

**Planning Commission**  
**February 6, 2006**

Chairperson Schneider called the regularly scheduled meeting to order at 7:13 PM.

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

Montgomery moved to approve the minutes of the January 16, 2006 commission meeting. Liebel seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Smith stated we also need to address that issue. Schneider asked what it is he wanted us to say. Smith stated that the Planning Commission and Wolfe Schneider as the head chair do recognize that holidays are illegal for the community to hold a meeting. Montgomery stated he is not sure he reads it that way. Smith stated he talked to the State. Schneider stated he is not sure why that has to be on the meeting right now, it is not on the agenda. Smith stated because he put an abstain to the minutes and he would like it brought back up. Schneider stated we are not on that right now, if you want an addition to the agenda, he would ask that we do it at the end.

**Sign Code:**

Staley stated the sign code has been sent back to committee for review. The Mayor has asked the Planning Commission to look at the sign code again and resolve any issues we have. Staley stated there is a portion that has conflicting verbiage so he will highlight that before sending it back to the Commission. The commission would like to take a look at it one more time so we will put that on the agenda for the next meeting.

Schneider stated that Smith would like to add to the agenda discussion about meeting on holidays. Schneider stated as he understands it Smith wants us to acknowledge that we shouldn't be meeting on holidays. Staley stated we shouldn't be meeting on holidays. Montgomery stated in the RCW it states we are supposed to meet on the next business day, will we have to meet that next day or could we meet on the following Monday. It was agreed upon by the Commission as long as it is posted and published it really shouldn't matter except that they not be held on a Holiday and notice is posted and published.

**Subdivision Regulations:**

Staley stated what he would like to make sure is we talk through everything to make sure we have our priorities straight. What he sent everybody over the weekend is strategies that other cities used to come up with density bonuses to get negotiation in black and white for what they want. One thing we discussed is we want parks, how are we going to do this and what will prevent a developer from just giving us \$779 per lot and walking away and getting all the lots they want. We think it is more important to get the parks rather than the \$779 per lot. So he has highlighted some of these things within these other development codes. From our last meeting it sounded to him that it was the commission's consensus that we want parks, open space and green space. Let's say a developer has an expectation for 100 lots on his parcel and we are asking him for 5 acres

of parks but yet he still wants his 100 lots so this is where flexible lot sizes would come into play. The flexible lot sizes along with the density bonuses allow us to get other amenities we would like to get like affordable housing. Maas asked when you do give a 15% density bonus, would you give all the lots a little smaller or would you give a few of the lots a lot smaller. Staley stated he would not like to see all the lots smaller, that is when you get the cookie cutter look. If you make a few of the lots quite a bit smaller, it spreads it out over the entire development. Schneider agrees that having all the lots smaller rather than having some of the lots quite a bit smaller would defeat the purpose. Doing that would also not be what the community wanted. Maas stated she is not sure about clustering either because that can sometimes give a stigma. Staley stated he is not sure about the clustering either because if you put the smaller lots every 5 or 6 lots, that definitely takes away from the cookie cutter look which is what we are trying to achieve. Staley stated tonight what we are talking about is what we want. Maas asked with these density bonus percentages, it talks about 15% and then if you connect the trails you get 10% and if you keep the view you get 5% and if you keep the historical building intact you get 5%. Is that a total of 15% or is the 15-10-5 & 5. Staley stated it is 15-10-5 & 5 which is a lot and he is not sure that is something we would want to do. Schneider stated he thought the cumulative bonuses would not exceed 15%. Staley stated what we are trying to do with this tool is to get what we want. There was a discussion about parks and whether or not to have one large park within a development or a few smaller parks. Schneider stated he feels it is also important that there is public access to these parks. Montgomery stated with the grid street pattern and a contiguous park plan he thinks we can achieve public access to the parks. There was a brief discussion about the developments along Ryan Road and how the commission would like to see a bike/walking path on Ryan and then another path/trail within the development. Discussion also included what kind of paths we would have, whether they would be paved or just gravel. Liebel stated it sounds to him that we are asking for too much, pathways through the development along with a paved bike/walking lane. Smith stated one of his concerns is what if you have a big cluster of a bunch of small lots and we are not charging impact fees how we will justify them covering their end. Staley stated every building lot has to pay the same impact fees regardless of the lot size. Schneider stated it is his understanding that we can't both collect the impact fee for parks and also have them build parks. Staley stated the absolute minimum we can do is provide some urban infrastructure that encourages walking. Smith stated in the Port Townsend regulations it states if the property owner doesn't comply with the homeowners association, you can place a lien on the property. Maas stated with all these parks, will they be owned by the City or the homeowners association? If they are owned by the homeowners association, will they be open to the public? Staley stated that is one problem, because when they are owned by the homeowners association, they become very territorial. He thinks what we are trying to achieve here is not semi-public, which would mean the City would be maintaining that property. Maas stated that would be a tremendous amount of money more to budget for. Staley stated what is going to happen around here is approximately 6-10 acres of stormwater detention ponds around town. So we already know when we get all these homes in here, we will have to hire a couple more people to take care of these. Most likely it would be in the City's long term interest to hire at least two more people. We are going to have probably 20-30 acres of parks. This is an added value to the City. There was a lengthy discussion about how this is going to be paid for if the City is taking over all the storm water detention ponds as well as all the new parks in town.

There was some discussion regarding the definition of open space. Maas stated she feels like we have been skipping back and forth and not really moving forward. Are we going to take all these sample subdivision codes and go through them individually? Staley stated what we are doing right now is setting our goals so before we start getting into the details of the subdivision regulations; we have to figure out what it is we want. We are getting pretty close. What he wanted to establish today is to figure out what we want and how do we get there. Staley stated what he is hearing is that we are not moving fast enough, he thought we were talking everything through. Maas stated that is just her opinion. Staley stated his concern is that we talk these things through thoroughly. Maas stated she does think we need our clarifications answered and our questions answered but she wants to stay on task and keep it rolling. The commission then talked about the goals and the priorities which are listed on the flip chart. Schneider asked if we need to differentiate between parks and trails because trails are considered linear parks. Staley stated he is not sure trails are actually linear parks but it is still land we need to achieve our goals. There was a lengthy discussion regarding having several small parks versus one large park within developments and how much park space should be required per square acreage. There was also discussion whether or not storm drain detention ponds should be part of the park acreage. Liebel stated if the storm retention ponds are required, they should not be able to use that as part of density bonuses. The planning commission would like to decide what they want and what they can have. Staley stated we already know there is 15% right off the top for streets, sidewalks and storm drains. So we need to find out how much should we be asking for parks? Maas stated the developer will only pay x amount of money for a lot and he will walk. She doesn't mean that Buckley needs to bend over backwards for developers, but Buckley has always had a reputation for making it hard on developers. That is why we are not flooded here with people. Staley stated we are not here to make it easy; we are here to get what we want. Maas stated we can ask for a pie in the sky but we do have to be realistic.

Staley stated to wrap things up, he would like the commission to come up with three priorities that we want to have density bonuses for. Schneider stated he wants connectivity but he doesn't think we should give up anything to get that. Staley stated what we need to decide is what are we willing to trade density bonuses for and what are we willing to not trade. That is what we will discuss next time. Schneider stated there should be sources from other towns as to how much land they have gotten out of developers so we are not asking for too much. He would like to go in with a high but realistic number. He thinks Buckley has a lot to offer and we shouldn't sell the town short. Liebel stated he assumes this is a negotiable thing, if the developer is willing to go 15% we are willing to go here, if they are willing to go 10%, we are willing to go here.

With nothing further, the meeting was adjourned at 9:06 PM.