



City of Poulsbo Planning Commission

City Hall – 200 NE Moe Street



Subject	Meeting Minutes	Date	3/28/2023
Recorder	Tiffany Simmons	Start Time	6:00pm
Committee Chair	Ray Stevens	Est. End Time	8:00pm
Committee Members	Jerry Block, Mark Kipps, Ray Taylor, Doug Newell, David Strickon		
Staff Present	Heather Wright, PED Director, Tiffany Simmons, Planning Technician, Nikole Coleman, Senior Planner, Kimberly Hendrickson, Housing, Health and Human Services Director		

		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: 02/28/2023	Commissioner RT moved to approve, seconded by Commissioner JB. All Aye's.
6:03pm	5.	Comments from Citizens	None.
6:05pm	6.	Presentation of Projects for Consideration Quasi-Judicial <input type="checkbox"/> Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N	<p>Housing, Health and Human Services Director Presentation– KH presented. Commissioner DN asked how the planning commission plays a role in the recommendations regarding this area. Chair RS shared the importance in caring for the community as a whole. Commissioner MK shared that he appreciates what the department is and how it provides a better-rounded solution to the community. HW shared some feedback about why we are taking a look at the Health and Human services chapter.</p> <p>Second Review of Health and Human Services Chapter, 2024 Comp Plan Update – NC spoke about the goals and policies. DN shared that he is pleased that it isn't just PED working on this and that there is a department to flesh things out. RS shared that seeing the whole chapter at the end will be helpful, NC agreed. DN shared that its helpful to know that the HHH department did agree and approve the proposed goals and policies.</p> <p>First Review of Housing Chapter, 2024 Comp Plan</p>

Agenda

Time	No.	Topic	Details
			<p>Update –NC presented. RS shared about his experience as a builder in his previous work and asked if there’s more details on how we hit the goals we are setting, NC responded. RS shared about the unknown with the legality of “plan for and accommodate”, NC responded. RS asked who creates the housing allocations, NC and HW responded. MK asked if any of the house bills have a way to keep the housing (If allocated at a lower rate) can be assured to be taken by the specific income defined group, HW responded. RT shared that sometimes the numbers don’t actually line up with what happens in the future, NC responded. RS shared that there is concern about big builders coming in and that local companies tend to help build the community, NC responded. RS shared the importance in not leaving a loophole, NC responded. DN asked if there were specific examples in other communities of things that were successfully adopted and implemented, NC responded. DN clarified the question, Pousbo doesn’t seem to need to change zoning drastically in order to accommodate, NC responded.</p> <p>Goal HS 1 – MK shared that it seems like most of this goal really seems to fall under Goal HS 2, could we potentially combine the two goals or clean up Goal HS 1, NC noted. JB shared that there was no heading on Goal HS 2, NC responded.</p> <p>Policy HS 1.1 – RT asked what “provide sufficient land” means when we only have a set amount of land, NC responded. RS shared that this is why we have densities set in out residential zones, NC responded.</p> <p>Policy HS 1.3 – RS asked if the job centers are supposed to be located in town, mostly the way this is written is challenging, NC responded.</p> <p>Policy HS 1.7 – JB shared a difficulty reading this policy and asked for clarification, NC clarified. RS asked what residential uses “developed independently” would mean, NC responded. RS suggested maybe adding some information to clarify this point or replace “independently”, NC noted.</p> <p>Policy HS 1.8 – RS shared dislike for the broad term “allowances”, DN suggested “allow”, NC noted. RS asked if this is contingent on bill 5466, HW responded. RT asked how wide is the 305 corridor is, NC responded.</p> <p>Policy HS 1.9 – Commissioner DS asked if the word</p>

			Agenda
Time	No.	Topic	Details
			<p>“advance” could change to “improve”, JB shared some confusion as well, asking if we should add some safeguards, NC responded and noted the change. RS shared that we should really think about what these should be, explaining that it is a bit too broad, NC responded.</p> <p>Policy HS 2.1- RS asked how we would accommodate this, since this is defined by the market, NC responded. MK shared some clarification on the situation, being, “expand the supply” and that “affordable” has a range, NC responded.</p> <p>Policy HS 3.3 – MK asked if this is focusing on the whole city, or a specific part of the city NC provided some feedback. DN asked if this was an existing policy, should “Shall” be proper, NC responded. RS shared the importance of this for aging in place as well, NC responded.</p> <p>RS asked why we stuck through 2.5, NC provided some feedback. RS asked if we were familiar with the “old town study”, NC responded. RS shared the desire to preserve the “old town” area in the future, NC responded. Conversation was held about adding this policy back in.</p> <p>Goal HS 4 – MK shared that this might be repetitive, and we might consider blending together this with the other Goals, HW provided some feedback. RS shared that this will also help readability for PSRC. MK and DN shared that maybe this goal can be more specific, NC responded. Some options for expanding this goal language were discussed.</p> <p>Policy HS 4.2 – DS asked what “Cultural displacement” meant in this situation, NC provided feedback.</p> <p>Policy HS 4.5 – JB asked if “faith based” should be included in addition to non-profit, NC noted this addition.</p> <p>Policy HS 4.8 – RS asked if the word “with” should be “or”, NC noted.</p> <p>Policy HS 4.9 – JB asked if this is necessary for the comp plan or if this would be beneficial elsewhere, HW provided feedback. JB shared that the PC most likely wouldn’t recommend this work, it would be the council, HW responded. RS asked why we are limiting it to the 80%,</p>

			Agenda	
Time	No.	Topic		Details
				HW responded. RT asked if the housing costs would then increase because of property tax, HW responded. NC asked what the consensus was and further discussion was held.
7:47pm	7.	Director's Report		HW provided information on active and prior council actions in regards to the department, upcoming items for Planning Commission and upcoming meetings.
7:53pm	8.	Commissioner Comments		RS shared some interest in upcoming bills.
7:55pm	9.	Adjournment 7:55pm		

Summary: Minutes were approved.

Ray Stevens, Planning Commission Chairman