

**Planning Commission
October 16, 2006**

Chairperson Cramer called the meeting to order at 7:08 PM.

The following members were present: Gordon Liebel, James Montgomery, Bill Dorn and Cindy Maas. Ken Smith was absent. Also in attendance was City Planner Dan Staley.

Chairperson Cramer opened the public hearing on the Gateway Landscape Overlay District at 7:09 PM.

There were no comments from the audience.

The public hearing was closed at 7:09 PM.

Montgomery moved to recommend approval of the Gateway Landscape Overlay District to the City Council. Liebel seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Planning Director Staley showed the Planning Commission a map of the first cut of the trail plan. This is very preliminary but he just wanted to bring to the commission what they have been working on. Cramer asked what the time frame is. Staley stated this plan needs to be put in place prior to all the new development coming in.

Planning Director stated on the Wastewater Treatment Plant we had more than one bid under the amount of money we have to start on the treatment plant. We are doing the financial analysis right now to see how close that is to see if we can actually start. This is not the capacity portion; this is the clarifying/the filtration portion. We know that the Department of Ecology and Pierce County are going to change our enforcement standards and are going to force us to comply with the National Pollution Discharge Effluent Standards of 2002.

Subdivision Regulations:

Planning Director Staley stated he made the corrections to the subdivision regulations that we have talked about already. For instance on the dead end streets there is a portion of the second sentence that is in bold blue, anything that is highlighted in yellow or in bright blue, these are issues that have not been decided on by the commission as a whole.

Underground Utilities:

Cramer stated she feels a 10-foot easement on section C sounds like a lot of property. Liebel stated that is only for signalization at intersections, which more than likely won't be in the middle of a subdivision. Dorn stated by law the controller has to be back so many feet. Liebel stated on Section D do we have 2-1/2 foot easements right now. Montgomery stated we have 2-foot easements. Liebel asked if we have the five feet in rear right now. Staley explained that what they are saying is do you want the drainage to run out in a specific way or can we leave 2-1/2 feet on the side for drainage. Discussion ensued. Dorn stated he likes the easements on the front or in the rear but not the sides. It

was the Planning Commission consensus to delete Section D. Liebel stated we currently have the 2-foot easement right now so should there be language in here for that. We don't know whether it would be in front or in the alley. If there is an alley, there should be something that states the utilities easement should be in the alley. Dorn stated whatever we do, we should make the requirement on public right of way that there is no direct burial for wire, everything should be in conduit. Staley agrees with the conduit issue and he will add this in the regulations. Liebel stated one thing we don't have here is surface drainage, we talked about tight lines for downspouts and impervious but we don't hold the contractors to a very high standard on surface drains, he doesn't know if that should be something that should be put in the parking lot. He is talking about everything that is not caught by the footage drains or downspouts. There must be something in place now for that but there must not be a very high standard because it wasn't dealt with very well in Copperwynd. Dorn stated he believes there is an ordinance that states you have to grade so there is a 76-inch fall within 10 feet. Liebel stated he knows there is something governing that but it is not being enforced well. Staley stated this would have to be a parking lot issue because he needs to check the code first. Liebel stated he thinks gas should be listed in Section A. Staley stated he would ask the gas department if they want that in conduit or not. There was a brief discussion about signalization and how the lights should have the new controllers.

Street signs and channelization:

There was no discussion and everyone agreed it was okay.

Sidewalks:

Cramer stated this says sidewalks on both sides, but we have talked about in some areas only having sidewalks on one side. Dorn stated we talked about only having parking on one side, but we should still have sidewalks on both sides, otherwise you would have a curb and then the homeowner's yard. Staley stated what he thinks this gets to is where do we want sidewalks, in a residential neighborhood along a local access street are we going to want this 100% of the time, or on an arterial such as Ryan Road, are we going to want sidewalks on both sides of the streets all the time. Montgomery stated Ryan Road seems like a bit of an anomaly because of some of the things we have talked about doing would be frontage improvements along there would negate the need for sidewalks if the trail plan was implemented. Is this something we need to reflect here? Liebel stated are you saying there won't be a sidewalk then. Montgomery stated what has been talked about is having on the North side of Ryan Road a meandering asphalt path. He doesn't know if it was discussed to have a sidewalk on the South side of Ryan Road. Staley stated the current Municipal code requires full frontage improvements of curb, gutter and sidewalk for any development. The point is does the recreational trail meet the definition of sidewalk or is it a recreational trail? Discussion ensued. There was a discussion about design and who will be responsible for the maintenance of the planter strips. There was discussion about the safety issues in having sidewalks and how far they set back versus closer to the street or not having sidewalks at all. Dorn stated he likes having the sidewalks closer to the street because you can see the pedestrians better than having them hidden and darting out from behind trees and bushes. Liebel agreed. Montgomery stated as a pedestrian, he likes having the sidewalks farther back. Staley stated the national

standard solution for pedestrian safety is to set the sidewalks back. Montgomery stated he feels it is very important to have sidewalks on both sides of the streets. Cramer stated it is more important to her to have sidewalks on residential streets. Liebel stated the question is if we have an access should we make it paved. Montgomery stated what kind of easement should we have, how wide is it going to be, is it going to be have shrubs, who is going to maintain it, etc. Staley stated those particular deals can be in the trail plan as part of the connectivity issue talking about the width of easements and things like that, but the place to say how often these occur is here in the subdivision regulations. Liebel stated we can come up with any scenario we want where it should be but how do we write that. It has to be generalized so it fits. Staley stated if we do not want pedestrians throughways to come out to the arterials then we say make the collector every 250' (or whatever number we want) in a subdivision.

Liebel asked about the dead-end streets requiring a turn around. How do you do that, do you take peoples property on either side to have this turn around. He doesn't see how you can do this. Staley stated you can do a "Y" or a "J" turn around. Discussion ensued. Staley stated he thought we were done with dead end streets, but after this discussion, we are not. And looking back at the dead end street section he has found that Section A and Section D contradict themselves. Effectively they are both the same thing. Section A is referring to the issue that Liebel has brought up tonight. Now that we know we have an issue with this, we will come back to it at the next meeting.

Staley stated back to the sidewalk section, we know we have a connectivity goal to achieve so whatever our connectivity goal is we have to make pedestrian access available. What we don't know is how far of a stretch is too far. So in this section we need to have language such as "X" distance without a collector street requires pedestrian thorough far. Montgomery stated it could read "if there is no collector street every "X number" of feet pedestrian access must be provided for connectivity." Liebel asked does that mean if you have rows of streets and your two collector streets are quite a ways apart, you have to have access between all of those or is it just the one adjoining the major arterial or is it just the one adjoining the park. Montgomery stated that was going to be his next question. Are we just talking about just between collector and arterial or are we talking between local access, residential streets and collectors? Cramer stated that goes back to the original question, where do we want them.

The next meeting will be November 6, 2006 at 7:00 PM.

Lisa Cramer, Chairperson