

# **EXHIBIT S**

*(New Exhibit March 11, 2021)*

**Planning Commission Draft Minutes from  
February 23, 2021 Public Meeting**



## CITY OF POULSBO

### Planning Commission Public Meeting & Public Hearing (Virtual)

February 23, 2021

**Commissioners Present:** Ray Stevens, Jerry Block, Mark Kipps, Tim Morgan, Ray Taylor

**Staff Present:** Karla Boughton, Nikole Coleman, Marla Powers, Jess Rae, Diane Lenius, Anthony Burgess, Michael Bateman

**Additional Attendees:** Applicant Charlie Wenzlau; Owner: Mike Brown; Citizens Frank Gibbons, Dan Keech, Don Russell, Jamie Green, Mark Smith, MaryEllen Wallner, Mel Morgan, (+5 unidentified callers)

**1. Call to Order**

**2. Flag Salute**

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

**4. Approval of Minutes:** 1/26/2021: Taylor recommended approval with one edit to Page 6, Mark Kuhlman section, paragraph 1, add “collector” after the word “neighborhood” at the end of sentence 7. Morgan seconded, all ayes, no abstentions.

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

**6a. Public Meeting for Poulsbo Place Division 8 Site Plan Review/Redevelopment Master Plan Amendment (Marla Powers)**

**Slide 1: Project Overview Slide.** Good Evening. My name is Marla Powers. I'm the Project Planner for the Planning Department for this project. This is Poulsbo Place Division Eight Site Plan Review and Redevelopment Master Plan Amendment. This is a Type 3 permit and the review authority is City Council.

**Slide 2: Outline.** I will talk about the proposal with permit consolidation, the Redevelopment Master Plan Amendment requests, the Site Plan Review, the SEPA mitigation – there are only two procedures for review -and the Staff Findings and Approval.

**Slide 3: Introduction.** The property owner is Phase Two, LLC. Charlie Wenzlau is the applicant; he's also on the call today, so he'll be able to talk about the project. This proposal is going to complete the final last phase of Poulsbo Place Redevelopment Master Plan. So that's very exciting.

This includes two different parcels. One parcel is a commercial zone. So it's going to have a mixed use building on it, and the other parcel is Residential High density, so it's going to have

the multifamily component on it. Those two sites combined are 2.11 acres. The commercial site will have 4,800 square feet (sf) of retail oriented toward Jensen Way with 29 residential units above that commercial and under -building parking. The multifamily site is going to have 5 buildings with 4 units for each building, for a total of 20 units along Third Avenue.

The residential parking is located below the building just like the commercial. The below-building parking is intended to minimize the amount of intrusion that parking would normally have on the site.

**Slide 4: Vicinity Map.** To orient you spatially, (refers to slide) the site is on the corner of Jensen Way where Sunset Street bends towards Third Avenue. There are two streets that kind of blend together as part of this. The site is just north of the post office.

**Slide 5: Site Map.** (Refers to slide) Here's a blown-up version so you can see the left parcel and hatching is the commercial and the right parcel (the long skinny one) is the residential multi-family.

**Slide 6: Zoning Ordinance Map.** For review of this project, it's going to be the Poulsbo Place Redevelopment Master Plan. There's an overlay, so you can see the hatching on there. That's going to be the standard that we look at for review for this proposal. It's also vested to the 1994 Zoning Ordinance. So in case you want to memorize another ordinance, instead of the one we have right now, you can have two in mind. We have a General Commercial standard, and then the Residential High, which is 11 to 14 units per acre.

**Slide 7: Site Description.** The site is, again, a mixed-use site. The mixed use commercial site is 1.057 acres. It's a little different than if you pulled up the Kitsap County Parcel Search. The dimensions are provided by the applicant who did a survey and so these are the numbers that we're going to go with. And then the residential portion is 1.053 acres, again, total of 2.11 acres. And it's undeveloped; you can see there's a bit of a parking lot and an undeveloped parking area just north of the post office. Otherwise, the rest of it has been previously cleared. There are lots of blackberries there and there's no other structure. And then you can see this as shown in the bottom picture (refers to slide).

**Slide 8: Permit Discussion.** The Redevelopment Master Plan Amendment is a Type 3 permit; it goes to City Council as the review authority. There's also an associated Site Plan Review - Type 2 - and the Planning and Economic Development Director is the review authority for that. The applicant has chosen to put these two projects together and have them consolidated. They move through the higher type process, which is a Type 3.

**Slide 9: Review Criteria.** The two pieces of documentation needed to review the criteria for this proposal are the Poulsbo Place Redevelopment Master Plan (PPRMP), provided as Exhibit O, and 1994 Zoning Ordinance, Exhibit P.

**Slide 10: Redevelopment Master Plan (RMP) Amendments.** The Redevelopment Master Plan Amendments are covered in the Staff Report, pages 8-16. The criteria for approval of an

amendment are under the 1994 Zoning Ordinance under PMC 18.31.070. There are 9 criteria. We are going to focus on just one – Criterion 5.

**Slide 11: RMP Amendments Approval Criteria (1-9).** Because criteria 1-9 are met, we're going to focus on Criteria 5, which is the criteria for alternate development standards proposed with a master plan.

**Slide 12: RMP Amendments Approval Criteria (1-9): CRITERIA 5 –** The Master Plan has already proposed amendments to the standards, so we are further amending what they have already.

**Slide 13: RMP Amendments Approval Criteria 5 - Extension and Use.** The first amendment they asked for is an extension of the Master Plan, requesting another five years of validity for the Master Plan, in order to final the development and develop this as the last piece of the Poulsbo Place Redevelopment Master Plan. Staff concurs with this conclusion and it's included as a Condition of Approval. The second request was for a use. This is for the commercial site. They want to include Mixed-Use Residential above Commercial for the site in the commercial area. This is consistent with all of our commercial zoning standards. And it allows for mixed use of the site and staff concurs and this is included as a condition of approval.

**Slide 14: RMP Amendments Approval Criteria 5 - Density.** The third amendment and staff report page 11 is the density for the multifamily component - the applicant is requesting an increase of four units. The increase is addressing the zone's density, not the total number of units approved through the master plan. There was a total in the 1995 Redevelopment Master Plan, of 360 units that were approved for this project. With development of this site, of a total of 49 units, the overall end result of units in the master plan is going to be 341. The increase in dwelling units does not exceed the total number of units permitted or approved in the original master plan. Staff concurs with this request and it's listed as condition of approval.

**Slide 15: RMP Amendments Approval Criteria 5 – Lot Coverage.** There's been a request to allow an increase in lot coverage for the commercial sites, and an inclusion of building lot coverage to be added to the master plan. So this would increase the lot coverage from 50% to 60% in the commercial area, and even at 60%, the current zoning ordinance allows 85% lot coverage. So this is well within our current standards. One of the reasonings for asking for increased lot coverage is to provide underbuilding parking. Increase of building lot coverage is to be more consistent with our current zoning ordinance, so that they can meet the standards that are in the master plan with that definition. So Staff concurs and includes this as a condition of approval.

**Slide 16: RMP Amendments Approval Criteria 5 – Landscaping Buffer and Setback.** There was a request for the landscape buffer to be reduced to 10' wide, but after review of this request, Staff found that there is an alternate one type landscaping that's already in the 1994 Zoning Ordinance that the applicant can use outright without requesting a master plan amendment. So Staff concurs with this request, but it's not necessary.

The next master plan amendment is for the setback for the multifamily sites to be reduced to 10'. The decrease in setbacks, again, is partially because of the underbuilding parking that

they're proposing for their sites. This area is going to be landscaped, screened, and it's going to contain a pedestrian pathway that connects Iverson to the heart of the urban plaza that is proposed. The 10-foot rear yard setback is consistent with our current zoning standards. So again, they're modifying the master plan to be consistent with our current zoning ordinance. So Staff concurs with this amendment and has included it as a condition of approval.

**Slide 17: RMP Amendments Approval Criteria 5 – Open Space.** Open space is the last amendment the applicant requested. It is decreasing the open space to 15% for the multifamily development proposal. The master plan amendment and the 1994 zoning ordinance exclude the setback areas to be included as part of the calculation for the open space. When you subtract out the setbacks, they can meet 15% of the open space, if using the calculations as provided in the zoning ordinance. If you were if you were viewing this site plan with the existing zoning ordinance, and you did the calculations that we do now, they would be providing 30% open space for this multifamily proposal. Staff concurs with this recommendation, and it's included it as a condition of approval.

**Slide 18: Summary of Requested Amendments.** In total, the requested amendments for the Poulsbo Place PPRMP development standards are consistent with similar standards found in the City's zoning ordinance for use, lot coverage, setbacks and open space. The remaining amendments to extension of the master plan and the density are consistent with the PPRMP. Staff recommends acceptance of the requested master plan amendments.

**Slide 19: PPRMP Division 8 Site Plan Review (SPR) – Design Guidelines for Commercial Site.** We'll go into the site plan review. This is a really big section, and it begins on page 16 of the staff report. To keep this presentation brief, I've done the bullet points for the criteria. The end of the staff report and the conclusion that we've drawn is that this site plan meets all the required criteria to be consistent with the Poulsbo Place Redevelopment Master Plan, the 1994 Zoning Ordinance, and the City's Comprehensive Plan.

**Slide 20: PPRMP Division 8 Site Plan Review (SPR) – Residential Area Design.** The design guidelines are for commercial sites, the use is as amended, and on the mixed use structure, they added some design guidelines for the mixed use structure and the commercial site. So those are all the standards and those are all met. The residential area design begins on the Staff Report, page 30, and includes clustering of units, the entry drives; the entry drive is going to be off of Iverson, so it's not going to be in the middle of pedestrian circulation. The parking areas and garages are all under building, so a lot of the parking standards and requirements that are in the PPRMP don't really apply to the site because of the underbuilding parking. In the open spaces as amended, they are providing all the refuse and storage that are required. The auxiliary facilities are going to be provided in the mixed use building.

**Slide 21: PPRMP Division 8 Site Plan Review (SPR) – Supplemental Guidelines.** The supplemental guidelines include signage, street furniture, lighting, landscaping and the Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions (CC&Rs). There's a section for street furniture in the Staff Report on page 35. They're proposing a really nice palette of street furniture that is in line with our current street furniture that we have in downtown. And the lighting also is consistent with what's envisioned in the PPRMP.

**Slide 22: PPRMP Division 8 Site Plan Review (SPR) – Additional Site Plan Components.**

Additional site plan components, beginning on page 38 of the staff report, as reviewed under the PPRMP on page 29, includes recreation. Tree preservation isn't applicable because the site's been previously cleared and there are no trees – well, there's one tree, but it's not going to be kept. There architectural standards are also in the Poulsbo Place Redevelopment Master Plan on page 31. And all these standards are met.

**Slide 23: PPRMP Division 8 Site Plan Review (SPR) – Residential Zoning Standards.** Residential Zoning Standards is where in the Staff Report on page 41, we go into the 1994 Zoning Ordinance. We're stepping out of the PPRMP and going into the 1994 Zoning Ordinance, because some of these items are not amended with the Master Plan. It was stated in the beginning of the staff report- but for the multifamily site, we're looking at the RDH (Downtown High Density) Development District that was approved as part of the Redevelopment Master Plan. We're using those standards to apply towards the multifamily site to note that that maximum density is 22 dwelling units per acre. So what they're proposing is 19, so that's consistent.

**Slide 24: PPRMP Division 8 Site Plan Review (SPR) – Residential Development Standards, SR Pg. 42.** The residential development standards – the maximum units per acre as amended is 19, but they can still do 22, per that district. Their lot width, depth, and front setbacks are all met. The rear setback as amended to 10' is met.

The building lot coverage for the residential is actually under - they're proposing 50% lot coverage for the residential and they can cover up to 60%. Their building height is matched; they're staying below the 35' allowance. And the usable open space, as amended to reduce it to 15%, is met.

**Slide 25: PPRMP Division 8 Site Plan Review (SPR) – Residential Development Standards, SR Pg. 44.** Some additional residential development standards – beginning on Staff Report page 44, includes recreation amenities, so they're providing a barbecue pavilion, some benches, some open space, water features and connecting trails. They're also providing some enclosed storage space in the underbuilding parking area that meets the 150 cubic square feet, which is a different standard. All of the residential development standards are met. The laundry facilities are being provided with hookups in each unit, and the impervious surface per the definition, being added to the Master Plan is met.

**Slide 26: PPRMP Division 8 Site Plan Review (SPR) – Height Determinations.** Moving back to the commercial center, there was a provision in the Master Plan that allowed for a landmark feature. This is a height exception for an architectural feature in the commercial zone. It can be no more than 20% of the roof area, and that's the middle image there (refers to slide), total height not to exceed 60', which is also shown in the red line on the image to the right (refers to same slide). It is supposed to appear similar to the image on the left, which is on the cover of the Master Plan, where it has this landmark feature where you're supposed to be able to know that there's more to go to from downtown. They are providing this feature and it meets those standards.

**Slide 27: PPRMP Division 8 Site Plan Review (SPR) – Off-Street Parking, SR Pgs 47-53, PPRMP Pg. 39.** There are a lot of parking lot design standards and access to parking. Many of them are not applicable because this is underbuilding parking. They're not trying to screen the parking or keep it contained, because it's all under the building. They are providing a lot of bicycle parking facilities – 50 - they're using some bicycle parking credits to meet some of the parking standards. And you can see in the image with the yellow and the orange on the north part (indicates left slide image). The orange is the guest parking that they're providing and the yellow is the standard parking. In these white areas there's bicycle parking that's provided, along with the storage and garbage facilities there. There's more residential guest parking in the commercial site here. And this little blow up of the parking standards (right image on slide) shows that they're meeting their minimum 9-foot width, 19-foot depth, and a 24-foot parking aisle/drive aisle.

**Slide 28: PPRMP Division 8 Site Plan Review (SPR) – Off-Street Parking, SR 53, PPRMP Pg. 39.** The number of parking spaces required is here (indicates slide): the commercial required parking spaces based on what the applicant proposed is 70, and the multifamily required is 45. They're providing a total of 134 parking stalls. Just a quick note: they're not reducing any on-street parking that's provided for the public right now. They're going to add more on-street parking that they are using to meet the number of parking stalls required, so that the total number of on-street parking stalls isn't reduced, and to show that they meet the parking requirements. Use of on-street parking stalls is allowed per the Master Plan.

**Slide 29: PPRMP Division 8 Site Plan Review (SPR) – Residential Mixed-Use Component (as amended), SR Pg 53.** The applicant chose to provide standards that are very similar to what are in our current Zoning Ordinance now: to have the residential units above the commercial, or above the underbuilding parking, to provide one outdoor activity - there are many outdoor activities that they are providing, including the urban plaza, a water feature, benches, trails, and they're providing the shared open space - the 38sf of private open space. I think their balconies for each unit range in size from 65sf to 108sf.

They are more than meeting that minimum standard. Mixed use lot coverage to increase the 60% - which has also been provided as a request to amend the Master Plan. One of the requirements is that underbuilding parking be set behind the commercial use or screen and this image on the bottom (indicates slide) shows that they've done a really good design for the underbuilding parking. You can see the arched entryway for the cars to go in. One side is screened and the other side is going to be commercial front for retail. It's a really nice design for commercial underbuilding.

**Slide 30: PPRMP Division 8 Site Plan Review (SPR) – Commercial Standards.** Commercial standards on Staff Report page 54. In a zoning ordinance beginning on page II-23 includes requirements for trash receptacles for each parcel as an occupiable structure, that mechanical equipment be screened. The site plan didn't show any mechanical equipment; as a condition of approval, any mechanical equipment will be screened from view of the public.

Regarding commercial development standards: for the front setback, they were supposed to build to the front property line, but they are providing a courtyard. The courtyard pushes the

building back, so it meets the courtyard standards and setback standards. Again, the building lot coverage was requested to be amended, and the maximum building height is 30' for this commercial building, and they're meeting that standard.

**Slide 31: PPRMP SEPA Mitigation.** The SEPA mitigation that is a holdover from the rest of the PPRMP Development is Urban Plaza. Previous development across the street on Jensen way provided 7,633sf. This proposal is offering 9,700sf - which is more than the roughly 5,000sf required, so they're meeting their SEPA mitigation for this site; that criteria has been met.

**Slide 32: Findings.** The master plan amendment proposal has been found to be consistent with the PPRMP and policies of the 1994 Zoning Ordinance. As amended, the site plan review proposal has been found to be consistent with provisions of the PPRMP, 1994 Zoning Ordinance and the Conditions of Approval as well as the SEPA mitigations.

**Slide 33: SEPA-Mitigations.** The MDNS was issued February 8, and provided as Exhibit L. The comment period closed November 6. There were 7 public comments received through that public comment period. There are 2 mitigation items from SEPA, for schools and the urban plaza.

**Slide 34: Procedures for Review.** Here's a snapshot of the procedures for review (refers to slide). As a result of the notice for Planning Commission Public Meeting, we did receive three public comments that were sent to you this morning. Those public comments have been included as exhibits for the proposal and I know at least two of them are here, in case you have questions, or in case they want to make sure their comments are addressed.

**Slide 35: Staff Findings & Conclusions.** This proposal is consistent with Poulsbo Comprehensive Plan, PPRMP, and the 1994 Zoning Ordinance. This is scheduled to go to hearing before City Council on March 17.

**Slide 36: Recommended Motion.** Planning Commission recommends to the City Council, the Poulsbo Place Division 8 Redevelopment site plan review and master plan amendments subject to the SEPA Mitigations and Conditions of Approval contained in the Staff Report.

"Planning Commission recommends {(approval) /(approval with modifications) /(denial)} to the City Council the Poulsbo Place Division 8 Redevelopment Site Plan Review and Master Plan Amendment subject to the SEPA Mitigations and Conditions of Approval contained in the Staff Report under Planning File P-03-24-20-01."

RS: Are there any Engineering comments?

AB: I think Marla covered it.

RS: How about discussion and questions from Commissioners?

RT: I have one question. This is Ray Taylor. I've noticed on the plans, on Google, and on the Kitsap County Parcel Search, that we cannot agree on what street we're next to. On the site plan done by Maps Incorporated, they call it "Sunset." On A-1, we call it "Third Street." On A-2, we call it "Third Avenue." I just want to know which street that we are next to.



**AB:** We will be using the addresses on the Kitsap County Parcel Search for addressing. The folks at Google have a mind of their own and we can't get all that. But they will be consistent, and we'll be required to be consistent with what is presented on the parcel search tool. We will be consistent with Kitsap County GIS.

**RT:** Our designer needs to do that too.

**AB:** We'll make note of that then.

**RT:** I was reading the comments from the citizens, and one of those comments was about whether or not that little park over there, Sunrise Park, will be public or private. Have we answered that?

**MP:** It's a private park, it's on private property, and there is no public use easement on that property.

**RT:** But we can still go ahead with that raised crosswalk, right?

**MP:** It's there right now; it exists.

**RT:** Okay.

**TM:** This is Tim. I have two questions: one is, with the boundary with the Post Office, I'm guessing that's federal property. Was there any special considerations that have to be made when you're bordering a federal property or post office property?

**MP:** We don't have anything in our standards to review federal property differently. I can ask Charlie as the applicant if he has talked to that site as a property owner, and if they have any other considerations.

**TM:** I was just curious. The other question was regarding the retail areas. Are there going to be outside trash receptacles in the retail area.

**AB:** The residential component will have a refuse storage area out of sight that will be coordinated with Public Works, a lot like the Martha and Mary daycare across the street. The refuse collection for the commercial portion of the project will actually be within the parking garage, and that will be wheeled out for pickup.

**TM:** Okay, so there are no trash receptacles for the patrons of the retail businesses then, you know, outside trash barrels.

**AB:** Marla, do you have comment on that? Because we don't have a requirement for that (for individual trash barrels in the plaza).

**MP:** Street furniture is included as part of an amenity for the urban plaza. One of the sheets in the landscaping section shows the garbage receptacles for public use, if that's what you're getting at. That's going to be available in the urban plaza area and then that garbage for the

commercial is going to be tucked inside the underbuilding parking area right off of Jensen, so it will be screened from view.

**TM:** Okay, thanks.

**JB:** This is Jerry. I was a little concerned that we are extending the 5-year plan after the previous 5-year extension that already expired. Are we getting ourselves in any sort of legal concerns or issues?

**MP:** Will our Director answer that?

**KB:** Good evening, this is Karla, the Planning and Economic Development Director. That's a good question, Jerry. We did note about that in the Staff Report, after consultation with the City Attorney, that as long as the request for the extension was made prior to the expiration date, and we've been continuously working on it, that the City will continue to its conclusion, and they may develop under the Master Plan, under City Council approval. We did consult with the City Attorney and he is satisfied that this process will work.

**JB:** Thank you.

**RS:** Okay, any other questions from commissioners? (None)

**RS:** Okay. So at this point, we will open up.

**JR:** (Interruption) I'm so sorry, Chairman Stevens; I believe the applicant actually had a presentation Marla was going to share.

**RT:** Okay, that would be great.

**MP:** Charlie, would you like to start with this?

**Charlie Wenzlau:** I think you did a really thorough job on the overall Master Plan presentation, so for the sake of time, we'll just focus on the SPR package.

**MP:** Okay.

**Citizen Don Russell:** We have one question here. (unmuted self) Can you hear me?

**MP:** Yes.

**Citizen Don Russell:** The 5-year extension means that they don't need to really start any construction within that period, is that right?

**KB:** It means that the 5 years is for the validity of it. So they need to be concluded by the end of the 5 years.

**Citizen Don Russell:** Okay, they need to be done at the end of the five years.

**KB:** Yes, sir.

**Citizen Don Russell:** Okay, so there's no planning for getting started, at this time? I mean, because we've been going to meetings for a couple of years. We've lived here 4 years, going on 5. And we've been to the several meetings at the fire hall, and then we got this. So we were thinking, "oh, something's going to happen." Well, it doesn't sound like it because we're very interested in the large condominiums facing the Martha Mary childcare.

**RS:** All right, so I'm going to call this for a second. We need to keep this a little under control. We haven't really opened it up for public comment yet. I started to, but we need to have the applicant give his presentation, and then we'll open it up for public comment. And if we could just take one person at a time with a specific comment, then just proceed in an orderly manner if we could. Okay. So, could we have the applicant do his presentation and then we'll move on.

**Charlie Wenzlau:** While Marla is getting it going, my name is Charlie Wenzlau. I'm with Wenzlau Architects. I just want to say how pleased I've been working with staff - with Karla, Marla and Michael. This has taken an incredible amount of coordination to pull this together. I also wanted to thank and make reference to our consultant team, which is Map for civil, Fisher-Bouma Landscape Architects, and Jeff Weiss from our office, has also been a primary team member. And then also Mike Brown, the developer, is on the zoom meeting if there's a question specifically to Mike.

**(Charlie Wenzlau)** Okay, so Marla, why don't you just go just scroll to the colored site plan drawing? I think you have to get through the civil drawings first. I'm just going to look at a select few drawings, just to make the comments. That's great. Okay. (References colored site plan drawing) So a couple of things, briefly. I'm going to try not to take too much time. Obviously, all of this is building off the 1995 Master Plan. Anecdotally, I'll just mention, and I think Marla and Karla know this: when I was a grad student, in the mid '90s, I did my thesis project on Poulsbo Place. So this certainly has a personal aspect to me, and has been a real opportunity for me to bring my professional experience back to something I spent a lot of time on 25 years ago.

The Master Plan is intended to be flexible over time, and allow adaptation which we've discussed. Another goal of the Master Plan was to encourage a variety of densities and housing types. So I think this project is bringing some added diversity to the housing types. And then the last piece is to complement the existing urban downtown - the urban development in Downtown Poulsbo. And this site represents sort of the logical end of the Jensen Commercial District, and its sort of termination, if you will, with our plaza.

**(Charlie Wenzlau)** A couple of significant things about the site planning. We're building in a developed neighborhood. There are a lot of residents, there are a lot of homes, a lot of concerns about the impacts the project's going to have. We've tried to be very aware that each phase of the project has a different set of responsibilities - to reinforce the scale and character of the neighborhood. And those evidence themselves, if you will, on Jensen, with our plaza and mixed use building facing the mixed use development across the street, to the north of our site.

Across - if we're going to call it Sunset - - I never did hear the name we're going to use. We have the residential neighborhood, and our buildings along Sunset and Third will appear as a two-story scale building from those street front edges, which will be equal or less than what you see in the surrounding neighborhoods. We also wanted to create a village feel to the project; that's certainly the way Poulsbo Place feels. Our buildings - the multi-family buildings along Third Street on this sketch are broken into 5 separate buildings to allow view quarters between them and break the scale down at the buildings.

**(Charlie Wenzlau)** And you'll see in a minute when we look at the mixed-use building on the corner, that has also been broken into two separate buildings with the big public stairway going between them. I think the two other things that are significant about the site plan is the importance and emphasis that's been placed on the public spaces. This is certainly something I enjoy as an architect, is finding out how to invite the public into places. And this project really has some wonderful outdoor spaces with the plaza, the big grand public stair, and then the public park where the road has the bend in it. We'll see some images of that in a minute.

Lastly, as Marla talked about, we've tried to hide the automobile to the maximum extent possible to really give the site over to pedestrians. So Marla, why don't we go and then this is what I'll conclude with - we have a series of three dimensional views of the project. And I'll just take you on a quick walk through the project. And I think that'll conclude my my portion of the presentation. Okay, we'll start there.

(Referring to 3D slides) So this is the overview of the project at the corner of Jensen and Sunset, and you can see the mixed-use building in the foreground and our multifamily buildings in the background. One of the characteristics of all these views and the architecture is the use of the repetitive or repeating-gable form.

**(Charlie Wenzlau)** And also the varied color palette. In in our early images, these ideas were drawn a little bit from the Bergen Norway merchant houses, which some of you may be familiar with. (Next slide.)

So this is the view, showing the entry to the parking garage, the landscape screening to the post office to the south, and then the view into the plaza. (Next slide.)

Now you're looking directly into the retail Plaza, with the small shops around the plaza and the residential units up above. (Next.)

**(Charlie Wenzlau)** And this is our grand public stair, with the landscape feel, landmark feature of the tower. And this stairway connects up to our public park. And then you can see there's a pedestrian bridge that connects the two parts of the building right there. (Next.)

Another view of the plaza, and that's the neighborhood tree that we thought potentially in the holiday season could be decorated. Next.

This is the corner of Jensen and Third, and the covered walkway with the retail and a small corner sitting area. (Next slide.)

**(Charlie Wenzlau)** So this is the view from the existing residential neighborhood just to the north of the site. And you can see now how the scale of the buildings drops to the two-story scale. And the commercial is basically, virtually out of sight now. (Next view.)

And then this is a view into our community park with the pergola along the curve of the road and looking down into the plaza area. (Next.)

Another view overlooking the park and another community tree. And then one of the other things you can see in this view is what were the residential units sitting on top of the retail, as you looked at it from Jensen, now appear as little row houses sitting along that pedestrian walkway. (Next slide.)

And this is looking down that walkway. And this is the path that Marla was talking about that extends all the way to Iverson and the parking garage is under the building to the left in there. Next slide.

**(Charlie Wenzlau)** Another view of that pedestrian area.

And then I think this is the last slide. And this is the view along Third Avenue. And these are 4-unit buildings with 2 units upstairs and 2 units downstairs with a common entry porch set in the middle. So that's the tour, and I'll be happy to answer any questions if you have them. Thank you.

**RS:** Okay, so at this point, we'll have any questions from Commissioners.

**Citizen Don Russell:** I have a question. Who's going to be responsible for maintaining the landscaping and the public areas? Is that a city function? Or is that a function of the owners of the property?

**Charlie Wenzlau:** I understand it's a function of the owners of the property and the homeowners association itself.

**RS:** Any other questions from Commissioners? (None.) Okay, now we'll open up to public comment.

**(RS)** Jess, if you could call on people as we go, that'd be good.

**JR:** Yes, Sir. Everyone has the ability to unmute yourself. So if anyone has a comment, or a question, please go ahead.

**RS:** We have Frank Gibbons first, he's raised his hand.

Citizen Frank Gibbons: Thank you. I have two comments. The first comment is, regarding the common areas, the developer, the current developer is the same developer that developed Poulsbo Place across the street. The common area development was, I guess the right word, was "defective." And as a result of that, the developer had a bond, I believe the term is a

“bond,” a \$50,000 bond, which was needed to correct the problems, plus the home owners association had to kick in additional funds. So my question is, the plan looks great. But how do you know the developer... what kind of hammer does the City have to make sure they do it?

**KB:** Thank you, Mr. Gibbons. I'll answer on the City's behalf. And Mr. Brown, if you'd like to speak to it, please feel free to unmute if you'd like to, after me. I think that's a very fair question, and part of the answer that I'll give you is that we're probably not going to bond for landscaping. Part of what bonding does is it's a financial promise that you'll conduct a certain performance in the future. And you're correct in that for Divisions 6 and 7, there was a landscaping bond and part of the reason was a very practical reason: the site was under construction. And there were houses being built, and it makes sense to hold off on final landscaping until the very end.

**(KB)** However, there was an under-estimation, I think, of the amount needed to fully landscape, the open space area to the landscape plan. I think the City learned some lessons on that. I do believe that this is a different developer team. While the ownership I think may be the same, I can't speak to that- the developer team is different. The place on Division 8 that's proposed to be landscaped is not necessarily within the residential portion like Divisions 6 and 7 were. We did work really hard - the I personally worked hard - with the HOA to try to do the best we could to give you the funds necessary to provide irrigation, was the main issue, for Divisions 6 and 7, as all commercial projects do require landscape irrigation, and we certainly we have required for this project as well.

I definitely believe that with the conditioning that we have, as well as a different development team, that we'll have a different outcome. Mike, I don't know if you want to address that; I know that you are aware of the of the landscape bond issue for Division 6 and 7.

**Mike Brown:** Sure, I'm happy to do that. I'm happy to start my video, but I'm afraid if I do my bandwidth will drop the entire call and I'll be trying to call back in so I'm a little hesitant to do that. But you're right, Karla. This is a different development team. The ownership structure is the same. It is also a different type of project because this is really a much larger project in scale, when you think about what must be constructed at a single time. Most of Poulsbo Place is single family detached, and so when you have 16 or 17 residences at a time, maybe 30 residences at a time, that are being constructed individually, and the landscaping is part and parcel in large part to the individual homes being constructed. Here you have larger pieces. And that doesn't mean that this won't be constructed in what might be seen as a phase, or a rolling-through, however you want to call that. You know, you start at one end and you finish at the other, it still has to be done in larger chunks so to speak.

There's this sort of built-in necessity to create more and finish more of that space as you go. The other part is a bit self-serving. The fact that as you are selling these units, you need to be able to, you know, put on a pleasant face on the project. Yes, so it needs to be fairly well complete as you enter the sales program. I think that's going to be a driver for the development team and the ownership team. But finally, I want to also say that there is a necessity to recognize that you can't just start with the landscaping, so to speak, so stand it on its head,

because as you go through and you construct the entire project, you would be decimating what you had created.

**(Mike Brown)** So there's a logical progression to it. There may be a time where you need to bond a piece that by necessity of the construction chronology needs to come at the tail end of the project. On the other hand, that which is complete is going to have landscaping and everything finished, as it goes. I see this is a totally different project, in some ways. It's more homogenous. I don't know if that's really the right term, but you have one in the front building - you have 28 residences that will all be constructed at the same time, they'll get CO all at the same time.

And that means that all of the landscaping and everything else needs to be complete within them. And so it's really a little bit different animal than I think what we've seen in the past. And I can tell you that the development team has changed - that the mentality of that has changed. And I guess I'm the tip of the spear when it comes to that. So certainly call on me if you have issues with the way that it's going. I've said all along. And at the public meetings, I think I've spoken with most of you. You know, I'm the point guy from here to the finish, and Division 8 is the finish of Poulsbo Place. So we're all excited to be at this point where it's being concluded, and I think this is a nice way to finish the project.

**Citizen Frank Gibbons:** Okay, let me let me move on to my second question. But before that, for the Commissioners that are here on the meeting, I think the answer is there is no hammer. That's the answer. Right now, there's no hammer to make sure they can they complete the project the way we are looking at it, right now.

Let me move on to my second question. The area that's shown, with parking next to the post office - I believe a lot of those people that park there are Postal Service employees. Have we talked... have we contacted the (Frank Gibbons- continued) Post Office, and do they realize they're going to lose that parking? And where are those people going to park?

**MP:** I can say that the Post Office being in close proximity to the site has received notice from the City of Poulsbo, per our Notice of Application and Notice of Planning Commission Public Meeting. So they've been made aware through the mail that this project is occurring and what the project is and when they need to comment. They have not reached out to Poulsbo staff with any questions or issues or anything they want to address. So from that public comment, notice perspective, we haven't heard back from them at all.

**Frank Gibbons:** Well, maybe I'd make a suggestion - is to pick up a phone and call the postmaster so they know what's going on.

**Mike Brown:** I'd like to comment on that, because we put that space in out of the goodness and expense of our own heart. And we've continued to allow the trespass.

**Frank Gibbons:** But they're gonna lose it, Mike.

**Mike Brown:** We've allowed it out of the goodness

**Frank Gibbons:** I know that.

**Mike Brown:** ... and provided for it out of the goodness of our heart, it's a trespass and we've allowed it.

**RS:** I think we have the question and an answer. It's going to be difficult, but I think we need to move on. Are there any other questions from anybody else?

**JR:** I see a Mr. Dan Keech.

**Citizen Dan Keech:** Yes, back on Frank's point. Poulsbo Place – that was a construction issue with the path. So on his point, on these parks; is there anything - any bonds going to be for construction or defaults in construction down the road, not just for the bushes- but that was a construction issue back in Poulsbo Place. Thank you.

**AB:** My apologies for not introducing myself formally, earlier. My name is Anthony Burgess, I am a Development Review Engineer for the City, and I've been working on this project. As part of occupancy for these buildings, they're going to be required to have permanent site stabilization, which is pretty vague. But that does mean that erosion is no longer an issue. That can be achieved through either landscape, or hardscapes, or other physical features. A lot of those details are more finely tuned with the next phase, which is a construction drawing review. That's something that the Engineering Department does look at - making sure that any slopes are going to be stable in the long run. I can't speak to what happened with the trail in question, but that will be a requirement moving forward for this project. Thank you.

**Citizen Dan Keech:** Okay.

**RS:** Any other questions from somebody? Please identify yourself.

**Mike Brown:** This is Mike, again, can I go back to the question of the hammer? Because I believe that the City does have a wonderful hammer - and that is a certificate of occupancy. If we don't perform at the level that's indicated and required by our approval, then the City has the right to not grant a Certificate of Occupancy. Without a Certificate of Occupancy, the developer really doesn't have anything. So I would submit that that is a significant hammer.

**RS:** Okay, any other Any other questions?

**Citizen Mel Morgan:** Yes, my name is Mel Morgan. I'm a resident of Poulsbo Place too, and I've watched a lot of the meetings about this. I think the project, in my mind, has evolved very well, in terms of its design, and one of the important features I think was the gabled dark colored roofs, which is very consistent with the rest of Poulsbo Place. Will that be a requirement when we get to that point, that they will have to match that?

**MP:** The design consistency in the site plan review process is a condition of approval. In each phase they go through for development, when they go to development review with Anthony,



Planning will also review the landscaping and the materials to make sure that it's consistent with what they've originally approved and what you saw here. And then when they submit their building permits, again, we'll make sure that everything is consistent with what the Site Plan Review has occurred so far. So as a Condition of Approval, number 8 of the Staff Report, page 60, says, "Development of the site shall be in conformance with site plan drawings as identified in Exhibit D and Planning file 3-24-20-01." That's what we hold to as we move forward. Of course, there's going to be some changes and some minor detail changes. But that's what we hold it to. I hope that answers your question.

**Citizen Mel Morgan:** Great, it does. Thank you very much.

RS: Does anyone else want to speak?

**Citizen Don Russell:** I still have one question about the landscaping. Specifically, has there been conversations with the HOA Board about the fact that the rest of us in Poulsbo Place are going to have to pick up the extra costs of doing the landscaping that's rather extensive, associated with this project, compared to the rest of the housing? Has that been specifically discussed with the HOA people?

**KB:** I just wanted to point out, this is a comment that we also received from Mr. Smith in writing. At this point the City does not have a role in HOA to HOA, although we definitely are going to encourage that you reach out now to Mr. Brown, to speak about your concerns regarding the maintenance of the trail and the sundial park that is privately owned and maintained by your HOA, Divisions 6 and 7. I think that he will have some ideas about how to work that out between the 2 HOAs, meaning Division 8, which is what we're talking about tonight, and your HOA.

**Mike Brown/RS/JR (Garbled)**

**JR:** Okay, we've got Dan's hand up again. I'm sorry, I think I interrupted Mr. Brown, though.

**Mike Brown:** I'm happy to have that conversation. I want to say that through the Divisions of Poulsbo Place that I have been involved with, which were 5, 6, 7, and now 8. I guess in my mind, there was never a question that the public was invited to the spaces that we were trying to create, and that the pedestrian friendliness and feel of it was part and parcel to the design intent. And certainly, in Division 8, we will do a better job of encouraging public visitation of that space. But I'm happy to meet with the HOA of other divisions to talk about mitigating any concerns that there are in regard to their spaces.

RS: Any other questions or comments? Anyone else?

**Citizen Dan Keech:** Yes, two things. Number one, like I think a lot of residents, I'm very excited when this is going to happen. So the question is, is there any kind of timeline when we're expecting this to be done? Is there anything on the board yet? And another question about the park again, on the drawings, it says it's a public park. But it was stated earlier, that is a private

park for the residents. Is that public or private? If it's public, what type of - is there liability for the residents that own that area? Thank you.

**Mike Brown:** This is Mike again. I'm assuming that you're speaking in regard to the park that is identified in the drawing on Division 8; I'm not going to speak to anything that's outside of Division 8. The intent is for the public spaces on Division 8 is that they are truly that - public. And that anybody can walk through and enjoy the space. I happen to think that that public engagement creates a more interesting neighborhood and community. And I'm more than willing to embrace that and deal with the insurance ramifications and so on so forth within the HOA documents that will be required in order to encourage that public participation in Division 8.

**RS:** Okay. Any other questions or comments? (None.)

**(RS)** All right, so we'll close the public comment portion. Any other discussion by Planning Commissioners at this point? Questions, comments?

**(RS)** Does anybody want to give me a motion? Could you bring up the suggested language again?

**JB:** Ray, I move the Planning Commission recommends to the City Council, the Poulsbo Place Division 8 Redevelopment Site Plan Review and Master Plan Amendment, subject to the SEPA Mitigations and Conditions of Approval contained in the Staff Report under Planning file P-03-24-20-01.

**RT:** I second.

**RT:** We have a motion, and a second, for approval. All those in favor signify by Aye.

**(Ayes.)**

**RS:** Any nays? (None.) Any abstentions? (None.)

**(RS)** The Motion passes. Okay, thank you very much. That's it. I think it's a very nice looking proposal.

**Mike Brown:** Thank you all, we really appreciate your support and the support of the Staff. In my job, it's one of the pleasures to work on something that's creative like this with folks as talented as Charlie, and the City's Planning Staff has been very, very interested in making sure that this last piece Division 8 of the Poulsbo Place Master Plan is executed in the right way. And I appreciate City Staff's work on that and their creative nature also. And we look forward to actually wrapping this thing up after many long years. Thank you.

**Charlie Wenzlau:** Anthony, thank you as well, you were a key player. Again, this has been so professionally done, it's been so collaborative. It's such a significant project, to blend all your planning goals and your oversight into what I think is hopefully going to be part of the future of

Poulsbo, you know, when people take pictures in the future, so it's thrilling for me and thank everybody.

**RS:** Okay. We will move on to the next item on the agenda. We will have the Public Hearing; so I'm going to close the public meeting and open the public hearing at this point.

**6b. Public Hearing for 2021 Comprehensive Plan Amendments (Nikole Coleman)**

**Slide 1: Title Slide.** Good evening. Nikole Coleman with the Planning Department, here to talk to you about the 2021 Comprehensive Plan Amendments. This is the Public Hearing tonight. I know in previous years, we've done a Workshop and then a Public Hearing, but we only had two applications, and they're both internal this year. So we didn't feel like it was necessary to take your time with a Workshop and then have Public Hearings. You received your Staff Report last week, which outlines the projects, so I'm just going to do a quick summary. Then I'm happy to answer questions. We also have Engineering Staff on, Diane and Anthony, to answer any questions you might have about the application that they submitted.

**Slide 2: Comprehensive Plan Description.** Just as a quick reminder, the Comprehensive Plan describes the 20-year vision for Poulsbo and how that vision will be achieved. The plan covers things such as land use, community character, transportation, housing, parks and rec, open space, economic development and utilities. The Comprehensive Plan is mandated by the Washington State Growth Management Act. Major Comprehensive Plan updates are mandated by the state every 8 years. The last update was adopted in 2016. However, in between those major updates, the City is able to consider minor amendments to the Comprehensive Plan on an annual basis. That's what we have here for you tonight.

**Slide 3. Review Process.** Just a quick summary of the review process, as is every year, our deadline is November 15th, or the 16th - because it fell on a Sunday. That's the deadline for applications, and then the process is for the applications to be officially approved or docketed to the next step in the process by the City Council, and that took place on January 13th. We had a Notice of Application with optional DNS that was issued, and as stated in the Staff Report, there were not any comments received during that public comment period. We still have not received any public comments up to this point in the process. We're here today with your Public Hearing, and then we'll move on to the City Council approval process. And again, we're moving right to Public Hearing, tentatively planned for March 17th right now.

**Slide 4.** Overview of 2021 Applications.

**Slide 5.** City-Initiated. P-11-17-20-01, Text Amendment, Engineering Department. Application 1 is a text amendment submitted by the Engineering Department. It is changes to Chapter 4 of the Transportation Policy, TR 9-10, to update an existing policy regarding development of the Liberty Bay Waterfront Trail. The update links goals and public access requirements of the Shoreline Master Program with non-motorized policies of the Transportation Chapter.

**Slide 6.** City-Initiated. P-11-17-20-02, Text Amendment, Planning Department. And then the second application that was submitted by the Planning Department is one that you see yearly. You should be very familiar with this if you've been on the Planning Commission at least one

year, which is an application that includes a text amendment to Chapter 12, the Capital Facilities Plan, to update Table CFP-4, (which is the City of Poulsbo 6-Year Capital Improvement Projects) to reflect the proposed projects listed in the 2020-2026 Capital Improvement Projects. So again, this table for the 20-2020 Capital Improvements Plan (CIP) was approved by the City Council at the end of 2020. And this is simply the process of adopting it as part of a Comprehensive Plan, which we do and is required on a yearly basis.

**Slide 7. Approval Criteria (PMC Ch 18.210)** There are approval criteria for Comprehensive Plan Amendments in Poulsbo Municipal Code Chapter 18.210. (Criteria listed on slide.) That's where they are located, and I walk through that in the Staff Report.

**Slide 8. 2021 Comprehensive Plan Amendments Staff Conclusions.** In conclusion, Staff has concluded that the Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan are either based upon new information or a change in circumstances since the initial adoption of the Comprehensive Plan; are internally consistent with the Comprehensive Plan; and are not detrimental to the public health, safety and welfare of the City.

**Slide 9. Suggested Motion.** Therefore, Staff respectfully recommends approval of all proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments as set forth in your February 16th Staff Report. And then my suggested motion.

"MOVE to recommend approval to the Poulsbo City Council, the 2021 Comprehensive Plan Amendments, as identified in Exhibit A to the February 16, 2021 Planning Commission Staff Report; and direct the Planning and Economic Development Director to prepare findings of fact in support of this decision for the Planning Commission Chair's signature."

**RS:** Any questions or comments from Commissioners?

**RT:** I understand that you're going to reduce the size of the trail from 14' to 6'?

**AB:** So what this amendment does: previously, we were held to a Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) standard of a 14' wide shared-use pathway, which is a wonderful facility. But I'm sure, as you are aware, our shoreline is variable in topography. And sometimes that does not work. So what this amendment does is it gives the City different options of treatments based on the landscape that we're dealing with. So at a minimum, we would be providing a 6' wide ADA pathway. But it allows us to use that as a different alternative, and hopefully provide the ultimate goal of having the trails, without being held to the 14' wide standard.

**RT:** But you've also reduced it from being a multiple-use trail, to (I don't remember right now what the name of it was), rather than multiple uses it was going to be, like a walking trail?

**AB:** Yes, so there's a transportation and recreational facilities. It's a double meaning. When it's transportation, it's like a sidewalk - whereas if it's a recreational facility, it has some different reasons for implementation. I did also want to mention that the ability to use a 6' pathway

would lessen environmental impacts compared to if we were in an ecologically sensitive area: a 14' shared use path would have a much larger impact.

**RT:** So, there's no in-between, is that what you're saying, is that you can't go to 10 or 12'?

**AB:** There is an in-between; what we're setting is a maximum and a minimum.

**RT:** Okay, if I get on the trail at one end with my bike, and it's 14'; when do I know that I have to walk my bike?

**AB:** Are you asking if we're going to have specific signage?

**RT:** Yes sir.

**AB:** That would be developed at the time of the project. We don't have a detailed plan for that in place. This is simply to allow the ability to have variability and trail width.

**RT:** I also read that it's going to be multiple surfaces. So how do you get anything other than a hard surface to be ADA compliant?

**AB:** You compact it with a vibratory hammer or plate compactor. It's similar to having ADA trails at Fish Park. We constructed just recently, multiple ADA pathways that are in fact gravel trail.

**RT:** Okay. But I see that I see from experience that those are going to require a lot of maintenance, to make sure that that portion remains ADA-compliant. Just because of the types of weather we are under.

**AB:** Yes; this amendment is not setting in stone where we're going to put these trails. It's simply allowing variability and giving our Staff the ability to provide good engineering judgment based on all the variables of development along our shoreline.

**RT:** Okay, what I read didn't say there was going to be a minimum and a maximum. All it said was you can reduce it to 6' width. I may have missed them.

**AB:** I'm looking at the statement it does say "may be constructed as a 6'-wide recreational path." So I would ask Diane, is this an either/or, or a variable width?

**DL:** The proposed amendment that we submitted recommended construction of a minimum 6' ADA-compliant hard surface. So the intent was for it to be a minimum of 6'. For those of you who have been around for a while, you may know that we applied for federal funds for the Liberty Bay Trail. We've been working on that for about 6 or 7 years. And the environmental process associated with a trail in the shoreline and overwater has gotten much more complicated. It's clear that that federally-funded process could take an extensive amount of time and may or may not be feasible. So, what this amendment does is it allows us to have maybe a lesser trail, but still a very desirable trail that would connect all the way around Liberty Bay and provide value to citizens. We haven't completely given up on something that's wider,

but we also know that it would be very challenging to make it happen. So as Anthony mentioned, this adds some flexibility to what we can do around Liberty Bay and get a trail in for citizens.

**RT:** Thank you.

**RS:** Any other questions or comments? (None.)

**(RS)** Okay, does someone want to give us a motion?

**TM:** I'll make a motion: to move to recommend approval to the Poulsbo City Council, the 2021 Comprehensive Plan Amendments, as identified in Exhibit A to the February 16, 2021 Planning Commission Staff Report; and direct the Planning and Economic Development Director to prepare findings of fact in support of this decision for the Planning Commission Chair's signature.

**MK:** I will second.

**RS:** I have a motion in a second. All those in favor signify by Aye.  
**(Ayes)**

**RS:** Any nays? (None.) Any abstentions? (None.) The ayes have it. Okay.

**NC:** Thank you.

**RS:** I'll close the public hearing and open the public meeting.

## **7. Director's Report & Report on Council Actions**

**KB:** I do have a report to the Planning Commission tonight. Good to see all of you. I wanted to report mostly about the permit activity that we're experiencing in the Planning Department, as well as our Long-Range Planning work for 2021.

So, starting off with our current Planning permit processing, if I may - and actually if I may indulge just for a moment about Poulsbo Place. It is a little bit of a bookend for me because I started working for the City of Poulsbo in 1995. One of my first projects was the Poulsbo Place Redevelopment Master Plan. I remember its approval out of the Planning Commission in December of 1995, and to the City Council in January of 1996. It's been a long time to see it come to its final conclusion.

**(KB)** Anyways, for that - we have 20 projects, either approved in the queue, 3 under construction. They're all residential projects. And if all of those come to fruition, meaning that they've undergone approval, and they get developed, it's going to bring a total of 1,215 new residential units into the City of Poulsbo. Four-hundred twelve (412) of those will be single-family detached homes, and 803 of those will be multifamily units.

I will just want to do the asterisk on the multifamily; 500 of that 800 is the Edward Rose Project, or now what is called the Oslo Bay Apartments on highway 3, and 305. So they're all in various places and moving through the process.

**(KB)** What we're going to see actually in 2021 is one 100-unit apartment that is actually already under construction up at College Marketplace, by the Olympic College campus. And we have two Preliminary Plats: Poulsbo Meadows and Crystal View, that will be final platting and under construction.

So all of those units aren't going to drop in Poulsbo this year or next year, it will probably be over 4-year to 5- year span, is what we're going to expect to see. But I wanted to let you know that those are all real projects. So stay tuned. I will note too, that we're seeing this in all jurisdictions. This isn't unique to Poulsbo. Just about every jurisdiction in Kitsap County is experiencing historic permit records. I talk to Planning Directors on a very regular basis, and all of them are reporting the same thing. So I think Kitsap County is becoming a popular place and there's a market for it.

**(KB)** The other thing I'd like to report on and if you have any questions, at the end, feel free. We have a busy year for our long-range planning. We have our (as you know, you've gotten a couple emails about our) Shoreline Master Program Update. You will be getting your review with an overview by Nikole starting next week. And then you'll be digging into your role as the City's long-range document advisory group. It will be as you normally do - methodical and page-by-page. Nikole will be your lead Planner on that, and we'll be walking you through that update.

But in addition to that, you also know that we're working on a Housing Action Plan. We do plan to have a check-in with you all. Nikole, are we doing a live zoom meeting? Or is it just going to be a check in with everybody? Do we have any people- have we decided yet?

**NC:** We haven't quite made that decision.

**KB:** You'll be hearing back from us and our consultant on our housing action plan. The survey results, I think you know, are posted on our webpage. And thank you for those of you that took part in our Housing Action Plan survey. I mentioned to you last year or perhaps the year before that I was seeking funding to do a Commercial Land Market Analysis. We were able to secure the those funds in this year's budget, so we have hired an economist to do an evaluation of what Poulsbo's commercial land needs are.

This is actually very instrumental in working on our 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update, which Nikole spoke to you about at our last the Comprehensive Plan Amendment agenda item. We are gearing up to our 8-year periodic update which is the 2024 Comprehensive Plan Update. We are beginning work now. The Housing Action Plan will be part of that. The Commercial Lands Market Analysis will be part of it. We'll be sharing all this information with you as we progress. This is going to be your technical work.

**(KB)** We are working on update to our Best Available Science, which is the foundational document for our Critical Areas Ordinance Update. We are also assisting the Parks Department

and their development of their Parks and Recreation and Open Space Plan that will go through the Park Commission, so you won't necessarily see it. Just know that your Planners are or will be working with the Parks Department on development of that; you will see it when it is part of the Comprehensive Plan.

**(KB)** I'm busy working with the Regional Planning Directors, as well as other agencies on the Countywide Planning Policy Update. This update will also be a foundational piece that the Comprehensive Plan has to be based on and be consistent with. The Countywide Planning Policies are being updated because our Multi-countywide planning policies, which is through Puget Sound Regional Council, was updated in December. And so we're working this year to amend ours to ensure consistency with PSRC's.

And finally, we're working with Kitsap County and their Buildable Lands reporting requirements. This is a requirement of the Growth Management Act that we do Buildable Land reporting prior to the periodic update for the Comprehensive Plan.

**(KB)** I just wanted to give you those quick updates. Certainly, if you have any questions, let me know if you want to talk offline, drop me an email or phone call. I'm happy to chat with you. I just wanted to let you know that we're busy on both sides of our house right now. Our Current Planning and our Long-Range Planning.

**RS:** Okay, thank you, Karla. Yeah, it's been a long time that we've been working on these plans.

**8. Commissioner Concerns (None.)**

**9. Meeting adjourned 8:28 p.m.**