

The Haugen Development

Applicant (representative) Response to Public Comments (deadline August 27, 2020)

September 2, 2020

A. Comment submittal from: Ms. Julia LaVassar

1. Cites the distinction between the *height* and the *elevation* of proposed houses.
 - Response: As mentioned in the Neighborhood Meeting and in multiple responses to comments from that meeting, the PMC (Poulsbo Municipal Code) regulates only the *height* of proposed structures. Fill below houses that results in a higher *elevation* is not regulated. The applicant has complied with the PMC in this regard.
2. Asserts there is a wetland “across lower edge of the proposed lots”.
 - Response: This area is intermittently wet due, exclusively, to runoff from Haugen Street. As described in the Project Narrative and as depicted on the Storm/Drainage Plan, the combination of stormwater management devices and features will obviate the great majority of this runoff. If the City re-surfaces (and/or re-grades) the street – as was also mentioned repeatedly in those same, aforementioned venues – this runoff would be even further minimized, if not eliminated. It should be noted that the owner of the property containing the intermittently wet area has expressed eagerness to have that area dry.

B. Comment submittal from: Mr. Ron Hirschi

Expresses concern about the environmental health of Poulsbo Creek, given that it was historically a salmon-bearing stream, that he has observed salmon at its mouth, and that the subject development will arguably drain into – or at least towards – it.

- Response: While it is indeed true that this development – like every other house, driveway and street uphill of the creek – could directly or indirectly contribute runoff to the creek, the many mitigatory features in both the site plan and building stipulations will minimize such impact from this project. These are described and/or depicted in the Storm/Drain Plan, Project Narrative, and SEPA Environmental Review, and include – but are not limited to – the direct connection of stormwater systems (both from Haugen Street and from future homes) to the existing system on 6th Street. It should also be noted that the primary obstacle to salmon migration in Poulsbo Creek is a complete and total barraging of the creek by water features on the property located on upstream side of 6th Street.

C. Comment submittal from: Ms. Nancy Rogers

Expresses interest in knowing where the two on-street parking spaces will be located, and asks where these locations can be seen.

- Response: These are depicted on the site plan. Space is created for them southward by extending the relatively flat area occupied by the street in a southward direction, facilitated by filling a small strip parallel to Haugen Street, as depicted on the Grading Plan.

D. Comment submittal from: Mr. David Blaskowsky

1. Asserts that “the city is not really interested is [sic] doing anything about ... complaints [about this project] and is merely allowing the engineering firm and the owner to do whatever they want”.
 - Response: While the applicant cannot speak for the City in this regard, we can assuredly say that all PMC is assiduously followed in the course of designing this development and in submitting all required documentation.
2. In regards to the physical conditions of Haugen Street, comments that the City should commit to making improvements rather than merely mentioning what “could” or “should” be undertaken. Also expresses concern that construction vehicles for the project will damage the street.
 - Response: The applicant agrees that the street would function better – and on several levels – if improvements were made; however, such improvements are not required of this project per PMC. Any damage to the street caused by construction at the proposed development will be repaired.
3. Asserts that traffic volumes and speeds are “much greater than the city acknowledges”.
 - Response: The applicant would not object to the City installing speed bumps on Haugen Street.
4. Mentions existing and ongoing stormwater issues on Haugen Street, and the City’s lack of response to citizen complaints about it.
5. Addresses the same “height vs elevation” issue already discussed.

6. In regards to the proposed allowable architectural designs, addresses the structures' roof pitches, heights and lot coverage.
 - Response: The architectural designs are conceptual, general guidelines. A second option has been included in the response to the City's Summary Letter. Both the existing architectural design and the second one can be modified – if necessary -- to comply with all PMC stipulations. In fact, the existing design is one that is implemented at Antonson Place, the new infill development on the other side of Hostmark, off Lincoln Road.

7. Asserts that "... the Infill Residential Development only allows for 5500 sf minimum lot size".
 - Response: The Infill Residential Development handout states that the minimum Lot Area is 5,000 sq. ft. This is reflected in the PMC.

8. Asserts that the issue of building heights and view obstruction was not addressed at the public meeting ("Neighborhood Meeting"), and that "[he] received no follow-up from the city".
 - Response: These issues were, most certainly, discussed at the Neighborhood Meeting and the notes from that meeting document this. Perhaps the issues were not concluded to the writer's satisfaction, and perhaps the City has not "followed up", but the applicant has most certainly complied with all relevant PMC stipulations.

E. Comment submittal from: Ms. Marlene Orwiler

1. In regards to the architectural design drawings, asks if they are "to appease those in the neighborhood..."
 - Response: The drawings are submitted in compliance with the IRD portion of the PMC, and to provide a general documentation that efforts will be made to match the existing block face in home design, scale and materials.

2. Inquires of the identity of the author of the responses to the residents' comments.
 - Response: The applicant's consultant/representative

3. Requests speed bumps on Haugen Street

4. Notes that water (presumably from the earlier-discussed existing stormwater runoff issues) freezes on the street and makes it slippery.
 - Response: The stormwater drainage measures to be implemented as part of this development will reduce sheeting on Haugen Street – at least downhill of the site – as discussed in depth elsewhere in this report, as well as in the Project Narrative and SEPA Environmental Review. Also as discussed elsewhere, further improvements to stormwater issues on Haugen Street should/could be implemented by the City to reduce sheeting and freezing on other parts of the street.

5. Notes that Haugen was a busy street before Covid, and asserts that “Three new homes isn’t going to help!”.
 - Responses:
 - ◆ “Busy” is a relative term. While there are not (known) traffic counts for Haugen Street, the LOS is A, meaning there is very little – if any – delay entering or exiting either end of the street. Such conditions are not “busy” in objective, transportation planning analysis terms.
 - ◆ Any new homes in any location will affect traffic, or “busyness”. However, and as noted in the Project Narrative and in the SEPA Environmental Review, because the development is so close to downtown services and transit, and because the surrounding areas are relatively “pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly”, the traffic generated by the proposed residences has high potential of contributing less than average additional trips to the street in question.
 - ◆ The project is located in an area of Poulsbo eligible for IRD for a good reason: traffic impacts will most likely be lower – if not far lower – than those generated by new residences farther from downtown, where automobile trips become almost mandatory, and certainly the norm.