

APPENDIX A Public Comments – Summaries and Responses

1. [Email from Ron Hirschi to Trust for Public Land, cc'd to Edie Berghoff at City of Poulsbo](#)

Summary: Mr. Hirschi asks the TPL if they would be interested in “preserving” the Haugen Development land **as protected open space** and states the reasons that that land should be preserved. The mechanism for “preserving” the land was not stated, but it is assumed that it would require purchasing the land.

Response: Both Mr. Hirschi and Mr. Sam Plotkin, Project Manager at TPL were contacted. Interest in discussing and receiving their proposal(s) for “preserving” the land was expressed. The idea of combining TPL financial resources with those of neighbors to execute the property purchase was included. The TPL declined to invest in the property.

2. [Email from Ronald Whited](#)

Mr. Whited addresses two issues – **stormwater management** and **building heights**.

a) **Stormwater management:**

Summary: Mr. Whited questions why the Haugen Development is not required to provide “Storm Water Management” and prerequisite topographic mapping.

Response: Stormwater management and topographic mapping is required of this project and will be undertaken by Team 4 engineering, as is required by PMC.

b) **Building Heights:**

Summary: In regard to his “neighbors loosing (sic) their views”, Mr. Whited appears to be asking (language is not entirely clear) how building heights can be relevant when the surface of any lot can be raised such that the structure can be built to any elevation that engineering makes possible, thereby blocking views of others.

Response: This is a valid concern but one that results from the fact that the PMC uses the word “height” on the building limits, rather than “elevation”. The developer has no input in, nor control over, the words contained in the PMC.

3. [Email from Jill Stenerson](#)

Summary: Ms. Stenerson states that the size and scope of the project “seems outrageous” and characterizes a similarly-allowed home on the street (at 647 Haugen, owned by Mr. Whited, author of email #2 above) as “a monstrosity”. By “size” of the project she means both **small lot size and building height allowed**; by “scope” she means the **parking and traffic issues** that she feels will result. To address her concerns, she advocates the creation of two new lots rather than three, and the imposition of architectural imperatives that avoid the “eyesore” of a new development nearby on Fjord Drive.

Response: Ms. Stenerson was contacted directly by phone in order to better understand the nature of her concerns and her stated solution. While the Infill Residential Development (IRD) section of the PMC does allow 3 lots, her concern about architectural style can certainly be addressed in the Building Permit process. At this stage, it can be confirmed that the issuance of

Building Permits shall take into strict account these concerns. The development will add only very few ADTs, and parking shall be supplied within each lot, per PMC.

4. **Email from Alan Orwiler**

Mr. Orwiler addresses three issues – **zoning, traffic and stormwater**

a) Zoning:

Summary: Mr. Orwiler asserts that the zoning at the site of the proposed development is a 7500 sf minimum lot size.

Response: As was discussed at the Neighborhood Meeting, this development is codified under Infill Residential Development, which allows for a 5500 sf minimum lot size.

b) Traffic:

Summary: Mr. Orwiler asserts that the development will increase traffic to an unacceptable level, but his main observation is that the source of the traffic issues already exists, is caused by traffic through the neighborhood, and is exacerbated by the poor condition of Haugen Street.

Response: Three lots will have a negligible effect on traffic. The City should consider improving the street, which is in need of re-surfacing at a minimum. Traffic-calming devices could surely be installed, but in Poulsbo are typically deemed unacceptable by emergency services personnel. The authority of such opinions could be re-evaluated by the City.

c) Stormwater:

Summary: Mr. Orwiler asserts that, at present, “...water comes down 8th Avenue onto Haugen in a heavy stream and much of it goes into the vacant lot that is to be developed”.

Response: It is evident from this email and from many others’ comments – both emails and verbal comments at the Neighborhood Meeting -- that significant stormwater issues currently exist on Haugen. Numerous parties have asserted that they have requested the City’s attention to these issues, but the City (Edie Berghoff) contends that no such reports are known to exist. While the overall neighborhood’s stormwater issues are clearly outside the responsibility of the owner of the Haugen Development, there are stormwater engineering measures that can be employed to address the issues on the Haugen Development property. Among the possibilities are a bioswale on the south side of Haugen, and careful attention to the functionality of the existing drainage ditch located on what will become Lot B of the Haugen Development. The Stormwater Report for this Short Plat will address the site-specific stormwater management. The City can research the existence of the earlier complaints and consider addressing the upstream stormwater issues that are apparently of significant impact and severity.

5. **Letter from Rick & Lilly Ransdell**

Summary: The Ransdells strongly express their dislike of the density of houses proposed, as well as the building heights and aesthetics that are allowed, and cite the same Fjord Drive

development as did Ms. Stenerson, describing the general reaction as “who approved this? Ugly, Ugly!”, and asserting that “these houses do not fit in the existing neighborhood and stick out like a sore thumb”. The Ransdells also write that they paid a dear price for their (existing) views and that it is the City’s job to protect those views. They defend this position in part by stating that the City should do so because when they lose their views, the value of their property – and thus the taxes – will go down, thus reducing the revenue to the City.

Response: While it is certainly unlikely that the City will take responsibility for “protecting” the Ransdell’s views, steps can and will be taken to assure compatibility as much as is practicable and within the PMC. Neighbors will be made aware of their ability to comment during the Building Permit process.

6. Letter from Marge Dyer

Summary: Ms. Dyer expresses regret that the site of the Haugen Development will no longer be a place from which neighbors can watch Fourth of July fireworks or sled in the winter. Most relevantly, though, Ms. Dyer expresses great concern about stormwater and notes that her parcel (which is adjacent to the Haugen Development) sometimes contains enough standing water for ducks to swim in it, and she has 2 large tanks to contain rainwater.

Response: The landowners have assured that access to the sledding and fireworks viewing (which is completely voluntary on their part now) will continue. The sledding slope will not be affected by the proposed development, and the fireworks can still be viewed from the landowners’ property. Careful and thorough hydrologic engineering will be undertaken, per PMC, to address stormwater and rainwater runoff issues.

7. Letter from Jessie Gordon

Summary: Ms./Mr. Gordon expresses dislike for the density of the proposed development, and objects to the “height” of houses allowed, citing the same example as other commenters – the property at 647 Haugen Street. Again, the elevation of this house is the issue here as much as the height, but because the PMC regulates height and not elevation, this type of development – that no neighbor likes – is allowed.

Response: The density is allowed by the Infill Residential Development provision of the PMC. The heights of the houses within the Haugen Development will be built to PMC. Because that code does not address elevation, the houses could obstruct others’ views. If the City were to re-write its code to fulfill the presumed intent of current code – to “fit in” – these concerns could be obviated, or at least greatly diminished.

8. Letter from Helena Lavassar

Summary: Ms. Lavassar expresses much the same concern about raising the elevation of the property so that the permitted height of new houses is at a greater elevation than fits the neighborhood. She, too, cites the property at 647 Haugen Street as an example of how this conflation of height and elevation in the PMC has resulted in a house that no one in the neighborhood likes.

Response: Same as #7 above

9. **Letter from Julia LaVassar** [identifies herself as daughter of #8, but spells last name differently]

Ms. LaVassar divides her correspondence into three subjects, as follows:

a) **Terrain**

Summary: Ms. LaVassar asks why “the engineering firm” has not submitted a topographical map of the site. Her main concern is how the development will address the relatively steep slope off Haugen Street, especially on the westernmost lot, Lot B.

Response: First, in the PMC, there is no requirement for a “topographic map” at the time of the Pre-Application Conference and Neighborhood Meeting. Topographic data will be obtained in order to undertake several aspects of the site engineering, including water, wastewater, stormwater and site plan. Again, because the PMC addresses only a building’s height rather than maximum elevation, there is nothing preventing a developer from filling the lots in Haugen Development as much as they want, and similarly to 647 Haugen Street.

b) **Traffic and stormwater:**

Summary: Haugen Street is already “overburdened” by traffic and stormwater issues; adding more trips and more impervious surface will only make these things worse; desires speed humps.

Response: An LOS could be determined for Haugen Street, but professional observation is that it is far from “overburdened”. As mentioned elsewhere, the stormwater issues on the Haugen Development property will be completely managed on-site. Neighborhood-wide stormwater issues should be taken up with the City.

c) **Neighborhood character:**

Summary: No matter how much the new houses are designed to fit in architecturally, the density does not match the neighborhood.

Response: It is true that several of the existing lots on the “block face” are significantly larger than the proposed ones. However, on the block face there are also lots of the following sizes, and which are depicted on the attached map:

Lot 103: 3,485 sf

Lot 011: 6,098

Lots 012 and 013: 6,534 sf

These lots are obviously either smaller than, or only just a little greater than, the proposed lots in size. Therefore, parts of the block face are of a density similar to that of the proposed development. One design feature that enhances the perception of density is trees. Because trees can visually obscure at least a portion of the view of the houses from the street, they can make the block face appear less crowded (i.e., of “lower density”). The planting of trees and/or other large foliage can be implemented along Haugen with the development of the lots to serve the purpose of enhancing neighborhood character.

10. **Email from Toni Lynn and Bill Seaman**

The party lists three topics – **building heights, lot size and “neighborhood infrastructure”**

a) Building heights

Summary: Commenters express interest in the average height being based on the average of all the neighbors who received the Notice of the Neighborhood Meeting, rather than only those of the block face. The commenters also echo other commenters in expressing concern in regards to the issue of using height rather than elevation in mandating the maximum elevation of structures to be built.

Response: The PMC bases height regulations on the new parcels’ block face, not on the entire neighborhood. Commenters can work to change the PMC if they desire. In regards to the height vs. elevation issue, this has been discussed repeatedly elsewhere.

b) Lot size:

Summary: Commenters express similar interest in having the lot sizes based on an average of lot sizes in the entire nearby neighborhood.

Response: At this location, the PMC presently allows 5500 sf lots under the Infill Residential Development category of RL zoning. Commenters can work to change the PMC if they desire.

c) Neighborhood infrastructure:

Summary: Commenters express the desire that “the city does a thorough study of the affects of [the development on] water, sewer, electric, traffic, stormwater runoff, environmental issues...”

Response: The PMC requires that the City do this very thing; these “studies” are undertaken at several stages in the approval process, including Pre-Application, Site Plan Review, Short Plat approval, SEPA review, Building Permit approval and Construction permitting.

11. Email from Jan Seifert

Ms. Seifert identifies three topics of concern – **lot size, building heights and architectural style.**

a) Lot size:

Summary: The proposed lots are too small; the minimum size should be 7500 sf.

Response: At this location, the PMC presently allows 5500 sf lots under the Infill Residential Development category of RL zoning. Commenters can work to change the PMC if they desire.

b) Building heights:

Summary: The building heights allowed are too high.

Response: As has been articulated elsewhere and repeatedly, the PMC bases its limitation on height, not on elevation; Ms. Seifert and/or any other concerned citizens can work to change the PMC to reflect what is likely the intent of that part of the code.

c) Architectural style:

Summary: Ms. Seifert expresses concern that the homes to be built will be “all the same”, and that such consistency (or monotony or uniformity) does not “keep the beauty of the neighborhood”.

Response: The IRD portion of the PMC includes the following language (18.70.070.P.3.e): “Duplicative front facade elevations adjacent to each other are prohibited; simple reverse configurations of the same facade elevation on adjacent lots are not sufficient to meet this requirement. In order to ensure architectural variety, three or more design elements per infill residence shall be utilized...”. In addition, all concerned neighbors have opportunity to review, and comment on, the conceptual building designs required of the short subdivision submittal. Team 4 can work with the property owners’ architects to ensure compliance with this portion of the code to the greatest extent practicable.

12. City of Poulsbo Comment Form, with attached letter, from David Blaskowsky

Mr. Blaskowsky’s detailed letter covers many topics. They could be categorized as follows:

a) (Mis)application of the Infill Residential Development (IRD) status:

Summary: The IRD is applied successfully in Poulsbo Place, but because physical conditions are very different on Haugen Street (“Old Town”), the IRD is mis-applied here. Mr. Blaskowsky specifies that the primary difference between the two neighborhoods is that in Poulsbo Place there were no views to be obscured by densely placed homes.

Response: Although Poulsbo Place was, in fact, not permitted under the IRD, one element of his comparison and observation seems reasonable and defensible: limiting the elevation of the houses to be built would mitigate at least some of the concerns about the blocking of existing views. However, and in general, the remainder of Mr. Blaskowsky’s comments are based on his incorrect assertion that Poulsbo Place was developed under the IRD provision, which it was not.

b) Ethics in Development

Summary: “The [IRD] process is aimed at maximizing profit at the expense of ethical concern for the existing community”

Response: All property owners have rights to develop their property, provided such development is in conformance with the PMC. City codes cannot regulate profit beyond the confines of the law.

c) Parking and Traffic

Summary: The addition of 3 new residences on the Haugen Development, plus the potential new residence at 701 NE Haugen Street, plus up to four more residences in future short-platting of the Ross property means that there could be parking and traffic impacts from a total of 8 new residences in the next 5 years. The streets are not wide enough for on-street parking, and the streets’ “narrow, deteriorating, uneven, roley,

poley, patched surface” are not appropriate for, nor capable of, supporting such development.

Response: New residences’ off-street parking can be accommodated on the driveways, as it currently is with existing residences. Haugen Street is perhaps in need of consideration by the City for resurfacing and/or drainage engineering. However, PMC requires on-street parking at a ratio resulting in the fact that two on-street parking spaces must be provided. These will be situated in the area to be graded to the south of the existing street, and will thus not impinge upon the existing street.

d) Character of Housing

Summary: Because many of the houses in the neighborhood are “predominately smaller (by today’s standards) single story houses with low roof pitches that are uninterrupted by a partial second floor”, the City’s requirement -- of averaging the heights of the existing houses to arrive at a maximum height for new houses – fails to preserve the “charm and character” of the neighborhood. The increase in density should include “standards that perpetuate Old Town ‘predominate’ characteristic (sic)”.

Response: The assertion about the calculation of allowable future building heights may or may not be true, but the PMC includes specific and precise means for ascertaining the height maximum for future houses. The “standards” that Mr. Blaskowsky desires are indeed included in the IRD provisions of the PMC. Additionally, comment periods exist at the time building permits are applied for.

13. Letter from James Absher

Mr. Absher’s comments focus on two issues: **neighborhood character** and **preservation/destruction of existing streams/creeks**.

a) Neighborhood Character:

Summary: Neighborhoods and towns, the form of which are largely the result of the fact that landowners’ “short-term gain of money is more important than the long term character of [the] city, are what people live in, and move to, Poulsbo to avoid. This development “runs against the sense of community” that still exists in Poulsbo and that is so lacking in much of the U.S. Allowing the short-platting of this property shows no consideration of how it will affect dozens of neighbors.

Response: As has been mentioned in response to numerous similar comments, the PMC allows for, the development as it is currently proposed. The PMC, which includes the IRD provisions, is adopted with opportunity for public input. If citizens wish to try to change the POMC, there are established mechanisms for doing so. The landowners of the proposed Haugen Development are opting for the IRD in part to give neighbors the opportunity to express their opinions about the character of the future housing. While the IRD process allows for such solicitation of opinion, the Building Permit process provides for more detailed input by members of the public.

b) Stream/creek preservation:

Summary: The history of the development of Poulsbo is replete with the filling, diversion and covering of native running freshwater bodies, to the great detriment of environmental health. The south fork of Poulsbo Creek runs next to the property, and the developer should not be allowed to continue this damaging treatment of existing creeks and streams.

Response: Per POMC, the presence of a critical area within 300 feet of the property triggers SEPA review. Included in that review are State-mandated – and City of Poulsbo sanctioned – preservation of existing water bodies.

14. Letter from Sylvia Schulte

Ms. Schulte’s comments focus on three issues: **drainage on Haugen Street, traffic** and **“total esthetics of Old Town Poulsbo”**.

a) Drainage on Haugen Street:

Summary: “Drainage on Haugen [Street] is a mess”, and will only get worse with more development.

Response: Based on both observation and the multitude of comments about the poor drainage of Haugen Street as it now exists, it seems the City needs to consider engineering and re-building of Haugen Street. Drainage on the proposed development will be studied and engineered per PMC, but the overall street drainage engineering studies and solutions need to be taken up by the City.

b) Traffic:

Summary: Ms. Schulte is concerned about the increase in traffic that the development will produce.

Response: The increase in traffic is below the threshold requiring mitigation. Proximity to transit and a “friendly” environment for walking and bicycling will help diminish the perceived impact.

c) “Total esthetics of Old Town Poulsbo”:

Summary: Old Town Poulsbo “is NOT a development with every allowable square inch used for a house”. I.e., the density of the proposed development does not fit the existing neighborhood. “Each house is different and has a nice size lot...”.

Response: The density of the proposed development is allowable per the IRD provision of the PMC. Per the PMC, and as mentioned earlier, the writing of the Short Plat stipulations will include the required directives that the homes to be constructed be of architectural variety.

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.