

Planning Commission
June 19, 2006

Chairperson Cramer called the meeting to order at 7:10 PM.

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

Liebel moved to approve the minutes of the June 5, 2006 Commission meeting. Montgomery seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Discussion about Marvin Sundstrom Letter:

Staley stated the last time Mr. Sundstrom was this angry at the City he wrote a letter to the editor and the City ignored it. Staley stated he does not run things that way. His suggestion would be if there is a letter to the editor that the Planning Commission get together and discuss it and respond to his letter. Montgomery stated he doesn't remember exactly but knows the Planning Commission was trying to accommodate the date for the Critical Areas Public Hearing but due to time constraints we could not do that. Cramer stated she also thinks part of it had to do with the fact of getting all the commission members at the same time with vacations and all. Cramer stated regarding the Rules of Conduct of the Planning Commission, the commission went through each of Marvin's concerns and discussed them so she feels comfortable with the decisions that were made. The commission would like Staley to respond to this letter in writing so if need be in the future it can be part of the record. Maas suggested that Staley e-mail the letter to the commission and they can review it and if they like it they can sign their names to the letter.

Subdivision Regulations:

18.38 Street and Block Layout.

Staley stated a lot of these things are very basic but he would like to know if it covers enough or if we need to add anything. Liebel asked for clarification on (D), why does this require the city engineer approval and nothing else does. What he thinks it should say is streets intersecting at not right angles are subject to city engineer approval. Isn't that true of all the other points in this section? Staley stated at before all the items listed, it states it shall provide for the following. On (D), sometimes you can't always get the right angles, so if it is more than a 90 degree angle the engineer would have to approve it for sight obstruction. Liebel stated he doesn't understand why we singled this item out. Maybe it should say on D, intersections should be at a right angle or as nearly as possible. And then for the whole section say anything not provided for in this section shall be approved by the City Engineer. It was decided on by the commission to change (D) to read "**Streets intersecting at right angles, or as nearly possible**". Montgomery asked how we tighten these things up for instance on (B) where it states streets generally following existing grid where possible does not sound strong enough. Cramer stated she doesn't think it sounds that soft because of the sentence prior to listing the items. Liebel stated maybe on (B) we should change the language to possible rather than practicable so that on every case where it is possible they would have to have a grid system unless they

could justify it. Because who defines practicable and is it practicable for the developer or is it practicable for the City? Staley stated practicable is easily justified on the builders, but when you say where possible they have to show how it is impossible, so he likes that better. It was a decision by the commission to change the wording on (B) to “Streets generally following existing grid where **possible**.” Staley stated we also need to add a sentence at the end to read “**Anything not provided for in this section shall be approved by the City Engineer**”. Cramer stated on (E) do we want to reference where the standards are. Staley stated he will change that.

18.39 Block Requirements.

Staley stated the first paragraph allows us to have cul-de-sacs and call that a block in which you can name them for example Cindy Way off of Cindy Road, anytime you have a separate block it gets a name similar to this. Cramer asked for a definition of two tiers of lots in (A). Staley drew a picture on the board and explained to the commission how the tier system works. Staley stated we could add the wording that tier lots are always adjacent to arterials and tier two lots are always adjacent to residential collectors. What this does for us later, we can choose to name the standards for tier one lots which would allow us to get enough landscaping to buffer from the arterial. Liebel stated he is not sure what we are trying to accomplish here. Staley stated we can put this on hold and he will bring an actual visual such as Nielson Meadows back to the commission to show how this works. There was a lengthy discussion regarding collector streets and arterials. Staley stated on next three items, was taken off the template and this was done when Gwen was here. Cramer stated her concern is will people really understand this. Staley stated the developer’s engineers and architects will understand it. Liebel stated in order for us to buy off on it, we would need to see what the end result would look like and how will this effect the smaller subdivisions that are only 6-10 lots. The commission’s consensus was that Items (B), (C) and (D) are okay.

18.40 Street Design Criteria – Street Grades.

Montgomery stated there aren’t a lot of grades in the City. Staley stated that is right and we just finished the one place that would have been an issue. The road at Elk Heights is 15% grade and the new standards which we adopted from Pierce County call for 12%. Sections B (1) and (2) will change from 10% - 12%. Section C, horizontal curves, it should read more than 60 feet in width. Section D the only place that this is applicable is Elk Heights and it is already taken care of. The 200 feet is standard.

18.41 Major Principal Arterials and 18.42 Minor Secondary Arterials.

Staley stated these are being renamed to correspond with the Transportation Element. Staley stated both of these are really out of our hands. These are basically dealt with during the Comprehensive Plan. All the numbers on here need to be consistent with the existing Buckley Transportation Element.

There was a discussion regarding meeting dates for July. It was decided by the Commission that the dates for the Planning Commission will be July 17th and July 31st at 7:00 PM in the M.P.C.

Landscape Overlay District:

Staley stated this is for the commercial parcels that front Highway #410 and it basically says we want them to shrub it up and look nice with the plants listed. One real sticking point is how wide the landscaping should actually be. There happens to be a property owner right now developing but the width we had is too wide for their parcel so we changed it to read if it takes up more than 20% of the parcel, you would have to contact the planning staff. What this is requiring is for a three layer effect with the tree layer, shrub layer and ground cover. There will be lists for all the layers. Also on the south side of Highway #410 the tree layer will be for shorter trees so as to not block the view of Mount Rainier. There was a brief discussion about when they have to conform to this landscaping code. The code says before the issuance of a new building permit or remodel permit application. There was a question as to whether or not a re-roof would be considered a remodel. Staley stated it should read before final of a building permit the landscaping has to be approved.

Cramer stated we also still need to discuss the issues the Building Official Mundy and Utilities Supervisor Dansby brought up at the last meeting. Staley stated the issue regarding the two car garages for duplexes will depend on the variance hearing this Wednesday.

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

Lisa Cramer, Chairperson