



## CITY OF POULSBO

### Planning Commission Public Meeting

May 14, 2019

Commissioners present: Gary McVey, Kate Nunes, Jerry Block, Ray Stevens, Gordy Hanson

Staff Present: Nikole Coleman, Charlie Roberts, Helen Wytko

1. Call to order
2. Pledge of allegiance
3. Approval of minutes HANSON/STEVENS 2 in favor 2 abstentions
4. Modifications to the agenda -None
5. Poulsbo Grading Ordinance Update

RS: Anyone have any comments on the revisions?

KN: There were not many comments to start with.

CR: Note that the new comment in purple was from local engineering firm who had good suggestions that we wanted to incorporate.

GN: I appreciated examples of routine maintenance.

RS: Great to have public comment and feedback, that is helpful to us. (No more comments on Grading Ordinance Update)

6. Poulsbo Tree Cutting & Clearing Ordinance Update

RS: Move on to tree cutting ordinance. I was vocal in last discussion, and I believe we need to have an ordinance that works for the full population. I do like trees but I want to make sure we do this right. Does anyone have comments or revisions on document?

GM: Page 3 regarding pruning. Cutting back of limbs larger than 1.5 inches in diameter. Correct language?

NC: Yes, that is standard pruning language.

GM: What is the pruning smaller branches?

NC: Just regular maintenance.

GM: larger than 1.5 inches than any size limit.

NK: keep in mind this is trees that need to be maintained. If someone has a tree on a sf lot, they can prune it is they see fit.

JB: 2000 sq ft of new hard surface, what is a new hard surface?

CR: Hard surface is ecology terminology as part hard surface can include impacted soil or gravel.

JB: Is a lawn a hard surface?

CR: No.

KN: Can we add hard surface to definitions?

NC: Yes, we want the language in there to notify people that it could require stormwater review.

RS: What if they are clearing out the driveway and backyard.

NC: We would look at them as two separate projects.

RS: Is this an and or an or?

NC: Or

RS: If someone had an area that wasn't cleared, and they wanted to put an area of hard surface and take trees off back of their property. They are two separate projects. Would that trigger tree cutting review?

CR: If a homeowner comes in and wants to put in a patio or driveway, that 2000 sq ft threshold would be exceeded and it would trigger a stormwater review. If they are taking trees out at the same time, we wouldn't do a tree clearing permit for a non related project.

RS: Gray area and we have to write code that doesn't have gray area.

NC: Solution would be we could remove hard surface language, if that is the catch up, 7,000 sq ft of clearing area. It would trigger stormwater either way.

RS: Trying to take contingencies out of it.

NC: That seems reasonable.

JB: I think some of the issue is we are putting both tree cutting and clearing in the same sentence. Should be two separate sentences.

NC: In our world, tree cutting and clearing are the same thing. Based on what you are discussing I would remove hard surface.

RS: As it is right now, you were taking down trees for grading permit, more than 7000 sq ft, is that disturbed area?

NC: CR discussed this while I was working on this section. 7000 sq ft is a high threshold. The reason staff was using the stormwater threshold is to let people know there is a stormwater threshold.

CR: Currently we have combined Clearing and Grading permit. Primarily issued for grading but often tree cutting is associated with it. I see that as not a big difference, if property owner is triggering a grading permit there is likely some tree removal associated with it.

RS: I guess in theory someone can take trees down and leave stumps.

NC: It is not uncommon for the City to administer combined permits such as site plan review and design review. We would do the tree cutting and clearing with the grading permit. We wouldn't charge an additional fee. Similar requirements for both.

RS: Is 7000 sq ft the correct number we want to go with?

NC: If over 7000 sq ft you have to do stormwater review, so that it is a logical connection so there is not a gap where planning doesn't care but engineering does.

RS: Will we be requiring someone to have a landscaping plan for their own property.

NC: They will need stormwater information for their property.

RS: That is if they are doing grading. Why can they not clear their whole lot?

CR: If you are taking down 7000 sq ft you would have to do stormwater mitigation, which is the regulated threshold in the stormwater manual. Creating an adverse impact that needs to be mitigated.

GH: If they cut trees and leave stump?

NC: If they are going in by tree service and they could cut around 10 trees.

GH: Disturbing would be chainsaw and pickup truck and drag logs off. That would exceed?

CR: Ecology defines cutting down a tree as land disturbing.

GH: Even though most of the sod is still there?

CR: Correct.

RS: We are an urban area, and that is where I am kind of okay because the size of lots.

NC: You would have to clear an entire lot.

RS: On 10<sup>th</sup> people took down big trees, irritated couple people in neighborhood, but they now have a lot they can use and plant. Even at that they didn't get close to 7000sq ft.

NC: We went back to stormwater requirements because internally we need a way to review it. Makes sense to administer it that way for us.

RS: I want to reiterate that we have got to do this so it is right for everybody. Does area have to be contiguous? Group of trees.

NC: Add up overall site. Gray area is if they are doing removal over different years. We would rely on stormwater manual.

RS: Should we add language that discusses permitting process?

NC: We can write language so it is clear.

RS: In the future would someone read it differently?

NC: I understand that, you are asking if staff turned over would code be applied the same?

RS: Or if someone opposed project.

NC: That makes sense we can include in revisions

RS: Any other discussion about 7000 sq ft?

GH: Agree with you clarify permit process.

KN: Can we go through page by page?

Consensus YES

KN: Page 5 C4 add if applicable at end of sentence, not everything is going to trigger critical areas ordinance.

Page 6 letter I think it should be an" and" instead of "is."

NC: Changed similar language on page 7, we can add that language on page 6.

KN: J change landscape contractor.

NC: Thank you I will remove that.

JB: If those are activities that are exempt, why would we do an after the fact permit?

NC: Language previously read you have to do after the fact. This says talk to the city.

JB: I don't see may though.

NC: That is what Kate is suggesting we modify.

RS: Problem with organization. This piece is in the exempt section and doesn't define what the trees are, really I think it should be in the non exempt category where you need a permit. Danger trees can be cut down, pushed into permit required section clause in there that if it is a danger tree and if something is wrong with it you can take it down.

KN: Do have 15.35.120 Maybe we are confusing it by addressing it under exemption. Maybe delete I and J and deal with them in their own paragraph.

RS: Anything else on 6? 7?

KN: On page 7 on the open spaces tree retention tracts, do we have any provision for changes. If a tree needed to be removed does it need to be replaced and at what comparable?

NC: Have an internal process, that we use administratively we can codify that.

KN: Give flexibility. 15.125.120.b first sentence seemed incomplete to me. All descriptive and sentence stopped and new sentence starts.

NC: Let me think of a way to change that clunky sentence.

RS: Anything else on 7? 8?

KN: I wasn't sure what land removal permit is? It wasn't a change we made last time, couldn't find any reference to it.

NC: Not sure what that is referring to, I will look into it, believe that it is just meant to be tree cutting and clearing, I revise that so it is clearer.

RS: Anything else on 8, 9?

KN: 170.b.1 questioning requirement to replace the tree with an equal amount of dbh. Say someone takes down a tree that is 20 feet in diameter, do we really want people to replace the existing dbh? But we do not necessarily want them replacing 20 1 foot dbh. If you have a huge tree you took down, you might want a tree that will grow rather than trees scattered throughout property.

NC: Our arborist looked at this code and I want to refer to him as to what a best management practice would be for this situation.

RS: Planning director is the authority on this?

NC: Yes, want to make sure it is flexible an open ended to be able to work on the site.

RS: Is there someplace it says that it has to be of a like species or approved species?

NC: second sentence the replacement shall be...

RS: City of Seattle will designate the exact tree they want replaced.

NC: What we will do is add language "at the direction of the city arborist."

KN: Yes, they need to work with the city and city arborist to figure out what works best on that site.

NC: Great, and I will take out dbh because it is too definitive and we want to be flexible.

JB: The City arborist has looked at this but has the tree board had a chance to look at this?

NC: Yes they were provided the documents, the arborist is on the tree board, and they saw his comments as well.

KN: What about including the heritage tree program?

NC: Maybe we can reference that section of code. I will look at how to incorporate it.

RS: Sounds like we have a public hearing next.

NC: May 28<sup>th</sup> starts at 7. Karla wanted me to mention that if you have summer plans we are coming forward with a couple items. If you are going to be gone and know ahead, let us know. We have lots of amendments scheduled.

Citizens no

Commissioner

KN: Saw that there was a notice for Edward rose to release master plan. Would need to go through city council. At the same time applying for site plan. Master plan had a vision and developers don't want to move forward with vision.

7. Comments from citizens (none)

8. Commissioner comments

GN: One brief announcement, today I filed for position 7 on Poulsbo City Council

7. Staff Comments

NC: We will have several upcoming meetings late summer/early fall. Please let us know your vacation schedule so we can plan accordingly.

8. Meeting adjourned 6:50



---

Ray Stevens, Planning Commission Chairman