

**City of Buckley
Planning Commission Minutes
March 3, 2008**

Chairperson Liebel called the meeting to order at 7:04 PM.

The following members were present: Bill Dorn, Bridget McNassar, Kathleen Snellback and Cindy Maas. Dale Clark and Lisa Cramer were absent. Also in attendance was Associate Planner Suraiya Rashid.

There were no minutes from the previous meeting.

Residential Cluster:

Rashid stated in the R-6000 we decided that duplexes would be the highest multi-family dwellings. In the residential clustering, are we still going to allow town houses and row houses? Liebel stated personally he prefers town houses over duplexes. McNassar stated she feels we should allow it. After a lengthy discussion it was decided on by the commission that there would be a minimum of 5% with a maximum of 10% for units with common walls and only two can be built side by side.

Rashid asked if we are going to mandate ramblers and if so what is going to be the minimum percentage. It was decided by a majority of the commission to leave it at 15%.

Rashid stated the last question she has on residential clustering is what are we doing with the standards for the reduced lot sizes. For the 4,500 are we still going to have the same setbacks as we do for regular 6,000 square foot lots? After discussion the commission decided that the only difference will be 7 foot side setbacks rather than 8 foot side setbacks. For the 8,000 square foot lots that are being reduced to 6,000 square foot lots, the commission decided to go with the R-6,000 regulations.

Zoning Code – Staff Revisions Section #4

Rashid had a question about the sign surface area for building or wall signs. She doesn't feel the picture reflects the verbiage. The commission decided to change the description below the drawing to clarify what is needed.

Rashid had a question about something that Ed added into this. It is in the commercial, NMU and Public zones. The wording is however; corner lots that have street frontage on at least three (3) sides are allowed a maximum of two (2) monument signs. Do we want to limit the two monument signs to buildings that have frontage on three sides or allow two monument signs for buildings that have

frontage on two sides. The commission was okay with the way it is written and to leave it in all the zones as listed.

Section 19.30.120 (5), Rashid stated she doesn't feel it is clarified enough by saying "per development". The commission decided to have it changed to "per subdivision".

Rashid had a question about the non-conforming signs Section 19.30.160 (2)(b), where it reads "if the sign is damaged in excess of 80 percent", she feels the 80% is too high. Liebel stated the reason for it being so high is because we have a lot of existing businesses and if they want to replace their sign, they don't currently meet the criteria so we don't want it to be a huge expense to the business owner to meet the current standards to replace their sign. The commission agreed to leave it as is.

Rashid stated the next item in question is Section 19.33 Site Plan Review. She feels this is very complex. Liebel stated if you don't require all this then things can slip through. It was decided to leave it as is.

Rashid stated she also wanted to note that the site plans will be coming to the Planning Commission for review.

Section 19.34.030 (3)(a)(ii), exterior site boundary. It has been changed from 50 feet to 20 feet. The commission was confused as to the requirements for this. The commission finally decided to change the wording and add "unless on an arterial and then the boundary would be 50 feet.

Section 19.34.030 (4)(a) parking requirements, this is requiring two off-street paved parking spaces for each unit. The commission agreed to leave it as is.

Section 19.34.030 (5), open space, Rashid had a question about this. Liebel stated because it is inside the mobile home park, it should be maintained and owned by the mobile home park. Rashid stated she would add this language.

Chapter 19.50 – Historic Commercial Design Review District

Rashid stated she is changing this whole section to match the zoning map. The commission was agreeable to this.

Section 19.51.050 and Section 19.51.070 are redundant and say pretty much the same thing so she will delete one.

The Planning Commission briefly discussed the handout they would like to have at the public hearing. Dorn stated one other thing that he would like to see is not have to have people go to the podium to speak if they can be picked up on the recording. A lot of people don't like to come to the podium and feel more relaxed

to be able to speak from the seats. One other thing that was suggested is to have an article written in the local paper to hopefully get the word out to more people so we can get more input.

The next meeting will be March 10, 2008

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

Gordon Liebel, Chairperson