

**Planning Commission**  
**June 5, 2006**

Chairperson Cramer called the meeting to order at 7:04 PM.

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

Montgomery moved to amend the agenda to allow John Dansby to speak to the Commission prior to Dean Mundy. Cramer seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Montgomery moved to approve the minutes of the May 15, 2006 Commission meeting. Liebel seconded the motion and the motion carried.

**John Dansby, Public Works Supervisor regarding alleys:**

Dansby stated he is here tonight to discuss with the Planning Commission their desire to have all the homes access the garages from alleys. He has some concerns with having all the new developments with garages in the back of the houses and using the alleys as their access. The problem with this is they are very hard to maintain because they are just gravel. Other cities that do use alley generally pave their alleys. We also have problems with the garbage trucks because they are heavy and big. There is also a budget issue because the crew is constantly getting gravel and then spending numerous hours grading the alleys. This takes away from our other daily duties. The city would like to also have the garbage and recycling picked up in the streets in front of the house rather than in the alleys. His request is not to put more garages on alleys, we know we have to deal with the existing alleys, however, don't cause more of a problem. He is not advocating to not have alleys, he just doesn't want to add any more garages onto alleys. Cramer stated it appears the issues are space, maintenance, budget and access. Liebel asked if we change the garbage will it be for all the customers or just the new homes that are built. Dansby stated we want to change them all to front pickup.

**Dean Mundy, Building Official regarding duplex provision issue:**

Mundy stated he has some concerns regarding the zoning. In one zone, there are no duplexes allowed at all and also in the R-8000 zone, you can put two triplexes on there but you can't put any duplexes there. Also duplexes regardless of the zone are required to have a two car garage per unit. Staley stated he thinks this may have been a mistake. He remembers Cindy talking about this and he thinks he was the intent of the Planning Commission to have one car garages for duplexes. Mundy stated he does see the pros and cons to have two garages per units for duplexes but it should be looked at differently under different zones. The other issue Mundy brought up was the lot sizes in the HDR being 5,000 square feet per unit. That is really high. In order for someone to put apartments in they usually like to add amenities like a pool, common area, etc. With those large of lot sizes, it is not cost effective for the property owners. He feels the Planning Commission should look at other cities to see what their lots sizes are in HDR. Senior housing under that same zone is 2,000 square feet per unit and he feels somewhere in between 2,000 and 5,000 would be good.

**Deliberations on the comments from both John Dansby and Dean Mundy:**

Cramer asked what the process is for making some changes. Staley stated it is a code amendment so it requires notification and a public hearing. Liebel stated he would suggest going through all the zones and check the square footages. Staley stated the other thing to look at is the permitted use for duplexes and triplexes. It was decided on by the commission to add this to the agenda item for the next meeting after everyone has a chance to look at the current zoning codes. Cramer stated with the information that John Dansby provided us tonight goes hand in hand with the subdivisions so we can address that while we are going through the subdivision ordinance.

**Subdivision Regulations:**

**18.34 Required improvements – Full subdivision.** There was discussion about the monument entrance signs and is that something that we really want to require. Staley stated after twenty years, you won't even see the signs because the landscaping grows over it. Smith stated it is more for a selling point for the developers. Liebel stated he thinks it works in some areas. Smith stated maybe we could do it by the size of the development. Staley stated you are getting very controlling if you do that. Montgomery stated if we do a good enough job with promoting our connectivity he doesn't think you would see the monument signs everywhere. It was decided to specify survey monuments but not require entrance monuments. Other issue is mailboxes and whether or not we want to require them. Cramer asked if that was our decision or does the post office have to decide that. There was discussion if all the mailboxes were clustered together, there should be a safe turn out for this or if there were smaller clusters of mailboxes through out the development it would make it more walker friendly. Staley stated he would check to see if there are any cluster mailbox standards. He really likes the idea to have the mailboxes to promote walking. There was a brief discussion about bus stops especially along Ryan Road where a lot of developments are going. Liebel stated he is not willing to drop this issue. Staley stated he will put this issue in the parking lot.

**18.35 Required improvements – Short Subdivisions:**

Staley stated should have actually taken this out because they are actually for Full Subdivisions.

Staley gave a brief synopsis regarding the letter that was given to the Planning Commission from a Council member regarding short subdivisions and the frontage improvements. There was a property owner on Mason and McNeeley that requested a frontage waiver but the Council didn't grant it, however there was another property owner right across Mason that asked for the frontage waiver and was granted the waiver. Cramer stated regarding the letter, there are some good issues that were brought up that we need to look at when doing short subdivisions. Staley stated the concern that this Council member has in the letter is which is a valid concern is these are the standards and lets ensure that the standards we are writing here are as strict or stricter to make sure we get some good streets around town. Smith stated it really doesn't matter what we do, the

Council can do whatever they want. Staley stated, however, with the Planning Commission discussing these things, we have it documented that issues are discussed thoroughly. Cramer stated one of the things we can show is that we have been consistent.

**18.35 Release of improvement guarantee:**

Staley stated this would be for in lieu of making frontage improvements or any other improvements that are required, you can post a performance bond or and improvement guarantee that this won't be done now but will be done before final approval. Liebel asked who sets the bond amount. Staley stated the Engineer will estimate the cost of improvements and then there will be an inflation cost added to that. Staley stated you have to have this provision for a performance bond.

**18.36 Clearing and Grading:**

Staley stated the issue out of here that will make the developer look for something else is the stated "all trees not intended for preservation". What is happening in a lot of other jurisdictions is folks are starting to notice that they are taking all the trees down. Here in Buckley we don't really have that issue. We will probably have to put some attention into this and seek public input on this. It could be a sensitive issue. Liebel had a question about the native soil (Buckley Loam only) retained. He really feels this is important because the materials that they import usually aren't good material. There was a suggestion to add after native soil "or functional equivalent" to make sure we get decent soil. It was decided on by the Commission to add this. Liebel asked if this is the place to discuss grading requirements. Staley stated that is all discussed and required in the Design and Construction Standards.

**18.37 Survey Monuments:**

Liebel stated we were going to change to the language to read Survey Monuments. Liebel asked what the use of state plane coordinates is encouraged means. Staley stated it is a projection that is used in the mapping tool that he uses a lot.

**Updates:**

Staley reported to the Planning Commission that the Council passed the Rules and Regulations for the Planning Commission. The sign code, one of the Council members found a contradiction in one of the definitions regarding total sign area. It then went to the City Attorney, so instead of getting the definition changed at the beginning they changed the definition throughout the entire document. So the document has to go back to Council.

With nothing further the meeting was adjourned at 9:00 PM.