

**Planning Commission**  
**November 20, 2006**

Vice-Chairperson Montgomery called the meeting to order at 7:08 PM.

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

There are no minutes for approval for tonight.

**Housekeeping:**

Montgomery announced that Planning Director Staley has submitted his letter of resignation effective December 15, 2006. Because there is still a lot to accomplish what does everyone think about having weekly meetings until Staley leaves. Smith asked what needs to be done before then. Liebel stated we are fairly close to being done with the Subdivision regulations but there are still some issues that need to be finalized. Staley stated there are some of these issues that we can knock off one at a time. One issue is the parks and open space, the other is flexible lot sizes. Liebel stated that Staley's recommendation to the city is to hire someone to fill in until they can hire someone permanently to help guide the commission on the jobs issues that the commission has been dealing with. Dorn stated he thinks it should go one step further and demand that we get assistance with a letter from the chairperson and each commission member sign it. Smith stated that is the Mayor's decision. Staley stated one other issue is that the Council has accepted a bid on the sewer treatment plant that adds capacity so the developers will be knocking down the door to get their developments submitted. Dorn stated ultimately then whatever regulations are in place at the time of submittal that is what the developer has to go by. Staley stated yes that is correct. Smith stated he feels we need to get as much accomplished as possible and get the new subdivision regulations in place and then if we need to go back and make changes and tweak it later, we can.

**Subdivision Regulations:**

Staley showed a map to the commission that Investco submitted to him today that is a conceptual plan based on our minutes and discussions that have taken place. This isn't set in stone, but it does show how what we have been working on comes into play. Bringing this shows where we are today and where we need to be. The commission then discussed certain items on this plan such as the open space, wetlands, flexible lot sizes, view corridors, etc.

There was a large discussion regarding open space versus green space versus parks. Montgomery stated in a situation like this one, they may have some critical areas but the amount of park space isn't enough. What weight do we give active and green space? Liebel stated if it was open space related to a trail with no park equipment that is more

valuable than wetland that they have to give up anyway. They have seemed to make a big commitment to the ideals we are trying to accomplish. If we had a flat plat with no critical areas and not open space, it would be entirely different than this type of plat that does have critical areas. Is it active space or is it green space. Dorn stated because all the land is the same in the City, why can't you take every development and tell every developer that they will take 2% of their development to use as a wetland so you can then tell them where you want to have them put the trail and open space. That way it can either go to the developer or to the city and then it can be banked. This way the people that are doing the trail plan can decide where the trails are going to go and we can decide where the roads will go. Staley stated it sounds like a great idea, however the Federal law does not allow us to do that.

Staley stated he is trying to determine what percent of each development will be critical areas. From this, he is looking at 10%-15%. What that means is that green space is weighted. Our work is to say what percent of the wetland will we accept as open space and then the remainder we want some equipment and plantings. Montgomery stated in order for it to count as open space, you have to give up something. Liebel stated if there was no wet space, there should be 20% park, but rephrasing that it could be 20% open space and of that 5% has to be an active park. And developments that have wetlands, how much of that wetland are you willing to dedicate to the open space requirement. Staley stated with active parks, you need to look at both adult and children activity. There was discussion on how to put the trails within the developments to have connectivity. Dorn stated another important part of living in Buckley is being able to get out of town with their car. What is going to happen at the end of Ryan with all these new cars? Staley stated that should be taken care of during the development phase with the developer. The developer will have to provide a traffic impact study so it they will have to do something to fix the traffic problem on Ryan Road.

Perimeter Wetland Trail (PWT), what we have discussed regarding the perimeter wetland trail is two things; it is a connectivity issue and the value it gives to the open space. The value for the active space is the adult versus the children. Montgomery stated an approved trail will satisfy some of the requirements for the active space. Liebel agreed. Dorn asked what the definition of park is. Liebel stated to him it is a big enough space to put playground equipment in it. Staley stated he is concerned with double counting the wetland because of the trail we have.

Staley stated for the homework this week is to decide adult versus children active space, what exactly is that. And also nailing down the 5% or whatever we want for parks space. After we get done with the parks issue, we can move onto flexible lot sizes.

**Dorn moved to hold meetings every Monday until December 11, 2006. Liebel seconded the motion and the motion carried.**

With nothing further the meeting was adjourned at 9:14 PM.

The next meeting will be November 27, 2006.

---

James Montgomery, Vice-Chairperson