

**Planning Commission  
September 18, 2006**

Chairperson Cramer called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM.

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

Smith moved to approve the minutes of the August 21, 2006 commission minutes. Maas seconded the motion. Liebel stated on the integrated stair issue,  $\frac{3}{4}$  of the way down, the sentence should read "Liebel stated he would **not** have to bond around anything because he wants to put in a private driveway ...." The motion then carried.

Liebel moved to approve the minutes of the September 11, 2006 commission minutes. Cramer seconded the motion and the motion carried.

**Trail-Open Space Plan Discussion:**

Cramer stated we need to get a couple representatives from the Commission that want to be on the Trail-Open Space committee. Smith and Montgomery both agreed to be on this committee.

**Schedule Public Hearing for Landscape Overlay District:**

The date will be October 16, 2006 at 7:00 PM here in the Multi-Purpose Center. Maas asked if anyone thinks there will be a lot of people here for this. Cramer stated the only controversial issue she sees is if someone wants to re-develop they have to update to the new developments.

**Stormwater Detention Pond Plan:**

Staley stated he has a couple standard documents that are templates so these two things will be on the website and he will bring these into the committee meeting. There will be sub-committee work on this prior to the regular meetings. Basically you will have a template. It is similar to what we did on the landscape overlay district. It is very basic, try and make the stormwater detention ponds look nice. There are a lot of areas that are doing this. Montgomery, Maas and Liebel stated they were interested in this committee. These meetings will start on October 9, 2006 at 6:15 PM, prior to regular commission meetings. Cramer stated we will hold two meetings for now in October on the 9<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> and then decide whether or not we want to hold an additional meeting. Maas stated she is concerned that we are getting behind.

**Subdivision Regulations:**

Staley stated one thing that the commission may be asked about because it is election time is the land use initiative I-933 on the ballot. The initiative is property fairness initiative. The Farm Bureau and almost no one else back it. What the initiative says is that if there is any land use regulation since 1996 that affects the property value of your home in a negative way, you can make a claim against the municipality. You can either have the municipality pay you for your loss or let you develop. So the municipality has to take the claim and pay for all the research and investigation. There is no proof provided by the landowner. The Association of Washington Cities is against it. We are

not against the property rights movement; we are for putting uses in their place. We are for zoning that said we could separate uses for the public good. At the first meeting in October, the Council will be voting on a resolution against this initiative.

**18.45 Private Streets** – Cramer stated there were some issues from the last meeting that we needed definitions on. Liebel stated we needed better definitions on private drives and private streets. Staley stated the City does not have a better definition on these. We do not have a code that says a private street is greater than 300 feet or a private drive is less than 290 feet. If we want to define that further, we would need to define that here. Maas asked what other cities do. Do we have definitions from other cities? Staley stated it varies from city to city. Cramer stated do we want to define that as part of this. Maas stated she would like to know what other cities have before we make a final decision. Staley stated private drive shall be defined as a private driveway not greater than \_\_\_\_ not serving more than two residential lots. Liebel stated they can be the same if we want the criteria to be the same. If we want the criteria to be different then we can define them differently. A drive is his mind serves one house possibly two and is nothing more than a driveway to get there but when it gets to be a ½ mile then should it be a street? Staley stated limiting the length of a drive then you would be limiting 20,000 square foot lot sizes from building a mansion on 6 acres that would require a street. This could be a weapon against big mansions. Liebel stated one of the ways it seems to hurt you are with impervious surfaces. Staley stated he will see if he can find some definitions for towns around here or in King County. Liebel stated a couple things we were in agreement on were the use of them and the number of lots served and the limit of private drives per development. Maas asked when Staley could get the information on the definitions. Staley stated he would have it to everyone on Wednesday. Maas stated she is a visual person and if she knows where these are, she can go look at them and learn a lot faster. Liebel stated on the commercial part of this it was suggested that it be 30 feet rather than 20 feet. It this because of major truck traffic. Staley stated yes it is. Maas asked if private streets have names. Staley stated yes. Maas asked if private drives have names. Staley stated no they do not. Maas stated private streets confuse her and she would like to do away with them. Staley stated it is entirely up to the commission. Liebel stated the good news is we don't have the likelihood to have a lot of private streets in the city and by putting limits on them we should be able to avoid having a lot of them. It was the commission's consensus that B & C are okay and we will come back to A when we get more definitions.

#### **18.46 Dead-end Streets**

Cramer asked if all this was standard information coming from somewhere else. Staley stated these numbers are averages from 3-5 other standards. Liebel stated the dead end street minimum of 50 feet lines up with the local access street. Staley stated yes they do. Cramer stated maybe instead of using neighborhood streets we should use the same language that fits such as local access. Liebel stated on section D it states dead end streets shall be a minimum of 50 feet for neighborhood streets and 55 feet for other streets, what other kind of streets would have dead ends other than neighborhood streets. Montgomery stated we were talking about Mason at one point being a collector street but right now it is a dead end. Maas stated Mason is projected to go all the way through as soon as developing happens. You wouldn't have a collector street dead end if you are developing and eventually will connect with another street. Staley stated the purpose of

this is to talk to the fact we don't want a street dead ending to no where. Staley stated he thinks we should eliminate "D", Smith agreed with Staley. Cramer stated in Section C where it talks about streets lining up with other streets when the opportunity arises, she would like to see language added to reinforce the grid pattern goal we have in the Comprehensive Plan. Staley stated with eliminating Section D we don't have to name street widths, we can just say full right of way widths. Liebel stated then will he add some comment on another section. Staley stated yes we would. Staley stated as reading through Section D, we have come across where the street will end at the end of the property or it will end at a place where there is no development possible. Are there any other places where they will end such as a park? Discussion ensued. Liebel asked where we need to write information for access to trails from cul-de-sacs. Staley stated it would be in this section. Liebel stated so if we were to say any cul-de-sac abutting a trail head or park needs to have pedestrian access, this doesn't give us an opportunity to put additional access on straight streets that are not dead end streets so where would we put that? Staley stated that wouldn't go here but he will put that in the parking lot so we make sure we address this in the appropriate area. Staley stated we need to add another section for pedestrian access to trails/parks. Cramer stated do we want to limit it to pedestrians. Staley stated the property end is handled in Section D, the development end will be handled in the hammer head/cul-de-sac and the park/trail end will be pedestrian access and will be a separate section. Montgomery stated it could state in the event a dead end street leads to a park or trail, pedestrian access shall be granted using a cul-de-sac. Smith stated if the street can't go any further and it is a dead end, then there should be a cul-de-sac. Liebel stated it states in Section A, all dead-end streets shall terminate in a circular turnaround, so there would have to be some type of turn around. Liebel stated not to throw a wrench into things but what about private driveways? Montgomery asked if we are going to add a new section for this. Staley stated a trail or park will be a public facility. So on all dead end streets; we have to allow for access to public facilities. Cramer stated we need a definition for public facilities, because not everyone will think of trails and parks as public facilities. Discussion ensued. Maas asked for clarification that in the large undeveloped areas, everywhere there is a dead end would be a cul-de-sac assuming in the future the other large areas would be developed, is that correct? Staley showed on the map how it would work.

Montgomery reported that Council member Boyle Barrett has been working very hard on the safe routes to schools grant on Mundy Loss to the High School road. There is only \$7 million for the State of Washington and Cristi is asking for \$1.7 million.

The next meeting will be October 9, 2006 with the sub-committee starting at 6:15 PM. and the regular meeting at 7:00 PM.

With nothing further, the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 PM.

---

Lisa Cramer, Chairperson