

**Planning Commission  
November 28, 2005**

Chairperson Schneider called the regularly scheduled meeting to order at 7:04 PM.

The following members were present: Ken Smith, James Montgomery, Cristi Boyle-Barrett, Lisa Cramer and Cindy Maas. Sandy Ramsey was absent. Also in attendance was City Planner Dan Staley.

Cramer moved to approve the minutes of the November 7, 2005 commission meeting as amended. Boyle-Barrett seconded the motion and the motion carried.

**Review Assignments Linking Goals to Objectives to Ensure Completeness:**

Staley stated this is just an overview; we had our consolidated comprehensive plan goals. These are the working, living, breathing document of subdivision regulations goals. We were to go through the consolidated comprehensive plan goals and make sure that all of those goals were addressed through the subdivision regulation goals.

Boyle-Barrett asked for clarification of Environmental Quality. Staley stated it is a catch all phase and we used it to capture critical areas, quality of life and clean air, clean water. In his mind it is more like quality of life. Boyle-Barrett asked if we want one goal to cover all those issues. Cramer stated it might make more sense to go through the goals in the comprehensive plan and relate those to ones on our list. The Planning Commission then went through the list and came up with the following:

**Land Use Goals**

General Land Use – Goal 1.1 – small town character / connectivity / environmental quality / pedestrian friendly / diverse housing

Commercial Land Use – Goal 1.2 – not necessarily addressed within the residential subdivision regulations.

Residential Land Use – Goal 1.3 – affordable housing / design standards / flexible lot sizes / diverse housing

Resource Protection – Goal 1.4 – diversity / environmental quality / protecting view corridors / flexible lot sizes / design standards

Parks and Open Space – Goal 1.5 – connectivity / open space / environmental quality / parks / pedestrian friendly / citizen participation / small town character / flexible lot sizes

There was a large side discussion regarding how to get more parks when we can only require the developers to either pay the impact fee or provide the park. Would like to see if there is some way to add another condition that if there are so many homes, they have to provide a park within their development along with paying the fees.

Transportation – Goal 1.6 – design standards / environmental quality / pedestrian friendly / connectivity

Public Facilities and Utilities – Goal 1.7 – Staley stated that is a required goal we have to have according to the RCW's so it really can't be addressed.

### **Housing Element Goals**

Goal 2.1 – small town character / affordable housing / diverse housing / design standards / flexible lot sizes

Goal 2.2 – affordable housing / flexible lot sizes / diverse housing / connectivity / pedestrian friendly

Goal 2.3 – affordable housing

Goal 2.4 – pedestrian friendly / connectivity / parks / open space

Goal 2.5 – environmental quality / flexible lot sizes / design standards

### **Economic Development Goals**

Goal 3.1 – diverse housing / affordable housing / pedestrian friendly / connectivity / environmental quality

Goal 3.2 – small town character / pedestrian friendly / connectivity / open space / design standards

Goal 3.3 – pedestrian friendly / connectivity / open space / parks / environmental quality / design standards

Goal 3.4 – environmental quality

Goal 3.5 – open space / parks / look for grants / interlocal agreements

### **Urban Design Goals**

Goal 4.1 – diverse housing / pedestrian friendly / design standards / open space / connectivity

Goal 4.2 – citizen participation / connectivity / pedestrian friendly

Goal 4.3 – design standards / citizen participation / pedestrian friendly

Goal 4.4 – pedestrian friendly / connectivity / environmental quality

Goal 4.5 – citizen participation / design standards / connectivity / pedestrian friendly / environmental quality

Goal 4.6 – this is unattainable with regards to the subdivision regulations.

## **Park and Recreation Goals**

These were addressed within the Land Use Goals.

### **Dates for next Meetings:**

Staley brought up the need for discussion about a landscaping ordinance/stormwater detention ponds, tree ordinance, Highway 410 commercial design standards and landscaping standards for Highway 410. Schneider asked if this would be for the entire commission or sub-committees. Staley stated it was completely up to the commission but thinks we should form sub committees. Schneider stated the problem he has is that all of these are interconnected and he knows from his own experience when he goes into a field like that he learns more about it if he were to be working on all the issues because they are going to tie together. He thinks regardless if it was a sub committee or the entire commission, those same people should be working on all these subjects because they are so closely connected. Maas asked why staff could not come up with these ordinances. Staley stated the one thing he hears over and over again is the public didn't have any input on things so he wants to make sure there is a public process on these issues. Cramer liked the idea of having sub committees like we did with the zoning code. Schneider stated if we want to do the sub committee, we should do that before our regularly scheduled meetings. There was discussion about having two sub committees or just one. Cramer suggested having the two meetings in December to deal with these issues and then in January start fresh with the subdivision regulations. Staley stated he doesn't want to stop the momentum with the subdivision regulations. It was the commission's consensus to have one committee and the members will be James, Lisa and Wolfe. The sub committee will meet at 6:15 before every regularly scheduled Planning Commission meeting. The meetings to be held in December will be December 5<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 PM.

### **Subdivision Regulations:**

Staley stated for the next meeting he would like the commission to think about all the goals we discussed tonight. These are the things we are trying to obtain. When we move forward and start talking about these things, remember we said are these things user friendly, are they flexible. Yes we want all this stuff but now we are putting it on paper and are they doable? Maas asked if Staley just wanted us thinking until the next meeting. Staley stated you can look at the example subdivision codes and make notes. Staley stated we need to start thinking about how we layout these things in space. The commission needs to make language for how we want things to look. With all the goals we are trying to achieve, how do we pack that in to the subdivision regulations? What will we give up, what are the priorities, are they good, are they enforceable?

With nothing further the meeting was adjourned at 9:03 PM.

---

Wolfe Schneider, Chairperson