

City of Poulsbo

Planning & Economic Development



July 30, 2026

Montebanc Management LLC
400 NW Gilman Blvd Suite 2781
Issaquah, WA 98027
Email: pjdevenzio@montebanc.com

Subject: Pinnacle at Liberty Bay PRD and Preliminary Subdivision | P-06-20-25-03 | Request for Revisions No. 5

Dear Applicant,

This letter is to notify you that the Planning and Economic Development Department (PED) has completed the fifth technical review cycle for the above-referenced application following the applicant's resubmittal received on July 21, 2026. Attached are review memoranda from the City's reviewing departments identifying the remaining revisions necessary for the application to proceed. Please submit a complete response to each review comment, including a detailed response matrix identifying how each comment has been addressed and where the revisions can be found within the revised plans and supporting documents. To facilitate staff review, all revisions shall be clearly identified through revision clouds or another approved change-tracking method.

Permit Review Timeline

Consistent with [PMC 19.80.030\(C\), \(E\), and \(F\)](#), and [Chapter 36.70B RCW](#), the City's permit review timeline provides for a review period of 290 days, excluding periods during which the application is with the applicant for preparation of requested revisions, additional information, or other applicant-driven delay:

- [PMC 19.80.030\(C\)](#): For project permits which require public notice per [PMC 19.50.020](#) and a public hearing per [PMC 19.50.040](#), permit decisions shall be issued within one hundred seventy (170) days of the determination of technically complete per [PMC 19.30.030](#).
- [PMC 19.80.030\(E\)](#): The permit decision time frames listed above include two technical/staff review cycles. For every additional technical/staff review cycle, an additional thirty days shall be added to the permit decision time frame. Additional fees may also be required per the current fee schedule.
- [PMC 19.80.030\(F\)](#): An additional thirty days is added to the permit decision time frames listed above if the city requests additional information from an applicant and the applicant is nonresponsive for sixty consecutive days and/or if the applicant requests that the city suspend their review of the application per [PMC 19.80.040\(B\)](#).

As of the date of this letter, the application has been under active City review for a total of ninety-five (95) days and has remained with the applicant for two hundred sixty-five (265) days. Accordingly, the City remains well within the applicable statutory permit review period.

With issuance of this Request for Revisions, the City's permit review timeline is again suspended in accordance with [PMC 19.80.050](#). The review timeline will resume upon receipt of a complete resubmittal responsive to the attached review comments. Pursuant to [PMC 19.80.050\(A\)](#), failure to submit the requested revisions, corrections, studies, and supporting information within ninety (90) calendar days of this request will result in the application being deemed null and void.

Staff's objective remains to complete a thorough, coordinated, and legally defensible review of the proposal to ensure that all applicable development regulations and decision criteria have been fully addressed prior to issuance of a recommendation to the Planning Commission.

If you have any questions regarding the attached review comments, permit review timeline, or resubmittal requirements, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Nikole Coleman

Nikole Coleman, AICP
Planning Manager



PLANNING AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

200 NE Moe Street | Poulsbo, Washington 98370
(360) 394-9748 | fax (360) 697-8269
www.cityofpoulsbo.com | plan&econ@cityofpoulsbo.com

MEMO

To: Montebanc Management LLC
From: Nikole Coleman, AICP, Planning Manager
Subject: Pinnacle at Liberty Bay PRD; Request for Revisions No. 5; P-06-20-25-03
Date: July 30, 2026

Following receipt of the July 21, 2026, resubmittal, PED staff completed an additional detailed review of the revised plans and supporting documents. Throughout the review process, the project plans have continued to evolve, with numerous revisions to roadway geometry, grading, retaining walls, utilities, lot configuration, and site design. Staff notes that many of these revisions were not clearly identified or clouded on the plan sets, making it difficult to efficiently identify changes and evaluate their implications. As a result, staff has completed a comprehensive review of the revised submittal and identified the following additional revisions that must be addressed prior to completion of the City's review.

1. *Plan Coordination.* Revise the Preliminary Plat, Civil Plans, Landscape and Open Space Plan, Tree Protection Plan, Architectural Exhibit, Critical Areas documents, and all supporting narratives to ensure consistency throughout the application materials. All plans and supporting documents shall accurately reflect the final roadway configuration, lot layout, grading, retaining walls, tract boundaries, open space, and project statistics. All revisions shall be clearly identified in the project documents.
2. *Revised Geotechnical Report.* Submit a revised geotechnical report prepared by the project geotechnical engineer evaluating the revised site design and confirming that the proposed grading, retaining walls, roadway improvements, stormwater facilities, and associated infrastructure remain consistent with the geotechnical recommendations. The report shall specifically address revised slope stability analyses, retaining wall design assumptions, foundation recommendations, groundwater conditions, construction sequencing, and any changes resulting from the revised plans.

Upon receipt, the revised geotechnical report may be forwarded to the City's independent geotechnical peer reviewer. Additional revisions to the report or project plans may be required based on the results of that peer review prior to staff completing its recommendation.

3. *Retaining Wall Design and Long-Term Maintenance.* The revised plans propose an extensive system of retaining walls, both internal and external to the subdivision, including numerous walls of substantial height. While the applicant has indicated that detailed structural engineering will be completed during grading permit review, the City cannot adequately evaluate or recommend approval of the Preliminary Subdivision without sufficient information to understand the impacts of these walls on the development. Because the retaining walls are integral to the proposed subdivision design, their location, scale, and long-term maintenance obligations are necessary for staff to evaluate compliance with the Preliminary Subdivision approval criteria and Planned Residential Development objectives.

The retaining walls represent a significant permanent feature of the subdivision and create substantial long-term ownership and maintenance obligations for individual property owners and the future HOA. Prior to completion of the City's review, revise the plans and supporting documentation to clearly identify:

- The general construction type of all retaining walls;
- Ownership and long-term maintenance responsibility for each wall;
- Required access easements for inspection, maintenance, repair, and replacement;



- The relationship between retaining walls and adjacent lots, roadways, sidewalks, utilities, open space, and critical areas; and
- Proposed architectural treatment and landscape screening of exposed wall faces.

In addition, staff notes that [PMC 18.130.080](#) (Fencing and Retaining Wall Standards) limits retaining walls located within required setbacks to a maximum height of six feet.

4. *Landscape Coordination with Retaining Walls and Utilities.* Revise the Landscape and Open Space Plan to demonstrate that proposed landscaping, including street trees, shrubs, and other plantings, can be accommodated without conflicting with retaining walls, retaining wall foundations, utility easements, stormwater facilities, required maintenance access, or underground utility infrastructure. Revise plant locations or species, as necessary, to eliminate conflicts and ensure adequate soil volume and long-term plant viability.
5. *Landscape Treatment of Retaining Walls.* Revise the Landscape and Open Space Plan to provide landscape treatment adjacent to retaining walls, where feasible, to soften the visual appearance of exposed wall faces while maintaining required structural setbacks, utility clearances, and maintenance access. Demonstrate that proposed vegetation is compatible with the retaining wall design and long-term maintenance requirements.
6. *On-Street Parking Adjacent to Retaining Walls.* Several proposed on-street parking spaces appear to be located immediately adjacent to retaining walls. Revise the civil and landscape plans to demonstrate that retaining wall placement provide adequate maneuvering space between public parking spaces and the retaining wall. If necessary, revise the retaining wall alignment or parking configuration to ensure that all public parking spaces remain functional and accessible.
7. *Tract F Ownership and Maintenance.* Revise to divide proposed Tract F into separate tracts reflecting distinct ownership and maintenance responsibilities. The tract containing the public stormwater facility shall be dedicated to and maintained by the City. The tract containing recreation amenities, landscaping, open space improvements, and other private facilities shall be owned and maintained by the HOA. Revise all associated plans, tract tables, maintenance notes, and ownership information to reflect the revised tract configuration.
8. *Wetland A Buffer Clarification.* The revised plans appear to depict a retaining wall within Tract C adjacent to Road C that may extend into the Wetland A buffer, including the approved 515-square-foot buffer averaging area. Please clarify whether the retaining wall, associated footing, reinforcement, grading, or construction disturbance extends into the approved wetland buffer or averaging area. If so, revise the plans or submit updated critical area documentation demonstrating that the proposal remains consistent with the approved Critical Areas Report, buffer averaging analysis, and mitigation measures. Any modification to the approved wetland buffer or mitigation area shall require Planning review and approval.
9. *Grading Within Mitigated Wetland Buffer Areas.* The grading plans appear to depict grading and land disturbance within previously mitigated wetland buffer areas at several locations throughout the project site. Please identify all areas where grading, clearing, utility installation, retaining wall construction, temporary construction disturbance, or other site improvements are proposed within existing mitigation areas or restored wetland buffers.

Provide additional information describing the extent of these impacts and demonstrate how disturbed mitigation areas will be protected, restored, or otherwise mitigated. If impacts extend beyond those previously evaluated in the approved Critical Areas Report, Habitat Management Plan, or mitigation plans, submit revised critical area documentation prepared by the project wetland consultant evaluating the proposed impacts and identifying any additional mitigation, restoration, monitoring, or maintenance necessary to ensure continued compliance with the City's critical areas regulations.

Staff must be able to determine that the revised grading plan will not compromise the function or long-term success of previously established mitigation areas before completing its review of the Preliminary Subdivision.



ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

200 NE Moe Street | Poulsbo, Washington 98370
(360) 394-9882 | D (360) 394-9767
www.cityofpoulsbo.com | dwashburn@cityofpoulsbo.com

MEMO

To: Nikole Coleman, Planning Manager
From: Donald Washburn, Engineering Technician
Subject: Pinnacle at Liberty Bay PRD and Preliminary Subdivision Submittal #5; P-06-20-25-03
Date: 7/28/2026

The City of Poulsbo Engineering Department has completed its review of **Pinnacle at Liberty Bay – Submittal #5**. The current submittal continues to contain significant deficiencies that must be addressed prior to approval. The following items remain outstanding:

Site Plan:

1. Per City of Poulsbo Construction Standards Appendix B, Section "Other", Note #6, A ten-foot easement fronting all lots shall be dedicated for public utilities. To provide continuous connection of the utilities, the utility easement shall extend along Sunrise Ridge and across Tract D. A dry utility easement will also be required along Road C adjacent to Wetland A unless the City approves its elimination. The applicant's response letter dated 7/21 indicates that dry utilities will be installed in the ROW along Tract Y to accommodate retaining walls. This approach is not acceptable by the Public Works Director, or City Engineer.
2. The applicant's most recent response states that adequate intersection sight distance at Sunrise Ridge cannot be achieved due to the proposed placement of homes on Lots 1 through 4. This is not an acceptable design approach. Where sight distance deficiencies result solely from proposed development design, the development shall be revised accordingly. Construction on these lots will be restricted as necessary to provide the required intersection sight distance. See related comment below regarding feasibility of access to parcel 252601-2-034-2002.

Transportation:

3. As of the writing of this memo, the city has not received sufficient information to determine if the required Baywatch connection is infeasible. As described in the Engineering Connectivity and Access Memorandum (June 15, 2026), construction of NR-12 providing a public street connection to the Baywatch subdivision shall be required.
4. The current site plan does not demonstrate how access to adjacent properties will be preserved. Plans shall provide future roadway connections to Tax Parcels **252601-2-034-2002** and **252601-2-044-2000**, consistent with PMC 17.80.060(B). Although the applicant submitted a memorandum asserting that connections to the southern parcels are infeasible, the City has not been provided sufficient information to support that conclusion. In fact, the applicant has demonstrated the engineering feasibility of the connection to Parcel **252601-2-034-2002**, but has elected not to provide the connection due to proposed home placement. This is a design choice and does not establish infeasibility.

5. While the revised roadway profiles now include crest and sag curves, Roads B, C, D, and the proposed improvements to Sunrise Ridge continue to fall short of the City's design standards, including the April 29, 2014 Policy Memorandum (*Clarification – Vertical Curve Criteria*) and the minimum AASHTO K-values for a 25 mph design speed.
 - a. It appears the applicant is attempting to mitigate substandard K-values by proposing a stop-controlled intersection at Road B. Because these deficiencies result from the proposed roadway design on undeveloped property, this approach is not acceptable to either the City Engineer or the Public Works Director. As previously directed, the roadway design shall be revised to meet applicable standards. Likewise, proposing a design speed below the required 25 mph minimum is not an acceptable alternative.
6. The proposed stop-controlled intersection at Road B does not resolve the underlying vertical curve deficiencies and is not an acceptable substitute for compliance with the City's roadway design standards. The roadway geometry shall be revised to meet applicable design criteria. Similarly, as noted above, this approach would not be acceptable to the City Engineer or Public Works Director.
7. The grading profile information for Road C still does not demonstrate that the proposed intersection is capable of meeting applicable ADA requirements. The Crosswalk across road C at Sunrise Ridge exceeds ADA running slope of 5% (proWag R302. 4.3). This requirement cannot be conditioned.

Stormwater:

8. The proposed retaining wall adjacent to the stormwater pond and Lots 1 through 4 is shown within future City-owned Tract F. Depending on the wall design, mechanically stabilized earth (MSE) reinforcement may extend beneath privately owned lots.
 - a. The City will not accept ownership or long-term maintenance responsibility for retaining walls supporting private development. The plans shall be revised so that retaining walls associated with private development remain under private ownership and maintenance.
 - b. Although the applicant's previous response proposed retaining Tract F under HOA ownership with a maintenance easement for the stormwater facility, ownership of all required stormwater tracts must ultimately be transferred to the City.

Geotech:

9. The latest site plan proposes retaining walls up to **35 feet** in height south of Lots 5 through 21, an increase from the 20-foot walls shown in previous submittals. The Geotechnical Report Addendum dated June 17, 2026, only evaluates retaining walls up to 20 feet in height.

The applicant shall either revise the Geotechnical Report to support the proposed 35-foot retaining walls or revise the site plan to conform to the limitations of the existing geotechnical recommendations.

Traffic:

10. The updated Traffic Impact Analysis and Peer Review Response dated July 21, 2026 has been forwarded to our peer review team for their continued comment. Any outstanding comments from our peer review team will be forwarded to the applicant upon receipt.