boughton then discussed: (1) their meeting schedule for the next few months; (2) they will receive a revised draft plan with line in, line out corrections based on the discussion so far; (3) new maps will be provided; (4) a legal analysis on the UGA will be prepared; (5) a technical memorandum on land capacity will be presented; (6) getting the PC’s summer vacation schedule.

Commissioners and staff then discussed outstanding issues, including: (1) the Park & Rec chapter stands out because it contains more than 80 policies; (2) it contains too many details; (3) it isn’t consistent; (4) a spreadsheet prepared by a commissioner for each chapter shows how out of balance the P&R chapter is; (5) it is easy to lose focus with so many policies; (6) it is ambiguous; (7) the policies need to be refined; (8) the whole chapter needs to be redone so it flows like the rest of the plan; (9) staff will work with Mary McCluskey to cut out the redundancies and remove the repetitive policies; (10) it is a functional plan so it’s intent and tone will be kept.

The discussion continued with: (11) the P&R Plan is an addendum to the comp plan; (12) it can be cited by reference; (13) other functional plans don’t have goals and policies; (14) it can be made to fit the tone of the comp plan; (15) the P&R Plan is updated every 6 years; (16) what discussion items the PC needs to bring to the next meeting; (17) staff will bring responses to PC’s input; (18) If there are issues that staff may need to research, e-mail them so there is time to do the research before the next meeting.

There was a brief discussion regarding the status of Viking Avenue.

The chairman then suggested that the Commissioners review their notes from previous meetings to see if they still have any outstanding issues to discuss at their next meeting. It is time to bring closure to the review process, they don’t want to re-hash items they have already discussed.

He complimented Ms. Boughton on a well done document and the other commissioners concurred.

7. CONTINUED COMMENTS FROM CITIZENS

Jan Wold discussed: (1) the population growth rate being excessive; (2) development; (3) fish habitat; (4) the plan having wrong numbers in it; (5) poor advertising of the meetings.

Dan Baskins discussed: (1) population growth; (2) the reasons for GMA; (3) concentration of growth; (4) targeting growth to urban areas; (5) protection of Liberty Bay; (6) the health of Johnson Creek; (7) where the water from the Olhava development goes.

8. COMMISSION COMMENTS

none

The meeting was adjourned at 7:30 pm

Ray Stevens
Chairman, Poulsbo Planning Commission