

**City of Buckley
Planning Commission Minutes
December 10, 2007**

Chairperson Cramer called the meeting to order at 7:06 PM.

The following members were present: Bill Dorn, Bridget McNassar and James Montgomery, Dale Clark and Gordon Liebel. Cindy Maas was absent. Also in attendance was Associate Planner Suraiya Rashid.

Cramer stated she had a question about the bottom of page 2, fifth sentence from the bottom, it states Rashid stated she probably “clanked” over this. The word should be “glanced“. Montgomery moved to approve the minutes of December 3, 2007 as amended. Clark seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Decisions on Open Space

Cramer stated she would like to go back to the minutes that were given to them several weeks ago from the November 2006 meeting where the commission actually defined green space and active space. We defined green space or passive space as non used open space such as landscaping, turf, shrubs, trees and natural state. The active space was a tier system; the lowest level was a lightly or unpaved path with little or no access to developed amenities with connections; between the lowest level and the medium level was gateways; medium level was walking, biking, benches, high visibility, adjacencies to a connectivity in a higher level of organized activity; between medium and high level was improved trail such as the Buckley Loop Trail and dedicated improved open space; the highest level had playground equipment, picnic tables, BBQ, horseshoes, automobile access, parking, restroom facilities, ball fields with the highest organized activity.

She wanted to make sure that this commission was still in agreement with these definitions being this was discussed last year. The commission agreed that the definition were okay.

There was a lengthy discussion by the commission regarding the level of service for parks for the city and how much the city is lacking. Liebel asked what happens if we don't meet that level of service are we penalized. Clark stated he thinks it is more of a guideline.

Montgomery wants 10% purely active and if you are counting wetlands and stormwater detention ponds the total number should be somewhere between 25% and 30%. Maas is concerned about the total percentage because what if a property owner doesn't have any wetlands, are they still going to have 30% total set aside. Dorn stated one issue with the retention ponds is we don't know if they

will be owned by the homeowners association or the City. Montgomery stated he was going by what the stormwater detention committee had discussed and that is having the city take over all the retention ponds and have new ponds be owned by the city.

Maas thinks it should be 10% open space total, but she would like to hear what other people have to say. Maas would like to see retention ponds taken out of the ratio. She thinks wetlands could be added as passive. She does agree with Liebel about getting using the buffers as passive open space.

Clark thinks it should be 10% active space and 5% passive. He is reluctant about the wetlands issue. He is not in favor of giving credit for wetlands, when they know there are wetlands when they bought it. He feels this is the minimum we should ask for. Maas stated there are some people who purchased property years ago before the wetlands were even an issue, so not everyone knew they had wetlands when they brought the property. Montgomery stated if there are no wetlands on the property, there should not be a passive requirement. If there are wetlands and the developer is willing to enhance that for passive open space, then he is willing to have density bonuses.

McNassar thinks there should be definitely be 10% active with a total of 25%-30% with 10% density bonus for wetlands if they are improved. The 10% density bonus could not be counted as active.

Dorn stated he is old school and would like to see larger lots with smaller percentages for open space. He thinks 10% total open space wetlands if they have small amount of wetlands. If they have a large amount of wetlands on the property, there should be some adjustments. He thinks the trail is a great idea, however he thinks it should come out of the streets and sidewalks.

Liebel has two options; he thinks 10% active space, no requirements for passive space with some credit for wetlands, buffer zones and areas that cannot be developed. If they have wetlands, buffer zones or non build able areas they could get up to 1-2% of the 10%. But then he has a concern about what are we going to do with the land. Instead of having all the little pocket parks, do we want one large park out by Ryan Road? Dorn stated he is concerned with the park land that it will not be maintained. How can the city cite people for not keeping their yards up when the city may not be able to maintain the parks and property that they own? Liebel stated we are going to be taking a lot of property from these people and what are we going to do with it? Clark stated he is more interested in the trail, not the pocket parks and he doesn't want to see a lot of maintenance problems for the city.

Montgomery did a visual about how the open space and the detention ponds will work. He had a 15 acre parcel showed 10% wetlands and 7-1/2%-8% for the

retention pond. He showed how the retention pond and wetlands could be used as passive recreation and how he would be in favor then of giving density credits for this.

Liebel stated we have to be careful of what we are asking for and we have to define what that 10% we are asking for is. Maas stated she likes the ideas of not making wetlands just to sit but to walk around. She likes the idea of trails around the wetlands. Montgomery would like to know what you can do in a wetland buffer. Can you put some sort of impervious trail. Rashid stated you can do more in a wetland buffer. The code states within a buffer you can have conservation restoration activities, walkways and trails, wildlife viewing structures, fishing access areas and stormwater management facilities. Dorn would like to know the different classification of wetlands.

After a lengthy discussion by the Planning Commission the commission decided to not have passive space be required. Montgomery moved to have a 10% active Open Space set aside for the residential cluster provision. Clark seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Cramer stated she will be taking a leave of absence from January through the middle of March because she is taking a class, if the commission was all okay with that. The commission decided that would be in the best interest of the city and the planning commission that Cramer take the leave of absence and come back when she is finished with her class. Cramer could keep in touch and give input; however she would not be able to be a voting member.

The next meeting will be December 17, 2007 at 7:00 PM.

With nothing further the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 PM

Lisa Cramer, Chairperson