

City of Poulsbo

PLANNING COMMISSION

Tuesday, October 18, 2016

DRAFT MINUTES

Members Present

Gordon Hanson (GH), Shane Skelley (SS), Ray Stevens (RS), Kate Nunes (KN), Bob Nordnes (BN), James Thayer (JT)

Staff

Karla Boughton (KB), Marla Powers (MP), Helen Wytko (HW)

1. Call to Order
2. Flag Salute
3. Approval of Minutes - 9/27/16 and 10/4/16 NORDNES/NUNES **5 in favor, 1 abstention.**
4. Modifications to Agenda – NONE
5. Comments from Citizens – regarding items not on the agenda – NONE
6. Public Meeting, 2016 Draft Comprehensive Plan

KB: The packet in front of you, next week we have the public hearing for the NPDES Code Amendment, we are going to have a workshop at 6pm for an hour and the hearing open at 7pm. After workshop on Sept 27th Anya wanted to give you some more information about the NPDES permits. She will have a PowerPoint with the genesis of NPDES. Then she will do a quick refresher of the code packet and then Charlie will go over the memo and staff report. The engineers took one last kick at the can after the workshop and made a few minor tweaks. PC modification in blue, staff recommendations in red. Nothing changed in Attachment A. Most you have already seen and the exhibits are the noticing requirements with the SEPA checklist.

I am pleased to introduce you to Marla Powers who came on board as an Associate Planner in February 2016.

Any questions on NPDES LID?

RS: Open up the public meeting on draft comp plan

KB: Last week we were joined by our engineering staff. We are starting on page 301. This is the last section. I am sure as you read it there is a more formal way to record the permit data with the buildable lands reporting. We thought as we were updating this we would include what was done in the buildable lands report. However, BL stops at 2012 and we keep the data current so we've gone through current date of 2016. Mapping came out of comp plan in 2009. The last half of the chapter is the land capacity analysis that is done with the buildable lands report. Taken with current availability. Interesting when we do the next land capacity analysis. Snapshot of the chapter.

RS: Take page by page 301-30

JT: 302 - Typo half way down change provide to provides

KB: It is struck out

GH: 303 - What is a testamentary subdivision?

RS: It is an interesting thing. Its land that is platted by somebody dying so through a will. There is a belief that you could circumvent all zoning. While they can split the land in a will, they cannot circumvent local zoning.

GH: On Viking way?

KB: It's the Cleaver family, off of Laurie Vei Loop off of Lincoln. He willed it to family and we needed to address lot size and setbacks. Explicitly exempted out in state subdivision law. A way to subdivide the land as legal subdivision but you should continue to check in with local zoning office for code as well.

RS: There is a belief that you can circumvent all government by subdividing your land in a will situation, that was tested and you can't.

KB: In this case, too they were thinking they did not have to do street improvements. A lot of wrangling with attorneys. Our City attorney said in 30 years this is the first one we had to deal with.

JT: I don't understand table 13-1, it seemed to be consistent except for res med and res high, the numbers that came up there are referring to lots not dwelling units.

KB: Yes, it is lots

JT: Well the second column is lots/ units approved.

KB: In this table, we are just dealing with lots. I can rename this table to better address.

JT: Take units out of column header.

KB: I will

JT: Note at the bottom of the table says 7/3

KB: it was a correction for structures that were all on one common lot and they wanted to divide the four into their own lots. We were trying to report actual lots being created for future development and only three remain for future development.

JT: Approval is for future construction.

KB: Lots created between 2006-2012 that were created new. Good question, that was confusing figuring out how and trying to report correctly.

RS: Table on one page, 304-305 I have here in paragraph 2 gross or net?

KN: If you read table look at gross density.

KB: Answer is both, when we set a target, it is at the high end of the zoning range. GMA net density is what we can calculate on. When we run zoning analysis that is what we run it on. Close to what you hope you can do. The closer they are on their gross, the higher their net is going to be. We had a lot of PUD which bumped up our net densities.

JT: Going back to that table, how am I supposed to interpret it?

KB: That is because we created 3 lots in 12 net acres. It is addressed on the next page on 305 talks about how we are not meeting that target in the planning period. We may have created one lot but then that apartment can get put on. When that gets developed we report that which puts us back in alignment.

JT: Why report lots and have the dwelling units as criteria?

KB: Because that is our density range target.

JT: If you are looking for the density range in dwelling units, what is the point in reporting lots?

KB: In this case, the county wanted us to report it, in next buildable lands report we will include both. I know it's confusing.

JT: It is kind of misleading, you are striking out on top line. So you are saying the county changed their criteria for this table. Because what you did on RL was consistent with previous reporting but RM RH does a flip flop.

KB: If we had units to report, we would have reported but during that planning period of 2006 and 2012 there was not one single unit created in those two zoning districts, we only had those lots created.

JT: OK, but you don't say lots, you are implying dwelling units up above,

KB: In RM, we had one small apartment building that did 10, RM just created 3 lots and no multifamily units created in that zone.

KN: Are you thinking it would be better to add another paragraph that would help explain that?

KB: Yes, I can totally do that, fine because in BLR we provide more information.

JT: I think whoever reads it to will not drill down into the detail.

KB: I will add notes to explain these are lots that will help support future multifamily development.

SS: 305 the Second sentence is all scratched out. I'm wondering what that is?

SS: 306 "increase" flexibility I think it should be "increased".

RS: 306-307 maps next page

KB: These maps, they are self-evident, they are reporting the complete picture up until September of this year.

RS: Next page these multi-colored maps are not going to work for readability. 309

SS: 310 second line down, insert "of residential"

GH: Discussion of CO issued since 2002, fine just leave it.

KB: We probably won't report that out again, stick what you see here about acreage units, gross density, net density.

RS: 312 – 315

SS: 315 Reporting a determination, need to insert "that"

RS: 316

KB: Making a comment to get rid of this shading.

RS: Yes

KB: Table shows the city limits has current capacity for 5300 additional people.

KN: Which puts us close to the 14,808.

KB: We actually have more capacity, but we have UGA on page 319 we have capacity for 6600 people in city limits in UGA. When you take away pop target of 14,808, we still have capacity for additional people. Anyone who worries that we are going to run out of room should be assuaged by this. When we calculate the number of units an available acre can carry, we use the max number of units in that zoning district. For example, RM 6-10 units an acre, our zoning

requirements requires a min of 6 units so I can guarantee 6 units (unless encumbered by critical areas). I don't have a requirement for them to use 10 but growth hearings board directed us to report 10 even though zoning code only requires them do 6. Ran numbers on min density requirement and we are right on track for the 14,808. Bottom line is we are still sized perfectly for 14,808, and if developers who are able to maximize density, and get above the minimum density, so, say, 6,,8, 9, 10 then we might see some efficiency in increased units. If we stay with conservative assumption, we are going to be right where we have been since 1998, which is sized perfectly for our population allocation. This does mean that we might have to address reasonable measures before adjustments to the UGA.

JT: All depends on what developer wants to do. I can see where the board is coming from, but it is unlikely that you will always max out.

KB: It is, when we saw the projects that got max density or over, is with PUDs so Caldart heights is the perfect example, and that was a very efficient use of that land. A lot of it is market, Quadrant Homes does minimum density. If you try to max in RM and RH, it is hard to do the 35' height limit. One day we are going to have to talk about raising the height limit and I am not looking forward to that conversation. We've been 35' for 100 years. Any time anything is 35', residential and commercial, we get community pushbacks.

KN: And everywhere is 35'

BN: This building is higher than 35'

KB: But they kept with average 35' except for the atrium. Every new mixed use building is wanting to utilize it. Does seem, that at this snapshot in time, they are wanting to bump up density to the higher 45' range.

JT: I don't like the high heights, but if you get more 35' then easier to do 45'

RS: The argument I hear is that it is the character of the community.

BN: For good conversation because sometimes character doesn't pay bills.

KB: For me, character is downtown where I think we should keep the cap at, and that 305 and Viking could be strip commercial anywhere. Let's preserve the downtown old town.

JT: I think that it has a good chance of flying.

RS: 303 5-10 should be 6

KB: Yes.

KN: Tables on 316 and 317 is there a reason we have to have so many numbers after the decimal point?

KB: I can change and round it up, but it might add a person or two.

JT: Well when you do the calcs you have to do it to decimal places.

KN: Someone will go through the table and count.

KB: Happy to do that.

RS: 317-319 First table, "New persons expected by", isn't that supposed to be 2036?

KB: it is.

RS: 320 –

SS: 323 what is allow co-housing

KB: Development type with no land subdivision and it's under one common ownership. Best I can say non- traditional, different smaller units like one or two bedroom and then a communal kitchen.

GH: Think there is one on Bainbridge.

KB: 324-

KN: 325 you mention College Market Place and Town Center. Where is Town Center?

KB: We have two centers and KRCC calls downtown "Town Center". Not Old Town Residential, Old Town Commercial, from Hostmark to Jensen. It's not our terminology. Next KRCC 2017 looking at town centers. Can make adjustments.

RS: Okay so appendices move through this one all the way to appendix A.

JT: Table of contents Capital Facilities Plan chapter 13 mistake.

RS: Appendix A, so did anyone dig through these numbers?

KN: It is interesting data.

KB: one thing that has happened since last comp plan is that census bureau had 10 year chunks and now American Community Survey that gives annual data points. I tried to include when relevant with the most recent data they had provided. Not the same effort as the census but a sample that they model out so there is some error in this, but it gives you an indication of what is happening in town that is more recent than 2010.

SS: I have something on 26, Housing Occupancy, fix "stocked" to "stock".

RS: 7-and map at end.

KN: very colorful.

KB: Helen did it! This is the most labor intensive map. It is a snapshot of what the uses are today, right now of every parcel of land in the city which we get of local knowledge and Assessor, Helen maps it and has to reconcile it because it is different

SS: How do you differ between estate and suburban?

KB: It is lot size.

JT: There is a narrative somewhere on that.

KB: This maps corresponds with the tables preceding it. Parcels represented in the map. Not instrumental in the work you are doing today, but helpful when starting a comp plan because when you are looking at zoning you shouldn't be thinking about what should be there, but what is there so you don't make everything non conforming. At this point in GMA it is mostly informational.

RS: The way that it worked here is that we had enough on our plate without figuring out what things should be. That's why when people say it is stupid to be zoned that way, it is because it was there before it was created.

KB: Done through master plans, concomitant agreements and a lot on Viking Ave. the county designated. Core of Poulsbo hasn't changed.

RS: Appendix C

KB: First table reporting the project specifics on table on 309 this is the table that we now maintain in the Planning Department.

RS: Okay, moving along, I don't have a problem with these colors

KB: Tables in the Buildable Lands for our Land Capacity Analysis.

RS: Anything else?

KB: Just county wide planning policies, which we had in 2009. If you had any edits, I cannot do anything about them.

RS: Last section is the county wide planning policies and then the red page is the site-specific amendment. I thought the applicants might be here.

SS: On page 26, I didn't understand what congestion pricing is?

KB: Congested pricing, I think it is what you are experiencing on 520 with the toll and HOV lane, that commuting during peak hours pays the top dollar.

RS: Peak hours rich can commute because they can afford to go through there.

SS: So, this is the county so does the City just pick and choose?

KB: Bound by county wide planning policies. Main piece is for appendix B3 on page 43. What we all care about, our pop allocation. 14,808 is derived from this table. The hierarchy is GMA, CPPS administered through KRCC, every mayor, tribal president and then size of the city may allow 2nd member. This board then is tasked with maintaining and managing county wide planning policies. We spend a lot more time than you think we would talking about some of these regional issues. KRCC has established that 2017 is year of land use. Look at UGA and centers PSRC Kings Snohomish Pierce and Kitsap follow lead on what they do.

SS: Why is it even in here?

KB: I put it in last comprehensive plan because it was recommended by commerce as a way to show consistency with CPPs. Sitting in there to acknowledge that we are in compliance.

BN: Putting it in as an appendix speaks for itself then, doesn't it?

KB: I can take it out if you want, it is just acknowledging that we are bound by these set of rules. If you read through it, none of it is really relevant right now but will come into play when we expand.

JT: I'd leave it in

BN: And it appeases someone and that is important too.

KB: When we got appealed, one of their things was that we were not consistent with the county wide planning policies and our main argument was that we showed it was in our comp plan to show our consistency.

KB: In our site specific amendment, we got one in.

JT: Is this appropriate for this update?

KB: Yes, we accept site specific amendments on an annual basis and applied last year and is a comp plan update. If you remember in 2009 we have 15.

JT: Is that when you rezone, when you do the comp plan?

KB: We rezone and redesignate at the same time. We are a small enough city we can do that.

BN: In 2009 we had a bunch?

KB: Yes, that was the big showstopper with Torval Canyon wanting to rezone the park. We had 15 site specific amendments and that's normally what brings people out to the public hearings. Possible people will testify on site specific amendment off of Urdahl Road.

BN: Has this been advertised yet?

KB: Yes recently, PH not until Nov 8, so I will know in the next few weeks. Lanzafame was here in 2009 and at that time we were recommending denial because we hadn't created OCI. Staff is recommending approval of it. I think I eluded to it before, one of the reasons we are recommending approval for it is because we have sufficient residential capacity. We are a little shy on employment zone so I will have some numbers on that, and in our mind it makes sense.

SS: So, we do this annual?

KB: Yes, but it usually doesn't take this long. Can apply for site specific apps now, have them in by November 15, docket it at CC in January, PC in March and CC in April. That will be the schedule every year until we hit our 8th year and have to look at the Comp Plan again.

BN: It used to be random.

KB: Yes, pre-GMA, then we had to do once a year. In our staff report we will walk through the criteria but we are recommending to support the request. On PH, you will make two motions, one on comp plan and one on site specific application, will have it written out for you all.

BN: Next week?

KB: November 8

BN: But Comp Plan is November?

KB: So, we finished comp plan today, won't see until staff report issued with PC recommendations done throughout the document. I'll follow Charlie's idea and put in color. And staff report on site specific.

KB: So, you have next week Tuesday out by 7:30 and then Nov 8

JT: So, Oct 25th is PH on LID and then the next one will be the 8th

KB: Yes, and then you will be done, assuming that we are not stormed by lots of people and have to continue the hearing.

BN: We might

KB: We might have a plat be ready in January.

7. Comments from citizens – None

8. Commissioner comments

KB: AK asked if trucks could be in HOV lane and WSDOT said no. Asked if can transition out of HOV lane and said no as well.

RS: or widen the whole thing.

KB: AK said that they alluded to it, WSDOT treats us like Seattle, and they think we are awesome because they compare us. So, to them, they think that we do not need any improvements on 305. It sparked a good conversation so that we build redundant streets systems to get around town if WSDOT not going to make any future improvements.

KN: Anymore talk with WSDOT where we have the curb bulbouts that could go out in the bike lane? Something that was in the trails plan years ago. They freaked out and came with our engineers, so the trails plan got softened. Section by Safeway fixed that piece.

MP: Aaron said it is on our 6 year CIP to fix.

BN: During the big storm, I was going down 6th Street that have the opening where the water goes into rock things they had sandbags out in front of them. Shooting the water out. Only thing I can think of they were trying to deflect leaves and stuff.

SS: Defeats the purpose that is what they are for.

RS: Was this the city?

KB: I don't actually know the reason but I can give you my guestimate. Those features are designed for normal rainfall and not designed to carry storm event like they were anticipating. I'll ask PW why they did that.

BN: Trying to divert leaves but diverting the water too.

JT: Got design that doesn't work sending the first flush of the season.

KB: Storm drain has oil water separators. The question is what was the reasoning behind diverting the water from the newly installed water collectors.

KN: Time to remove sand bags.

KB: Irony of course is LID next week.

RS: They don't like that model.

KB: Proprietary

BN: Leaves would have filled boxes up bigtime. How are you going to maintain that, it will cap it right off. Like drain rock but bigger.

BN: Going to need maintenance eventually to get sediment.

9. Meeting adjourned 7:27pm.

Ray Stevens

Chairman, Poulsbo Planning Commission

DRAFT