



City of Poulsbo
Planning Commission
 City Hall – 200 NE Moe Street



Subject	Meeting Minutes	Date	12/13/2022
Recorder	Tiffany Simmons	Start Time	6:00pm
Acting Committee Chair	Mark Kipps	Est. End Time	8:13pm
Committee Members	Jerry Block, Ray Stevens, Kate Nunes, Ray Taylor, Doug Newell, David Strickon		
Staff Present	Heather Wright, PED Director, Tiffany Simmons, PED Administrative Assistant, Nikole Coleman		

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: 09/27/2022	Approval motion made by Commissioner JB seconded by RT. All Aye's.
6:03pm	5.	Comments from Citizens	None.
6:05pm	6.	Presentation of Projects for Consideration	<p>Economic Development Chapter, 2024 Comp Plan Amend – HW presented the economic development chapter. Commissioner DN asked who was actively doing the tasks described in the chapter, HW responded. Some discussion was held on changing the verbiage. Goal ED 1- None. Policy ED 1.1- DN asked how this goal would be implemented, HW responded. Policy ED 1.2- JB asked if this language is excluding the larger/national companies, HW responded. Commissioner KN asked if removing the word "local" might be a good adjustment, HW noted this. DN added that we might not necessarily want some of these larger companies, NC added that the goal of PSRC might be that local business need more support. Commissioner/Chair RS agreed that we should create two separate categories to support local and large companies. Commissioner DS added that it does focus on production and that some larger companies are only retail, not production. Policy ED 1.3-Commissioner MK asked if we need to implement the language that was used in PSRC for the Tech companies and innovation, HW responded. Policy ED 1.4- None.</p>

Quasi-Judicial
 Y N

			Agenda	
Time	No.	Topic	Details	
			<p>Policy ED 1.5- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 1.6- RS shared that "consider" is not a declaration statement and that these should contain declaration language, NC offered "evaluate and amend" instead.</p> <p>Policy ED 1.7-None.</p> <p>Policy ED 1.8-None.</p> <p>Policy ED 1.9-RS asked for a rewrite, HW noted.</p> <p>Policy ED 1.10-None.</p> <p>Goal ED 2</p> <p>Policy ED 2.1- DN asked why we decided to add to this, HW responded. DN commented that some of the bullets might be things the College should be doing, not the city, NC offered some ideas, more inclusive language was discussed.</p> <p>Policy ED 2.2- DN shared that his thoughts are relatively the same as 2.1., NC responded. DN emphasized that all campus' are an investment to the community.</p> <p>Policy ED 2.3- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 2.4- DN added that this might be better off moved to the top of the policies.</p> <p>Policy ED 2.5- RS added that some trades language might be a good addition here.</p> <p>Goal ED 3 – DN asked when we have to start obtaining more land as part of our growth, HW responded.</p> <p>Policy ED 3.1- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 3.2-JB asked if this means we will be implementing commercial within residential spaces, HW responded. Commissioner RT added that this can cause problems with traffic, NC and RS responded.</p> <p>Policy ED 3.3- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 3.4- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 3.5- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 3.6- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 3.7- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 3.8- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 3.9- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 3.10- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 3.11- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 3.12- None.</p> <p>Goal ED 4</p> <p>Policy ED 4.1- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 4.2- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 4.3- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 4.4- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 4.5- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 4.6- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 4.7- KN shared that it would be nice if the</p>	

			Agenda	
Time	No.	Topic	Details	
				<p>utilities would be extended to existing networks or non-served areas while we are already in the street, NC responded.</p> <p>Policy ED 4.8- None.</p> <p>Goal ED 5</p> <p>Policy ED 5.1- JB shared that he would like national groups represented as well, HW responded. MK shared that even large groups are local once they are here.</p> <p>Policy ED 5.2- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 5.3- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 5.4- KN was curious why we need to look at parking for the port, HW responded. DN seconded this idea, NC responded.</p> <p>Policy ED 5.5- KN asked what we mean by economic diversity, HW and NC responded.</p> <p>Policy ED 5.6- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 5.7- DN asked where this change came from, HW responded. DN asked if the city has the capacity to do this, HW responded. MK added that this should be written as an action then, HW noted. RS shared that new businesses might enjoy this. RT shared that the form on the website is helpful, but it does need to be updated.</p> <p>Goal ED 6</p> <p>Policy ED 6.1- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 6.2- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 6.3- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 6.4- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 6.5- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 6.6- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 6.7- None.</p> <p>Goal ED 7</p> <p>Policy ED 7.1- RS asked if we could add language to include any additional entities that may come into play, HW responded. JB asked where the tourism is coming from, HW responded. JB asked if there was a way to describe it as small-scale events or tourism, HW responded. DN shared that the parking capacity and other factors of downtown can't exactly handle it, NC responded. DN shared that the policies should include infrastructure improvements to be able to handle increased tourism capacity, NC responded.</p> <p>Policy ED 7.2- KN shared the desire for a "Hiker/Biker Campsite" for the tour groups and that American legion park has some good potential spots, HW responded.</p> <p>Policy ED 7.3- None.</p> <p>Policy ED 7.4- DS shared that these policies can help with the overloaded capacity while bringing tourism, RS and NC responded.</p>

			Agenda
Time	No.	Topic	Details
			<p>Policy ED 7.5- None.</p> <p>Religious Properties Density Bonus Discussion – HW presented.</p> <p>The commissioners requested a quick history on the situation, HW responded. DN asked if we could broaden the density bonus to more than Religious Properties, HW responded. RT asked how you keep the developer from having a religious property buy a parcel and then build regular housing instead of low income, HW and NC responded. DN asked if it might be better to wait until MSRC has the chance to look at it before we proceed, HW responded. RT asked if the home is sold if that stays affordable or not, HW responded. JB shared that this should be maintained for 50 years, HW responded. DN shared that limiting the bonus to only ALL affordable would probably be the best option, JB agreed. RS shared that we should have the buildings done concurrently if used for separate buildings. RS also shared the desire to wait, implement a broad ordinance and edit it once other jurisdictions have successfully completed the program. RS shared that it is any property CONTROLLED by a religious organization and how that may be challenging, NC responded. MK shared that these concerns on this being abused might be why its limited to Religious Properties, because they cannot make a profit. DN shared the discomfort with implementing this now. MK asked what Nordic Cottages is doing and how that could be used as an example, HW responded. The commission decided to pause until we have a missing middle discussion in 2023.</p>
8:03 pm	7.	Directors Report	HW shared information on recent council decisions, meeting updates, the upcoming planning commission schedule and 2022 planning commission accomplishments.
8:10		Commissioner Comments	JB shared his thanks for the work and flexibility from the team.
8:13pm	8.	Adjournment 8:13pm	

Summary: Minutes were approved.



Ray Stevens, Planning Commission Chairman