

Planning Commission
August 7, 2006

Chairperson Cramer called the meeting to order at 7:05 PM.

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

Staley asked that the commission change the agenda to add an item to have the street alignment for the Integrated Stair Binding Site Plan recommendation by the Council Street and Sidewalk Committee. **Montgomery moved to change the agenda as Staley has requested. Liebel seconded the motion and the motion carried.**

Cramer asked if there were any changes or corrections to the minutes. **Dorn moved to approve the minutes of the July 17, 2006 Commission minutes. Montgomery seconded the motion and the motion carried.**

Integrated Stair Road Alignment:

Staley stated there has been a request from the Street/Sidewalk committee for the Planning Commission to review the road alignment for the Integrated Stair Binding Site Plan. Staley showed the committee on the map exactly what they are asking for. The Buckley Municipal Code stated the street has to be placed according the future street plan and full frontage improvements have to be done. The applicants are asking from the street and sidewalk committee that they install a private drive with the option of when they are ready to develop the residential property they would push the road all the way through or that the committee waive all the requirements. When the street and sidewalk committee received the request, they wanted to have the planning commission give them a recommendation. Montgomery asked what the recommendation was from city staff. Staley stated what the city has been talking about for a long time is that they have the private drive and then sign an agreement to fully develop the street at a later date. Already the future street map will not be correct because of the placement of the LDS Church. The issue is the road would have to be moved from the future road map that the City of Buckley currently has. Staley stated the issue is the amount of footage to do frontage improvements in 100's of feet, which is very costly. The applicants would like to put off the cost for right now. Dorn stated shouldn't this actually go to the Board of Adjustments. Staley stated no because they are not asking for a variance from the setbacks, they are asking for a waiver to the Municipal Code regarding the requirements for frontage improvements. Staley stated the question is do they do full improvements now or do they do private with an agreement to do that later. Cramer stated she is concerned that we are consistent and she is not sure what other decisions have been made. Discussion ensued. Cramer stated because we have two members missing and no one has any concrete opinions, she would like to table this until the next meeting.

Staley stated in the context of the field trip and street discussions, he has a number of objectives and one of them is the purpose of making a narrow street is to give more room

for development and slow traffic down, it is a negotiating chip. One of the other things that will come out of this is one of the conceptual's he has for the Investco property is the need to have connected trails and habitat. He has to negotiate with these people to get cross streets and maintain connected green space. The other thing is a lot of what we are discussing; the developers look at because it impacts them. One proposal that came up is we need to have a trail plan in the city so when we do the subdivision regulations we can say this needs to connect with the trail plan. What he has proposed is that we need a board, so he is throwing this out there for anyone on the Planning Commission that would like to be on that board.

Field Trip Discussion:

Staley stated he would like to talk about what we think we got out of looking at these streets and actually walk on them and measuring them. One of the things we are struggling with is the street width. Liebel stated he has a couple of things. The street planters where Bill lives they are only 2 feet wide, in Copperwynd they are 4-5 feet and they are still too small. The other thing he learned is Copperwynd's street coming in to the development should be a collector street and it is not. It is the same width as all the other streets in Copperwynd. Dorn asked how much the lot coverage is on the 6,000 square foot lots. Staley stated it is 45% with a house and 55% with a garage. Dorn stated then there is no place for any parking. Discussion ensued regarding whether or not to have parking on both sides of the street and if not what zones they should be required. One thing we need to think about now that we have all these street widths in our heads is what are we trying to achieve with these street widths. Not only are we trying to move cars, we are trying to move people. One of the reasons we have the complete street design is that we need to think how we are going to move people; we will move them by walking, riding a bike or driving. Staley stated his whole point with the street discussion is the complete street. Maybe we designate one or two streets that run north and south with no parking on the street so you can ride your bike or the kids can walk to school and you have better visibility. Just like we have different rules for different zones, maybe we should have different rules for different streets. This is not a decision we need to make tonight. Cramer asked where we go from here. Staley stated the things we really need to work on are the streets which we will integrate with the trail plan. The other item is how much open space we will have and what we are going to do for incentives. We can't make a decision on the streets yet because that comes with the incentives. What we are thinking about over the next few weeks is what we found on the streets, what is appropriate for parking on one side, parking on both sides, street widths, planter strips, etc.

Staley then discussed a piece of property on Ryan Road that the owner is proposing all duplex development. So this is also something to look at within our subdivision regulations. Do we want development like that, with all duplexes or do we want some houses dispersed within the duplexes. Cramer stated we have been talking about affordable housing and that clearly fits what we are looking at. Staley stated the reason he brings this up is when he lived in California, the area was 45% duplexes. Sacramento then came up with an ordinance that limited the amount of duplexes by only allowing duplexes on corner lots. He feels when this proposal goes public; we are probably going

to get some opposition. Liebel stated if they are all clumped together, they will more than likely be all rentals, where as if you disperse them amongst single family, there would probably be more of a tendency for someone to buy one and live in one side and rent the other side out.

Staley stated what we are going to try and get through the next five sections for the next meeting.

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

Lisa Cramer, Chairperson