

Planning Commission
April 2, 2007

Chairperson Cramer called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM.

The following members were present: Bill Dorn, Cindy Maas, James Montgomery, Gordon Liebel and Bridgett McNassar. Also in attendance was Interim Planning Director Ed Davis.

Montgomery moved to approve the minutes of the March 19, 2007 commission meeting. Dorn seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Review/Edit Subdivision Regulations:

Cramer stated when she was going through the information that Davis gave us, there were some conflicts from the comprehensive plan to the public works standards. She sent an e-mail to Administrator Schmidt about this and his response was that we would have to use the information within the comprehensive plan because it is the newest information and the city is in the process currently of updating the public works standards to reflect what is in the comprehensive plan. Davis stated the Comprehensive plan is an adopted guide to develop the city and until you put things into code form which the public works standards are, they are the ones that prevail. Cramer stated that is not the information she received from Administrator Schmidt. Davis stated that is a question that should be asked of the City Attorney as to what state statute says. It may be possible that Administrator Schmidt talked to the City Attorney but that is something that should be clarified. Liebel stated if the city is working on new public works standards, we should go by the comprehensive plan because that is the most current document. Montgomery stated if a developer came in and had both documents, which one would he go by? Davis stated they could use whatever one they wanted to. Cramer stated we will need to get this clarified; however we don't want to get hung up on that because there are some definite differences, so for now she would like to go by the information that was provided by the City Administrator. Davis stated he doesn't see bicycle lanes in either the public works standards or the comprehensive plan. Montgomery stated in the public works standards you have several listings for some streets where in the comprehensive plan you have one listing for each street. Cramer stated there are some streets listed in the comprehensive plan that are not listed in the public works standards because they didn't exist at the time of adoption of the public works standards. Cramer stated the question we have now is do we want to keep what is in there or do we want to line it out and now we know what is in the public works standards and the comprehensive plan do we want to just refer to the public works standards as opposed to spelling out so much of the information. Montgomery stated if the public works standards are updated and adopted, those would be the most current. Davis stated what is normally done is you have a public works sub committee of the council and they work with the staff and they get changed regularly depending on what is happening within the city. So the flexibility for the public works standards is greater than changes to the comprehensive plan. If all the standards are in the comprehensive plan, they can only be changed once a year. Cramer stated if we are going to refer to the other standards, at what point in our subdivision regulations

do we start. Liebel stated the hardest part is to get some of the conceptual items that we really want to happen or not happen into a document that is typically not where you find them. The long discussion we had has been good because we know what our intent is and we know what we want to do. Montgomery stated from street grades to dead-end streets, we can keep the headings but have them refer to the other documents. Montgomery stated he think a lot of the content we have in our working copy, we have talked about a lot. There are a lot of changes between the working copy and what is in the comprehensive plan and if we still like the changes then we should not only amend the comprehensive plan, but also change the public works standards and then simply refer to the documents in the subdivision regulations. Dorn stated so we are looking at the working copy part II. Cramer stated yes. Liebel asked if we would refer to the public works standards in one place or under each heading. Davis stated you may want to just refer to it at the beginning so it is not redundant. Cramer stated within Dave's copy, he is recommending eliminating everything from 18.39 (Street design criteria-street grades) through 18.44 (neighborhood streets). Cramer asked if everyone was in agreement with that. Montgomery stated his question is do we want to delete all of it or just the content and leave the headings with a reference under the heading. Maas asked about Dave's copy, should we be using that being he has already gone through this with his comments. Cramer stated what she would like to do is go through each section and use Dave's copy to review his comments. After discussion in the different sections, they will read as follows:

18.30 Requirements for improvements.

Prior to the construction of any minimum improvements as approved upon the preliminary plat or binding site plan, the subdivider shall furnish certain engineering/construction plans. These plans must be prepared, signed, and dated and stamped by a Washington State licensed civil engineer and shall be in accordance with the City of Buckley standards including public works, adopted standards and specifications.

There was a lengthy discussion by the planning commission as to what sections need to stay and which ones should be deleted. There was some confusion by the commission members as to what actually needs to be included in the subdivision regulations if they are already in the public works standards.

There was a discussion as to what is in the current Buckley subdivision regulations. Cramer stated basically our current standards have a lot of information in it and just refers to different sections. Maas stated if we take our current subdivision regulations and compare it to the ones we have written and insert a few things to expand our current regulations that doesn't address everything, wouldn't that be what we want? Why did we have to re-invent the wheel? Planning Director Davis stated he reviewed our current subdivision regulations and found some small edit changes that need to be made, but for the most part, they are adequate. Maas stated why don't we all take the current subdivision regulations home and look them over and insert into our current regulations what we need. Cramer asked Planning Director Davis what his thoughts were on that. Cramer stated she feels a little frustrated with this whole thing and doesn't know what

direction we need to take. Maas stated she is also frustrate and would like to know if our current regulations can be updated with our regulations that we have come up with to come up with the final document. Planning Director Davis stated he needs to finish going through our current subdivision regulations and then he will read Part I of the new regulations and also the version that City Administrator Schmidt made his comments on. Cramer asked Planning Director Davis to keep in mind; she doesn't want to lose the ideas that we had very clearly emphasized in the comprehensive plan. That is the stuff that the citizens of Buckley have made very clear that they would like. Planning Director Davis asked that all the planning commission members get a copy of the current subdivision regulations. Liebel stated he would suggest that the current subdivision regulations may not be that good, he feels we have been led down a path we shouldn't have. We have spent 1-1/2 years thinking this is how subdivision regulations are supposed to be and now he is hearing that is not quite the case. Planning Director Davis stated there are many ways to approach it and his predecessor felt like the commission needed to approach it in a way that the commission would have total background of what was produced, but he thinks his predecessor had trouble in bringing the information together of what is in existence and what was produced and Davis doesn't feel that is something the commission wants to go through now. Maas stated we have to have these done by May. Davis stated this is April already, so he doesn't think this will get done in by May. Cramer stated we have to get it done. Cramer stated we had talked about last month meeting more often possibly having another meeting this month. Planning Director Davis stated he would be able to check up on his reading this weekend and be able to bring more information to the commission at the next meeting. Montgomery stated at the next meeting we need to bring in the easels that we worked on for so many months and also the board with the Comprehensive goals.

It was the commission's consensus that they would meet extra Monday's this month so our meetings for this month will be April 16th, 23rd and possibly the 30th.

Montgomery stated he just wanted to say he doesn't feel all the work we have done on this is wasted.

At this point the planning commission will postpone any more discussion on the subdivision regulations.

Update on Trail Plan:

Montgomery stated the committee has mapped out streets where we would like to see trails and safe routes, safe routes being a combination of bike lane and sidewalk. The mission statement reads having non-motorized multi-modal access to and from all residential neighborhoods, parks, schools and commercial districts. They have identified the safe routes and are now discussing goals and objectives and how to implement those. Cramer asked if there was a plan on how to make is safer crossing Highway #410. Montgomery stated they have discussed other options but of course are more costly. Davis stated they would have to apply for a grant. Montgomery stated he feels the pedestrian level on service on Highway #410 is in adequate. Montgomery stated he would get a copy of the conceptual plan to show the commission.

With nothing further the meeting was adjourned at 8:42 PM.

The next meeting will be April 16, 2007 at 7:00 PM.

Lisa Cramer, Chairperson