

**City of Buckley  
Planning Commission Minutes  
June 18, 2007**

Chairperson Cramer called the meeting to order at 7:02 PM.

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

Cramer stated there were a couple content changes in the minutes. Under Section 18.37.010 Payment of calculation fees – at the end of the sentence the following verbiage should be added, “as adopted by city resolution”. Under section 18.37.020 Calculation of total fees – at the end the last sentence should read .... “... construction of public improvements made by a developer as a condition of land use approval are calculated as per city adopted fee resolution”.

**McNassar moved to approve the minutes of the June 11, 2007 commission meeting as amended. Dorn seconded the motion and the motion carried.**

**Subdivision Regulations:**

**Review PUD’s and PRD’s:**

Interim Planning Director Davis stated he directed every one to read the Camas regulations. He edited the Camas PUD’s to fit what Buckley may want. Davis then went over the changes that he is proposing. Cramer wanted clarification if we even want to go this way or not. She thought we would discuss the basic principals as to why this would be an advantage or not and then see if this is the direction we want to take and then yes we could go ahead and edit it. Clark stated he appreciates the edits because it goes with what we did last week and then if we do decide to go with this the edits are already done and we don’t have to go back. Cramer stated prior to looking at these specifically there had been some comments pro and con about the PRD/PUD so she thought maybe we should have a general discussion about what people think about it. The commission all agreed. Dorn stated his impression, they way her understands the PRD it is only for 10 acres or more so we have the other applications still in place for regular subdivisions and variances and conditional uses. Basically he is seeing this as another layer of bureaucracy and he has a problem with that. A lot of this leaves the determination up to the City Administrator which could be very controversial. He sees this as a way of side stepping the Planning Commission and some of the methods the community feels at ease with. Cramer stated the way she understands it is that the Planning Commission will still review the plat. Dorn stated yes they will after all the deals have been struck. Discussion ensued. Cramer stated she liked this because it was meeting more of our goals. Dorn

stated his main concerns are that it is more of a bureaucratic function and that people in non-elected positions can make decisions. Davis stated but we are giving them the parameters to make the decisions by adopted this. Dorn stated he doesn't agree with the hearings examiner either. Davis stated the hearings examiner is the person that will keep the city out of court because he only does what is adopted in the regulations. Dorn stated regarding the PRD's, how do you explain to the person that has 9 acres that he can't do the same thing that the person that has 10 acres. Davis stated it is an option. Davis stated it has been proven that less than 10 acres, you can't provide the open space that PRD's require. Discussion ensued. Dorn stated he is very skeptical about this, he is not saying he wouldn't vote for it but he is skeptical. Dorn stated as long as the public has a voice. Dorn asked what the difference between the PRD and PUD is. Davis stated the PUD is applicable to all zones including residential but the PRD is only applicable to residential development. Cramer stated she does like how the PUD incorporates so many of our goals about the open space, trails, connectivity, etc. Clark asked exactly what innovative means on page 6. Davis stated there may be something that has come out in the last couple years such as a mother in law apartment in the back of an accessory dwelling that has a wrinkle in it that is different from the code and we feel it is really neat rather than degrading our codes, that would be innovative. Clark asked if we put stipulations like this in the regulations, in future planning commission can they go back in and change them. Davis stated you can always go in and tighten the regulations that you don't like or if it is something you do like, you can broaden the regulations. Clark stated he does like have flexibility and wants to make sure it is built into the regulations. Dorn asked about the development agreement and what is the sequence for that. Davis stated it would go to the planning commission first and then to the engineers. They would have to have a conceptual plan for the planning commission. Davis stated one thing he learned at a conference he went to was green building. We may want to add in our subdivision regulations that a certain percentage of the homes have to be built green, it is something for the planning commission to think about. Cramer stated the only thing she could see negative about this would be the cost because we are already struggling with being able to provide affordable housing. Clark asked on page 9 it refers to greenways and parks, what is the difference. Davis stated greenways are generally a linear kind of parks such as a trail that has bump outs with tot lots or where people who run can do other exercising. The Buckley trail would be considered a greenway. Cramer stated she had a question about land being subdivided could not be subdivided again for five years. Davis stated that is normally in the state stature for short plats but not for long plats. Clark stated the one thing he did not like in the PUD's is the density bonuses because we already have small enough lot sizes. Davis stated what this allows for is something like row houses, town houses, condos or duplexes, which allows for a goal that planning commission set forth. Cramer stated one thing that was discussed earlier

regarding duplexes was to only allow a certain amount of duplexes per acre. Dorn stated the other thing discussed was to only allow duplexes on corner lots.

The Planning Commission then went over the City of Pacific PUD regulations and Davis made changes to reflect what would be good for Buckley. Cramer stated because we have three members absent tonight she really doesn't want to make any decisions tonight so this will be discussed further at the next meeting.

#### **New Business:**

##### **Review scheduling priorities memo from Mayor Johnson:**

Cramer stated this memo was prepared by the Mayor to show us what Davis' scheduling priorities are. She was pleased to see that the majority of these duties are planning commission duties. Dorn stated as far as the stormwater detention pond design standards, they are kind of at an impasse because they need someone to help them write the standards.

##### **Title 20 and Chapter 2.33, plat review and responsibilities of the Planning Commission:**

At the last meeting, the commission wanted Cramer to speak and explain their position. She did not speak at the meeting but did submit a letter to the Council. There were two things in the letter, the first recommendation was to oppose the amendment to Chapter 2.33 and the second recommendation was that the City Council considers the hearing examiner process. The out come of the meeting she felt was very fair, they discussed the issue in depth. What was decided was that the current plats that are up for final plat approval, those will be moved forward and then the Building/Zoning/Environmental committee agreed to meet with the Planning Commission to come up with a long term resolution. We need to come up with a date. The regular meeting is July 2, 2007. It was a commission consensus to hold the meeting with Building/Zoning/Environmental council committee on July 9, 2007. **Dorn moved to change the regular meeting date from July 2, 1007 to July 9, 2007 with the Building/Zoning/Environmental Council committee chairperson confirmation that the other committee members are available. Clark seconded the motion and the motion carried.** On July 16, 2007 will be the joint meeting workshop with the City Council.

Cramer then went through with the commission the chart from Title 20 for the procedural process and the wording in Chapter 2.33, the responsibilities of the planning commission. The reason for going through this is to explain how the confusion may have come about and what to do to clear it up. The way the amendment was written, Chapter 2.33 was changed to read that the planning commission will review preliminary plats, this way both Title 20 and Chapter 2.33 now coincide with each other. Cramer stated her problem is the commission intent was to review all preliminary and final plats. This will be discussed further with the Council Building/Zoning/Environmental committee. There was a brief

discussion about the hearings examiner. Cramer stated the Planning Commission needs more information about it before they can support a hearings examiner; she likes the idea of the consistency but needs more information on it.

Cramer would like to get a roster of all the planning commission members to pass out so everyone has contact information.

The next meeting will be Monday July 9, 2007 at 7:00 PM.

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

---

Lisa Cramer, Chairperson