

Planning Commission
September 11, 2006

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

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

Cramer stated because the minutes were handed out tonight and we have another meeting next Monday, we will postpone the approval of the minutes until next meeting.

Trail Plan Discussion:

Staley stated basically what he wanted to have done today instead of doing detail of where the trail is going to go is to outline what the expectations are so both committees can pool their energies. Council member Schneider stated what their committee was thinking is they love the Foothills trail so they would like to get a trail that is city wide that would connect all the parks of the city together along with one of our most valuable assets and that is the White River. They have roughly drawn lines on a map how you can get around Buckley and then down to the river and then back up connecting to the Foothills trail. Planning Director Staley stated what we are doing here by working on the subdivision regulations and what we just recently came up with is the very same thing. How are we going to have connections going through town? So we are thinking about the very same thing that the Council is getting at. So what we need is a committee with 3-5 people with some blending of Planning commission and Council members and maybe even a citizen so we can say this committee initiated this work and we make it happen. Schneider stated this goes right along with the Community Development Committee. She then went into detail on what the Community Development Committee has done in the past. Schneider asked Planning Director Staley what exactly he wants from the Council committee today. Staley stated we need to formalize the trail/open space committee and name the members. There was a discussion on who should be on this committee. Staley suggested that the Parks committee say they are going to work on this for 3-6 months. Make it an ad-hoc and whatever Planning Commission members want to be on it also. Council member Schneider asked if Staley would be willing to attend those meetings. Staley stated absolutely. Council member Schneider stated she would make this the main item on her agenda and they meet the first Tuesday of every month from 7:30-8:30. Council member Schneider stated she welcomes anyone from the Planning Commission to work on this with them.

Smith moved to change the agenda to have the subdivision regulations prior to having the stormwater detention pond discussion. Liebel seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Subdivision Regulations:

Staley went over the changes that have been made and there is a question as to whether or not survey monuments should be included in this. Staley stated because it is already

listed in 18.34 required improvements, there shouldn't be an entire separate section on this.

Where we left off was **18.44 Alleys**. The last discussion on alleys was that is it probably important to think about alleys per zone for instance requiring alleys in the R-6000 and say it is a good idea in the other zones. Liebel stated he doesn't agree the second part of the statement. Cramer stated she would like to say she visited Dupont and they have alleys and if we could guarantee that ours would look like that, she would be all for it. She did feel after the last meeting that everyone was feeling that in certain areas it would make sense to have alleys. The big question is whether or not we want to require them. Smith stated if we require alleys that could give us a little bit of trade incentive. Telling the contractors if we allow you not to have alleys, then they can give us something back in return. Liebel stated he is opposed to that. He is willing to concede that we should not exclude alleys. He feels there is a real need for them with smaller lot sizes. He thinks if we require alleys and then use them as a bargaining chip what we are saying is we don't really want alleys, we are just using them as a bargaining chip. He thinks there is a better way to accomplish that and that is to require open space. Smith stated if you require the open space then the contractor is going to want something in return. Staley stated if you have a plan in place such as our trail/open space plan, then the contractor is going to know what is required right up front. Cramer stated we have had long discussion on alleys so how do we move on from here. Staley stated this is one issue he feels we should table for now and come back to it and then will have to vote on what needs to be done. Cramer stated she would like to get a sense of how everyone feels. Montgomery stated he feels R-6000 should be required; R-8000 is questionable and R-20,000 no way. Dorn stated there is another way to look at it and that is if you have large streets then alleys wouldn't be required, but if you have small streets, alleys should be required. This way you don't change the open space. Whether they are required or not required, there should be options. Smith stated he thinks R-6,000 and R-8,000 should be required and R-20,000 should not. Maas stated she has been thinking since the last meeting that she is maybe leaning toward requiring an alley on anything smaller than a 6,000 square foot lot. Other than that she is against alleys. Cramer stated there are definitely some variations on the opinions. Maas asked how can you determine alleys if you don't know how wide the streets will be. Staley stated that is something that we will have to work out later. Cramer stated lets put this on hold for now and get through some of these other issues.

18.45 Private Streets – Staley stated the current subdivision regulations allow for four lots served off a private street. These new regulations shall serve no more than two lots which is lower, however if we want to continue with our goal of connectivity, how many of these private streets do you want in town. Dorn asked if we are doing away with cul-de-sacs. Staley stated no we are not. We are strongly encouraging grid streets; however there are situations where a cul-de-sac is all that can be done. Liebel asked when a driveway becomes a private street. Discussion ensued. It was the consensus of the commission that a private driveway serves only one lot where a private street serves two or more lots. Staley stated we need to define private streets and private driveways. The question we need to answer is do we allow private streets, if so to how many lots and how many private streets per subdivision. Liebel stated if we completely eliminate

private streets, then they can come back and apply for a variance. If we allow them and give some criteria then it makes that process a little easier. You can't just look at the subdivision regulations, you also have to look at the comprehensive plan which gives you what the intentions are. When you have to have a private street, these are the requirements. Staley stated most developers will be looking at both the regulations and the comprehensive plan. Montgomery stated he doesn't like them but is not sure we should actually eliminate them. If we do have them, he would like to limit them to only serve two lots and only allowing one per plat. Cramer agreed with Montgomery. There was a very lengthy discussion and after discussion it was decided to have the wording on Section A to be "When necessary there shall be no more than one private street per plat and shall serve no more than two lots unless you are making up for granted open space provision, then one more shall be allowed". There was another discussion regarding private drives versus private streets. Liebel stated we clarified that private drives served only one lot and private streets serves two or more lots. Staley stated he will draft up a new version of this to have for next week. Liebel asked if there is any reference source to see what they have regarding streets and driveways. Staley stated he will talk to Dean tomorrow about this and get the definition straighten out.

Stormwater Detention Pond Plan:

Staley stated we need to start the work on the stormwater detention pond. So starting the first meeting in October we will be having our group workshop prior to the regular meeting. We are going to define what we are going to do with storm water detention ponds. Our intention is to make it a part of the open space plan and the amenity of the subdivision so it is not an eyesore. Maas asked if Staley would be bringing in pictures. Staley stated yes he would.

Maas asked because the commission is having a hard time making a decision on alleys, do you think it would be in the best interest of the commission to have another field trip and go to other cities that have alleys with 6,000 square foot lots. Staley stated the could but no decision was made.

Cramer stated at the next meeting we will be deciding on who is going to be working on the stormwater detention pond committee and who will be working on the trail plan committee.

The next meeting will be Monday September 18, 2006 at 7:00 PM.

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

Lisa Cramer, Chairperson