



## CITY OF POULSBO

### Planning Commission Public Meeting

March 10, 2020

#### MEETING MINUTES

Commissioners Present: Tim Morgan, Mark Kipps, James Coleman, Sr. (Vice-Chair), Ray Stevens (Chair), Kate Nunes, Raymond Taylor

Staff Present: Nikole Coleman, Jess Matrazzo

**1. Call to order**

**2. Pledge of Allegiance**

**3. Approval of minutes for 2/25/2020:** Motion: Move to approve minutes as presented.

Moved by Coleman, Seconded by Taylor—1 abstention (Kate Nunes): Motion carried.

**4. Modifications to the Agenda:** None

**5. Comments from citizens regarding items not on the agenda:** None

**6. Public Hearing -2020 Comprehensive Plan Amendments, Nikole Coleman**

Comprehensive Plan Amendments are presented tonight as a follow on from the previous Public Meeting Workshop. Overview: The Poulsbo Comprehensive Plan describes the 20-year vision for Poulsbo and how that vision will be achieved. It covers topics such as land use, parks, transportation, environment, utilities, capital facilities, and economic development. It is mandated by the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA). Major Comprehensive Plan Updates are mandated by the state every 8 years. The last update was completed in 2016. The next major update is due in 2024. In between major updates, the City is able to consider minor amendments on an annual basis.

Timeline: The review process is the same each year – applications are due November 15<sup>th</sup>. We started the application review and SEPA review, and then we had a workshop here with Planning Commission on February 25, and this, tonight, is the Public Hearing with Planning Commission. The applications make up what is called a docket, which we will take to City Council on April 1st. City Council will decide whether the applications are to continue through the application process.

Summary Review of Applications:

**Private Application.** Site-Specific Map Amendment (to City of Poulsbo's Land Use and Zoning Map): Sole Private Property owner-initiated amendment, from Edward Rose Millennial Development, LLC. Two separate Staff Reports were written; we keep private applications separate from those submitted by the City for a streamlined workflow. Application Number P-11-15-19-04. This application requests to re-designate and rezone a portion (about 2.4 acres) of parcel 102601-4-022-2009, from Commercial (C-3)

to Residential Medium (RM). Part of Edward Rose development area off of SR305 between Viking Avenue and Bond Road.

**City-Specific Applications:** From City of Poulsbo Parks Department - Application Number P-11-15-19-01, Morrow Manor, parcel 242601-1-060-2002, Rotary Morrow Manor Morrow Community Park Site-Specific Rezoning Application. This application requests re-designating and rezoning from a portion of the parcel from Residential Low (RL) to Park (P). This is a park that was gifted to the City with the development of Morrow Manor duplexes. Parks Director Mary McCluskey has 2020 funding to develop the park – it’s easier to develop a park when it is zoned as such.

Also included in Application P-11-15-19-01 is a text Amendment to Chapter 12 requesting minor changes to the Parks Capital Facilities Program, recommended by Parks staff, Parks and Rec Commission and citizens. This is a housekeeping request to remove some projects from Capital Facilities Plan (that have been completed) and add new ones that they will try to obtain funding for in the future. It’s important that projects be listed in the Capital Facilities Plan to obtain grant funding.

From City of Poulsbo Planning Department – Application P-11-15-19-03. Text Amendment to Chapter 2, Land Use, requesting to incorporate updated Puget Sound Regional Council “Regional Centers” framework, and designate 1 Countywide Center (Downtown Poulsbo) and 2 Candidate Countywide Centers (College Marketplace and SR 305). We covered this at length at the workshop, and further explanation has been included in the Staff Report.

Another Application from City of Poulsbo Planning Department – Application P-11-15-19-03. Text Amendment to Chapter 12, Capital Facilities Plan to update Table CFP-4, City of Poulsbo 6-year Capital Improvement Projects list. You see this every year; it reflects the updated proposed projects.

\*Approval Criteria for Comprehensive Plan Amendments are listed in the Staff Reports in detail. To summarize, Staff has concluded that the text and map amendments are either based upon new information or a change in circumstance since the initial adoption of the Comprehensive Plan, are internally consistent to the Comp Plan, and are not detrimental to the public health, safety, or welfare. We respectfully recommend approval of the Comp Plan Amendment Applications as set forth in your March 3<sup>rd</sup> Staff Reports.

RS: Questions? -None

**Comments from Citizens regarding Public Hearing - 2020 Comprehensive Plan Amendments:**

Lindsey Kravitz, Poulsbo citizen, head of Splash Pad (Citizen) Committee. What is a Splash Pad? It’s an all-ages water play area, usually located in a city park adjacent to a traditional playground. It holds no water, but sprays up and then drains. I moved here from Tacoma, where there were 11 splash pads. I didn’t expect not to find any here. I met with the Parks and Rec Commission a year ago to ask about plans for any, and they were unaware of their existence. They asked that I research and form a committee, which I did. There are 5 people on our committee. We were asked to: gauge community support and to do site surveys for all the existing parks. Our community survey was so popular that we had to shut it down. We had 1300 people respond in 3 days. Over 95% said they were in favor of a

splash pad here in Poulsbo. Over 42% said they leave Kitsap County to go to splash pads. They are taking the ferry to Seattle or Edmonds, or they are going to Tacoma. That was a pretty great gauge of community support. We have social media outlets with huge followings (Facebook and Instagram); we just launched our website a few days ago as well. From the site surveys that we did, we went over different criteria that would be necessary for a splash pad. State health code mandates presence of one each gender bathroom at the park – that took several of the parks out of the running. There is also building code to comply with. We presented to Parks and Rec Commission in October that Raab Park would be the best location for a splash pad. That evening the commissioners unanimously voted to add us to the capital facilities plan, which is why I'm here tonight, since it's up for review tonight. I wanted to ask that you move that forward tonight. We are also partnered with Kitsap Community Foundation for fundraising. We just launched a couple days ago; I met with the fund raiser this morning. We are working out the details while we work with Public Works. I have a big presentation on the financial and maintenance impacts to them tomorrow. I continue to meet with Mayor Becky about this and several City Council members. Just yesterday we got endorsements from Sherry Appleton, Christine Rolfs, and Emily Randall at the state level. I need to meet with Karla to figure out park impact and parking. We have some initial drawings and concepts, but we are working on coordinating with a landscape architect to figure out logistics for placement – likely next to the play-for-all is what we have pitched. Our timeline is to open in the summer of 2022. The survey indicated that people want this to already exist. We feel that 2022 is a reasonable and realistic goal, based on fundraising success and working in conjunction with the City to ensure we can get the maintenance details worked out. That's my update for you tonight. Do you address this here?

RS: We just listen to input here tonight during Comments from Citizens. Any others? (None)

We'll close the Public Hearing and open the Public Meeting.

JC: Were you aware of splash pad?

NC: It's in the application for the Parks Amendment for the CFP and Planning Staff has been aware of it for the whole year. \*Red line item added under Park Land Development

JC: MOTION: Mr. Chairman, move to recommend approval to the City Council Application No. P-11-15-19-01, Application No. P-11-15-19-02, and Application No. P-11-15-19-03, and direct the Planning and Economic Development Director to prepare findings of fact in support of this decision for the Planning Commission Chairman's signature.

RT: Seconded the Motion. Unanimous approval to recommend. Motion carried.

JC: MOTION: Mr. Chairman, move to recommend approval to the City Council Application No. P-11-15-19-04, a request to re-designate and rezone a portion of the property at 21210 State Highway 305 NE from Commercial/C-3 to Residential Medium, and direct the Planning and Economic Development Director to prepare findings of fact in support of this decision for the Planning Commission Chairman's signature.

RT: Seconded the Motion. Unanimous approval to recommend. Motion carried.

**7. Public Meeting: 2020 Land Use Housekeeping Code Amendments, Nikole Coleman**

2<sup>nd</sup> workshop: Presented to you is the current draft with your recommended changes to this point; we may make additionally changes. Also included are 4 slides from tonight's presentation that you may wish to view later.

Timeline: The review schedule for these amendments: Your first workshop was February 25<sup>th</sup>, second workshop is tonight, and your Public Hearing is scheduled for March 24<sup>th</sup> (I'll be on vacation, so Karla will be present for that), and then we will move on to City Council review.

Tonight, we will go over some of what you may consider major changes from the comments you made on February 25<sup>th</sup>; there are a couple of new items and downtown guest parking.

First, on (Page 3) TITLE 18: ZONING ORDINANCE, Chapter: 18.40 Definitions **Amendment 6**. Section: 18.40.030, N Definitions: "Nonprofit community organization" – Staff has proposed the text to read "503C" without the "-6." I have asked the Farmers' Market; they are a "C-6."

TM: Does including the "-6" enable them to get grant money? Is designating with a number necessary for grant funding purposes?

NC: That doesn't seem to be the case; leaving the "-6" off might be helpful if ever they change their designation in the future or if the organization changes.

MK: Adding a designation might be too restrictive – a "503C" is a charitable organization.

Discussion result: PC unanimously decided to leave the "-6" off.

(Page 6) This proposed change is new and was brought forth by one of our applicants who is here tonight if you have questions. **Amendment 8**. TITLE 18: ZONING ORDINANCE, Chapter: 18.70 Residential Districts. Section: 18.70.050 Development Standards in the RL Zone, C1 Recreational Amenities. For recreational amenities, for City RM and RH zones, for 1-20 units, 2 recreational amenities are required. The language addressing the amenities isn't restrictive regarding what they have to look like. For addition of one or two small units, which is recently the case - taking a single family to a duplex or triplex, requiring the addition of two amenities seems excessive. Proposed language would allow 1 to 4 units to be added without the addition of amenities. Landscaping and open space requirements will remain.

(No questions from PC.)

(Page 8) Ray Stephens had brought up the specific nature of the lighting plan and at what point lighting is to be addressed (at full landscaping maturity). **Amendment 8**. TITLE 18: ZONING ORDINANCE, Chapter: 18.70 Residential Districts. Section: 18.70.050 Development Standards in the RL Zone. D. Landscaping, Site and Building Design Standards, 11. Lighting d. The landscaping field has lighting guidelines that make our specific language unnecessary. We have photometric plan requirement in the code requiring lumen readings every 10 feet, but we recommend avoiding specific landscaping maturity language.

RS: Do we have a standard?

NC: The standard is 0.6 lumens for off-site light throw, which comes from our City Engineering Construction Standards. Stating the standard here will create a potential need to change if Construction Standards lighting requirements change; this can be avoided by referring to those standards.

JC: Do we need the standard referenced in here or how do I find it?

NC: We can say per Construction Standard #(), as amended.

RS, JC: Yes.

NC: : (Page 9) TITLE 18: ZONING ORDINANCE, Chapter: 18.80 Commercial Districts. **Amendment 9.** Section: 18.80.100, Off-Street Parking and Loading Standards in the C-1 Zoning District.

Regarding parking, I have included 4 slides that you can review at your leisure – there are two weeks until your Public Hearing, which allows time for Staff to provide more information as needed. Referring to slide “Jurisdiction – Required Guest Parking” - Comparison with other jurisdictions is done because we are not alone in having a perceived or real parking problem in the downtown area. Comparable city codes lead to us learning how others are handling this issue. This is for guest parking downtown and is separate from residential multi-family (apartment complex) – this is for a mixed-use building in downtown where we require commercial parking and residential parking. For that residential parking, we require guest parking. One example is the city of Des Moines, which doesn’t require guest parking for downtown mixed-use building, but does for multi-family residential. Gig Harbor and Anacortes and Covington have parking requirements similar to what Staff has recommended. Federal Way and Duvall are more qualitative and require more information for parking requirement determination.

RT: Why are we changing from one guest space for 4 dwelling units to one space for 8 units? What criteria did someone use to determine this ratio?

NC: We use Staff expertise, which applies background and understanding of the issues we are facing. 1 space per 4 is a residential, multi-family apartment standard, not a downtown standard. We did not contemplate the difference the standard’s source would make in 2018.

RT: I am concerned about changing this standard; it seems we are doubling the number of units a contractor can build.

NC: We aren’t changing the fundamental parking standards for commercial and residential units – this is an additional standard for guest parking.

RT: We just recently approved residential use of commercial downtown buildings on the first floors. Are we allowing residential there but not providing parking for the guests of those tenants?

NC: The approved mixed-use commercial downtown units were built and parked to commercial standards, which are more restrictive than residential. Residential use on the first floor would be over-parked due to the stricter standards.

JC: If guests are able to park in commercial spots during non-business hours, where do they go when businesses open up the next day?

NC: During business hours, residential guests do not have parking precedence. Lengthy stays would elicit on-street parking.

RS: Downtown units are small and provide limited space for guest use, so the residents are less likely to have long-term guests.

NC: Parking studies have reflected parking challenges during big events (such as Viking Fest) and exceptionally beautiful weekend days.

Slide – Current Code – Recommended by Staff – Proportionality

Slide – Guest Parking Downtown:

Option 1 (Staff Recommendation): 1 parking space per 4 dwelling units

Option 2: Proportionality (at 15% of required residential parking)

Option 3: Maintain Existing with Additional Language

There are also options of leaving it as it is now (1 per 8) or change it to 1 per 6.

RS: Are regular parking allotments determined by dwelling unit size (studio/1/2/+ bedroom)?

NC: We do, we use a ratio of half (of the total units) at studio – which requires 1 parking space, and half at 2 bedroom or more (which require 2 parking spaces per unit).

Parking discussion (for the downtown core) resulted in determination that 15% proportionality results in higher guest parking requirements than are currently in place.

Vote Results: (Majority preference of 1 parking space per 8 dwelling units will be reflected in the staff report; it can be changed at Public Hearing in PC so desires.)

*1 guest parking space per 8 dwelling units: TM, MK, RS, KN*

*1 guest parking space per 6 dwelling units: JC, RT*

**MK: Recommends using the 4 helpful slides in City Council presentation when the time comes.**

NC: (Page 18) TITLE 19: PROJECT PERMIT PROCEDURES | Chapter: 19.40 Application Review Procedures, **Amendment 20**. Section: 19.40.040 Type III Permit Applications. F4. Ray had brought up that there was no end date included in the Hearing Examiner Permit Procedures; Karla and I decided to use “30 days” as the best wording (“not more than” seemed cumbersome). \*It’s in a couple of places in the Land Use Housekeeping Amendments (Also on (Page 23), Section E. TITLE 19: PROJECT PERMIT PROCEDURES | Chapter: 19.70 Decision Appeal Procedures **Amendment 25**. Section: 19.70.010 Appeal on Type I and Type II Permit Decision.

NC: (Page 20-21) TITLE 19: PROJECT PERMIT PROCEDURES, Chapter: 19.50 Public. Notices **Amendment 23**. Section: 19.50.020 Notice of Application. C2

(Page 22) TITLE 19: PROJECT PERMIT PROCEDURES, Chapter: 19.50 Public Notices, **Amendment 24**.  
Section: 19.50.030 Notice of Public Meeting.

(Page 23) **Amendment 25**. Section: 19.50.040 Notice of Public Hearing.

For Complete Notice of Application/Complete Notice of Public Hearing, the notices are posted to the City website, and physical copies are posted at Code-required locations. For the noticing *letters* that are mailed out, we have begun to use postcards instead of mail because it saves time and money. The presented changes are meant to clear up the noticing process requirements.

Timeline: Your Public Hearing for 2020 Land Use Housekeeping Code Amendments is on March 24<sup>th</sup>, and you will get your Staff Report next week. If you have any questions in the meantime, call or stop by.

**8. Comments from Citizens (regarding Public Meeting: 2020 Land Use Housekeeping Code Amendments):**

Brandon Wishouse: I appreciate the support on the amenities amendment and encourage long, hard thought regarding parking. I would caution the Planning Commission to ensure enough parking is planned, because once areas are developed out, it becomes potentially impossible for new standards to be feasible. On a different note, why are parking requirements being discussed only for downtown commercial property parking? Residential property development throughout the City might benefit as well from more open requirements. I'm personally interested in medium-high density right now, but other districts might benefit from reviewing these requirements as well.

**9. Commissioner Comments:** None.

**(Added) Staff Comments:** Karla sent an e mail for our Housing Action Plan Kickoff Retreat; I don't know that she's heard from everyone. RS confirmed that he had responded via email with anytime. Friday, April 10<sup>th</sup> is the targeted date, in the afternoon.

**10.** Meeting adjourned 7:59 p.m.

**Schedule: Planning Commission Meetings:**

**March 24, 2020 – 7pm** Public Hearing: 2020 Land Use Housekeeping

**(T) April 10, 2020 – tentatively 1-4pm** Joint Workshops for Planning Commission and City Council & Housing Action Plan Kickoff Retreat

**(T) April 14, 2020 – 7pm** Noll Terrace Subdivision

**(T) May/June – 7pm** Shoreline Master Plan: Required Update



---

Ray Stevens, Planning Commission Chairman