



City of Poulsbo

Planning Commission *Special Meeting*

City Hall – 200 NE Moe Street

Subject	Meeting Minutes	Date	05/24/2022
Recorder	Tiffany Simmons	Start Time	6:00pm
Committee Chair	Ray Stevens	Est. End Time	7:22pm
Committee Members	Jerry Block, Mark Kipps, Ray Taylor, Doug Newell, David Strickon		
Staff Present	Mayor, Becky Erickson, Heather Wright, PED Director, Dan Schoonmaker, Parks Director, Mike Lund, PW Superintendent, Nikole Coleman, Senior Planner, Tiffany Simmons, PED Administrative Assistant,		

[Packet Link](#)

		Agenda	
Time	No.	Topic	Details
6pm	1.	Call To Order	
6:00pm	2.	Pledge of Allegiance	
6:01pm	3	Modifications to the Agenda	None.
6:02pm	4.	Approval of Minutes: 05/10/2022	Approved by Commissioner MK, Seconded by Commissioner JB. Commissioner RT abstained, all others Aye.
6:03pm	5.	Comments from Citizens	None.
6:08pm	6.	Presentation of Projects for Consideration	<p>Stormwater Vaults as Public Parks –HW PED Director, DS, Parks Director, ML, PW Superintendent, Mayor, BE presented.</p> <p>MK asked ML to clarify on the park maintenance itself, not just the vault, would it be more difficult being many small parks, ML and DS responded.</p> <p>Commissioner DN asked if the size of the vaults is efficient enough to support uses like courts, etc. that people will go out of their way for, BE and DS responded.</p> <p>Chair RS shared that Neighborhood parks vs. community parks are semi-defined by who uses the park (An HOA or the Public). RS also commented the confusion about fencing off the vault entrance with the premise of the conversation being open space and added comment on the needed impact fee and traffic discussion. RS added some ideas on partial impact fees.</p> <p>JB shared his input on the lack of space to provide facilities like restrooms, parking, etc. and shared his agreement with RS comment on potentially only using certain vaults as community parks, based on space.</p> <p>BE added some additional comments. Senior Planner NC shared some photos of current plans. HW presented a</p>

Quasi-Judicial
 Y N

			Agenda	
Time	No.	Topic	Details	
			<p>decision tree.</p> <p>RS asked a clarifying question on "required", HW clarified. Commissioner RT shared that he believes the contractor should supply the amenities and a credit should be supplied so that things are brought full circle.</p> <p>JB shared he would prefer a partial requirement based on the situation; RT reiterated this point. DN added the space is important.</p> <p>MK asked if the code could be written as a case-by-case basis based on the proposed amount of space and additional factors.</p> <p>RS shared curiosity about the Caldart development as an example of repercussions of that vault not counting as an amenity, BE shared some comment.</p> <p>NC shared those developers could still choose to produce a pond and thus an incentive for the developer could be helpful. RS shared some comment.</p> <p>RS shared that maybe we proceed and adjust as the code is written, he also shared some examples of credit options based on building the amenity and amount of space. He shared the desire for some language about adding additional grounding for the city "We reserve the right that we can put something on the property". HW shared that we could work on adjusting the code to have flexibility and starting with the conversation with the developers as not to scare them away.</p> <p>BE shared her comments and agreeance on the flexibility language.</p> <p><u>Second Review of Comprehensive Plan Chapter 1 –</u></p> <p>NC shared the document with redlines. The commissioners were asked to go through and add any comments.</p> <p>Pg1: Guiding Principles item 4. Appears to be missing a word or so (Grammatical comments). MK shared some language suggestions.</p> <p>Pg2: Item 6. DN shared some adjustments with many "and"s. Item 8. DN shared some wording suggestions to adjust the goals of the business we want to attract.</p> <p>Key Goals. NC shared some structure for reviewing the document. RS shared the land use idea for diverse housing as an addition as well.</p> <p>Pg3. Key goals. No comments.</p> <p>NC then provided a survey. She then asked the commissioners to answer the questions provided one at a time. RS shared some flaws with perspective mindsets/bias before taking the responses to strong handedly.</p> <p>RS: Q1: Downtown identity, Neighborhood identity, Natural Environment, Heritage/History/Culture, Site</p>	

			Agenda	
Time	No.	Topic	Details	
				Design/Landscape/Hardscape RT: Q1: Public Safety, Building design (Site Design, hardscape, Landscape), Heritage/History/Culture, Diversity, Local Historic Preservation, Natural Resources, Small Business, Schools/higher education, Public/community spaces JB: Q1: Heritage/History/Culture, Public/Community spaces, Local Historic Preservation, Building Design, Site design/landscape/hardscape MK: Q1: Downtown Identity, Walkability/Pedestrian Friendly, Community/Neighborhood identity, Place (Visual beauty, natural/built) DS: Q1: Community spaces, Public Safety, Community Events, Natural environment, Heritage/History/culture (Diversity), Pedestrian Friendly, Downtown Identity, small business, education. DN: Q1: Downtown Identity, Pedestrian Friendly, Public/Community Spaces, Natural Environment, Small Business BE: Q1: Natural environment, Downtown Identity, Neighborhood identity, History/Heritage/Culture, Schools/Higher Education, Pedestrian Friendly Commissioners shared comments on Q2 and settled that the title potentially does not need anything past community culture.
7:30pm	7.	Director's Report and Report on Council Actions		HW shared updates from the Council and upcoming scheduling.
7:35pm	8.	Commissioner Comments		RT shared that he may or may not be able to attend on June 14 th . RS shared some comments on the newspaper article about the MFTE to council. RS reiterated the special meeting on June 7 th will be at 6pm.
7:40pm	9.	Adjournment 7:22pm.		

Summary: Minutes were approved.

Ray Stevens, Planning Commission Chairman