1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Stevens called the meeting to order at 6:00 pm

2. FLAG SALUTE

3. MODIFICATIONS TO AGENDA - none

4. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF - none

5. COMMENTS FROM CITIZENS - none

6. 2009 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DRAFT REVIEW

CHAPTER 10 – UTILITIES

Karla Boughton, Consultant, gave a power point presentation covering the Utilities and Participation, Implementation and Evaluation chapters of the Comp Plan. She discussed: (1) the requirements of GMA on these issues; (2) the need for a new utility map(3) city managed vs. non city managed utilities; (4) the Participation, Implementation and Evaluation chapter is optional.

Commissioners and staff discussed: (1) what is means by an aggressive water conservation program; (2) the city currently uses the minimum water conservation standards; (3) public works will take more action to make sure water conservation is observed; (4) the flushing of mains; (5) metering all water usage including construction trucks and dust control measures; (6) the city needs
to get a better idea of water that is not accounted for; (7) developing incentives for low flow and conservation measures; (8) issuing rebates for water saving devices; (9) irrigation metering; (10) rain gauge usage; (11) establishing penalties for excessive water use; (12) having water police issue citations for water usage outside of regulated watering hours from 6 to 10; (13) there should be a definition for the water program and a citation called out; (14) public works wants to increase the monitoring of water usage; (15) the definition of “looping” a water line; (16) not looping the line causes stagnant water; (17) lines have to be flushed more often to keep them clean; (18) state standards are the same as federal ones; (19) state standards supersede county ones; (20) page 150 UT-1.6 is a conflicting statement and needs to be re-arranged.

The discussion continued with: (21) page 150 UT-1.5 homes that are on septic and within 200 ft. from a water line pay a penalty, which is a way for the city to keep track of where functioning septic systems are; (22) the Health Department has the dates of when septic systems were installed; (23) the city doesn’t make people hook up to the system; (24) a good working system is a benefit because the city does not incur any costs; (25) wells are not mentioned separately because the policies are the same; (26) when properties are annexed into the city they are not required to re-certify their wells or septics; (27) the penalty charged to homeowners is equal to the base sewer charge monthly fee; (28) establishing a time frame for hookup, possibly at point of sale; (29) the Health Department looks mostly at critical areas for contamination problems; (30) the penalties are listed in the PW plan.

The discussion continued with: (31) page 149 UT-1.2 needs to be modified; (32) annexation prior to utility extension; (33) city services are an ace in the hole and should not be given away; (34) the city still implements the “no protest” policy when extending utilities; (35) who determines the health emergency; (36) UT-1.1 what standards are used; (37) 1.3 new development must be built to PMC standards; (38) for descriptions, refer to the PW capital facilities plan; (39) page 151 for non-city managed utilities a citation should be given; (40) PSE information needs to be clarified.

The discussion continued with: (41) page 152 if a developer wants to offer gas to the homeowners he has to bring the line in; (42) page 153 UT-2.2 how the city ensures that the regulations are consistent; (43) call out names of cable companies; (44) how often the franchise agreements are reviewed; (45) the city maintains typical contracts with the providers; (46) reviewing complaints about providers; (47) the utility commission has made things more stringent for providers; (48) Goal UT-2 should call out what facilities and what services.
CHAPTER 11 – PARTICIPATION, IMPLEMENTATION AND EVALUATION

Commissioners and staff discussed: (1) Page 159 PI-2.4 establishment of the notification period; (2) the language was provided by the city attorney; (3) comp plan amendments are only done once a year; (4) what is the definition of sufficient; (5) the city has traditional posting regulations; (6) page 158 under Implementation and Evaluation, drop the word “family”; (7) page 159 PI-2.6 how staff is trained to be familiar with State Attorney General’s rules on “takings”; (8) the SAG has a website that staff can look at.

7. **GULDJORD – SHORT PLAT**

Edie Berghoff, Associate Planner, presented the Guldjord short plat which is a proposal to complete a two lot short plat from a 31,803 s.f. lot located at 18389 9th Avenue. She also discussed: (1) zoning of the site and surrounding area; (2) ultimate size of the two lots; (3) the use of the current lot; (4) the future use of the new lot; (5) access to the properties; (6) restrictions on doing another short plat; (7) a comment letter received from an adjacent property owner (David Blaskowsky) who is concerned about water infiltration to his property; (8) the conditions of approval that are in the staff report; (9) the proposal is in conformance to city standards; and (10) all city codes have been addressed.

Commissioners and staff discussed: (1) how the drainage issue will be addressed; (2) storm water runoff; (3) the proposed infiltration pit; (4) there are guidelines that determine where the pit should be located; (5) runoff from the pit.

Jim Groh, City Engineering Department, used an overhead picture of the property and discussed: (1) requirements for the storm water come from the currently adopted storm water manual; (2) the setbacks that are required by code; (3) soil samples will be taken for testing the ability to infiltrate the water; (4) the topography of the area sends the surface water towards Sommerseth St.

Commissioners and staff discussion continued with: (1) the storm water system in the area; (2) the CIP plan shows a connection to Haugen; (3) siting of the infiltration pit is not up-hill, so it should not affect Mr. Blaskowsky’s property; (4) use of appropriate setbacks; (5) using Low Impact Development standards and rain gardens if the infiltration pit does not work; (6) no soil borings have been taken at this time; (7) specifications of the curtain drain installed by Mr. Blaskowsky and whether a permit was obtained to install it; (8) a driveway can go in the setback from the curtain drain; (9) a driveway can be made to slope into a vegetative strip; (10) the curtain drain is next to the footing of the garage and its depth is not known.
MOTION: NORDNES/HANSEN. The Planning Commission shall hereby recommend to the City Engineering approval of the Guldjord short plat planning file #02-06-09-1, subject to the Conditions of Approval. 6 for. 1 absent.

Chairman Stevens disclosed that he lives close to the Reinhart short plat which is next on the agenda and that he feels he can be impartial in reviewing the application. No objections were heard to him remaining at the table.

8. REINHART (Xenos) – SHORT PLAT

Edie Berghoff, Associate Planner, presented the Reinhart (Xenos) short plat, which is a proposal to complete a three lot short plat from an approximately 0.81 acre site located at 985 NE Swanson Way. She then discussed: (1) zoning of the site and surrounding area; (2) ultimate size of the lots; (3) the use of the current lot; (4) future use of the new lots; (5) access to the properties; (6) storm water easements; (7) a comment letter received from the O’Leary’s; and the proximity of the site to Swanson Way.

Commissioners and Staff discussed: (1) no vacation of property is proposed because it is city right-of-way; (2) conditions of approval for the short plat; (3) exclusive access to the site from Swanson; (4) access to the site from Hwy 305 is going to be prohibited; (5) a gate and/or bollards will be placed at either end to prevent vehicle passage; (6) trees will not be cut because they are in the city right-of-way; (7) the conditions of approval don’t say anything about not cutting the trees; (8) the applicant is doing the improvements required in the conditions of approval; (9) adverse possession is not allowed on a right-of-way; (10) utilities are also in the right-of-way; Swanson will not be a driveway, but it can be walked; (11) a board fence on the north side has been moved; (12) the state has not asked that the board fence on the west side of the property be moved; (13) who makes the decisions regarding right-of-way modifications; (14) condition #42 makes reference to an approval that the PC doesn’t have a copy of to look at; (15) if the City Engineer says it is ok he is the one that is in charge.

MOTION: NORDNES/HENRY. The Planning Commission shall hereby recommend to the City Engineer approval of the Reinhart (Xenos) short plat, Planning File #03-03-06-1, subject to the Conditions of Approval for a site located at 985 NE Swanson Way.

9. CONTINUED COMMENTS FROM CITIZENS

David Blaskowsky discussed: (1) this is the 2nd short plat in his neighborhood; (2) his property lines got moved during the surveying; (3) the monument in the street
was removed and never replaced; (4) the easement was in line with the road; (5) now his flower bed is in the easement; (5) there are errors in the easements; (6) there is a plat discrepancy on the SW corner.

Commissioners and staff discussed: (1) staff will talk with the engineer that did the plat; (2) errors in property lines do not affect the PC’s decision making abilities; (3) adverse possession; (4) with new technology there are bound to be errors in property lines; (5) the PC is not establishing lot lines, they are reviewing a land use decision; (6) Mr. Blaskowsky should get his property surveyed.

Jan Wold discussed: (1) population growth rate; and (2) poor advertising of the PC meetings.

10. **COMMISSION COMMENTS - none**

The meeting was adjourned at 7:48 pm

__________________________________
Ray Stevens
Chairman, Poulsbo Planning Commission