

**City of Buckley**  
**Planning Commission Minutes**  
**April 20, 2009**

**Chairperson Snellback called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM.**

The following members were present: Panasiuk, Dorn and Maas. McCorkle was absent. Also in attendance was Associate Planner Suraiya Rashid.

**Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Dorn moved to approve the minutes of the April 6, 2009 commission meeting. Maas seconded the motion and the motion carried. Dorn stated he didn't receive the March 30, 2009 minutes, Snellback stated she did not get them either. It was decided to postpone approval of the March 30, 2009 minutes until the next meeting.

**Public Hearing – Fence Regulations**

Snellback opened the public hearing at 7:06 PM. There were no comments from the public so the public hearing was closed at 7:06 PM. Dorn stated he had a question, on the trail the plan is to have four foot fences. Rashid stated there is nothing in this code that reflects that. Dorn stated if it is going to be added to this he thinks we should as a commission make a note that it has been discussed. Rashid stated if it comes up at Council, she will mention that the planning commission discussed and there were opposing feelings. It was then the commission's consensus to move this forward to the City Council.

**Landscaping Standards**

Rashid stated there was one section she didn't make changes and that was under Maintenance Requirements Section 19.29.080 because she doesn't think the city council will approve it, so we will discuss that when we come to it. Snellback had some questions from the minutes on some of the issues that were discussed. Her questions were answered and discussed. Rashid then went through the entire document with the commission to go over the changes that were made after the last meeting.

Rashid stated under definitions, she changed the “barrier buffer” definition, she felt it was too restrictive.

Section 19.29.030 (2), this was changed to long subdivisions only, and then (9) she talked to Dean Mundy, the Building Official about this and asked if he felt this was over restrictive and he did, especially the first part, so we have deleted the first sentence.

Section 19.29.040 (5), there was discussion about screening around dumpsters and utility boxes for when people need to get into them so she added verbiage to address this.

Section 19.29.050, (2) from the discussion at the last meeting it sounded like involving a certified arborist was important so that language has been added. In (2) (b) (VI), she removed the sentence “an effort shall be made to preserve existing trees on site and incorporate them into overall design” and put this into the document in a different place. Under (3) she included the language for a performance bond for two years. Dorn asked if that was legal, Rashid stated this will go to the city attorney so he will check this.

Section 19.29.060, she changed the language on this completely and added the information about using the city’s adopted street tree list. Under (1) she added that within the historical commercial zone that it would be approved by the Design Review Board. Under (2) (a), she felt approval could be done by the Planning Department and (b) she added the word shall instead of to. Under (4) (a) there were some changes made to the parking lot canopy buffers and she expects this to have some discussion on this. There was a lengthy discussion. Rashid asked about the sentence that says, “Parking lots shall be designed to provide a minimum of 50 percent canopy shading within 10 years of planting”. Dorn stated he thinks about the police and fire departments and that they would not want it this way. Panasiuk feels it should be 25% but it really depends on what kind of use is being put there. Dorn stated it should be 25% or less but in lieu of trees put in shrubs. The commission decided to separate it from residential and commercial/industrial. The commercial/industrial will be 15% and the residential will be 30%. Under (4)(b), Rashid felt that with all the other requirements this provision was excessive so to help with that, she would like to add verbiage that in lieu of this requirement, an applicant can create a rain garden sized to treat stormwater

flow from the parking lot. These are very good environmentally, everyone agreed with this and we need to add a definition for rain gardens. Under (5)(b), the clear trunk area should be ten feet rather than seven feet; (d), for the historical commercial zone, again this will be reviewed by the Design Review Board; (e) we have changed the word encouraged to required and (f) we have removed the second and third sentences. Under (7), Rashid stated she drafted this because anyone who does a landscape plan according to this document is required to do an existing tree survey. There was a lengthy discussion. Dorn had concerns with the mitigation portion. Rashid asked the commission what kind of mitigation techniques they would like. Maas does not like the contribution in the amount of appraisal to the city's parks and recreation fund. The commission agreed. Rashid stated if this technique is not included it really isn't necessary for an appraisal so she will remove that portion. Rashid will come up with more mitigation techniques and if any of the commission members have any ideas, e-mail Rashid with your ideas. Dorn stated we would be smarter to make the regulations short and sweet, Rashid agreed.

Section 19.29.070, Rashid stated she added this paragraph. Dorn still had a question about people not being able to prune the trees in front of their home. Rashid stated what if just remove the word pruning and leave removal and topping will that take care of this problem. The commission agreed to remove the work pruning from Section 19.29.060(5) (f).

The next meeting will be May 4, 2009.

With nothing further the meeting was adjourned at 8:49 PM.

---

Kathleen Snellback, Chairperson