

City of Buckley
Planning Commission Minutes
August 6, 2007

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

The following members were present: Bill Dorn, Gordon Liebel, Dale Clark, James Montgomery and Bridgett McNassar. Cindy Maas was absent.

The minutes for June 18, 2007 and July 9, 2007 were handed out but will be reviewed and passed at the next meeting. Also handed out was Title 20 of the Buckley Municipal Code for everyone to review.

Cramer stated the City of Enumclaw has recommended adopted a hearings examiners system for land use applications. It will eliminate the existing Board of Adjustments and limit the Planning Commission to a policy function with the City Council being the final decider on most land use applications. She thought that was interesting that they are just starting that. Liebel stated it seems like a lot of small locals are going to the same system we are looking at.

PRD's (Planned Residential Development) and PUD's (Planned Unit Development) pros and cons:

Liebel stated he has given this a lot of thought and it seems to him the question isn't whether or not we want a PRD or PUD, the question is what are we missing from our goals that are not in the subdivision regulations or Title 20. There is currently nothing for open space. Affordable housing, we can all argue whether housing is affordable, but if you only give them a 4,000 square foot lot, obviously they won't be able to build a large house which limits the cost. The smallest lot size we have now is 6,000 sq. ft. so the only way to get the smaller lots is to have a PRD. When looking through all these, the key thing is open space. One thing we don't have is trying to connect to the trail plan. There are a bunch of pieces that are missing and he doesn't know if we can get them all in here or if this is even the right place to get them in. So if we know what we want, what are we willing to give up to get that? Cramer stated the way Davis explained things is that it seems the PRD/PUD is how we are going to get our goals to get the flexibility. Liebel stated if you want flexibility then you need a guideline which is the PRD/PUD. If you want to say that every builder over 10 acres has to give us 15% open space, then that can go in either the subdivision regulations or Title 20.

Montgomery stated when we first started working with Ed, he had a hard time going backwards because we spent all this time with Dan talking about the pieces of the puzzle and then Ed came in with a different background and different way of doing things. He doesn't feel our goals have been addressed other than in the introduction. This document is what is going to shape the development. Cramer stated the down side to having it as a separate document, the PRD/PUD; it is an

option, not a requirement. The subdivision regulations are requirements. Liebel stated if you make the PRD's not attractive or equal to what they can do without it, then why would they do it? Why would they give us open space, if they can cram as many houses possible on the land already? So another way of doing it is to put the incentives in as a must, rather than shall. Cramer stated one thing we need to remember is we have to have the City Council and the public buy off on this and to have the PRD/PUD's not be a requirement, may be better to provide more flexibility. Liebel stated with any company, regardless how good they are, if there is too much financial hardship, they are going to go with what is going to make them more money. Liebel stated he is not trying to promote it one way or the other; he is trying to figure out how to get our goals accomplished.

Montgomery stated he doesn't feel that our proposed subdivision regulations still do not meet our goals. Montgomery stated our new planner is not going to have the background of what has been discussed with the public hearings and what the community wants. Dorn stated that is correct and when you look at the PRD's and PUD's the planner has a lot of authority to make decisions. Dorn stated he is not comfortable with the planner and hearings examiner having the authority for the flexibility.

There was a brief discussion again regarding the hearings examiner and whether or not it is a good thing.

McNassar stated two of the things she felt the PRD's and PUD's addressed that we haven't really addressed yet were affordability and range of housing prices and variety of housing types. Several of them addressed having to have a minimum and maximum of multi-family housing and also having large homes with small homes so you don't have the rich neighborhoods and the "slum" neighborhoods. Montgomery stated one thing that was discussed earlier is having duplexes on corner lots in developments and limiting them to a maximum.

Cramer stated some of what she likes about it is a more advantages way of using a site. Liebel stated one of the advantages is if we allow them some percentage of the open space requirement for wetlands then we still get open space.

Cramer stated lets identify the things we want to have and then decide if we want one document or have two separate documents. McNassar asked for the cities that have PUD's where is it in their code? Cramer stated she found most of them under zoning. Clark stated he would really like to talk to some of the other cities one on one to see if they are actually working. He would like to have someone come and talk to the Planning Commission that has a PUD in place and how it works. Discussion ensued.

Dorn stated the PUD's make him nervous, but yet he likes the flexibility about them. If you go with the PUD's it has to have some substance with checks and

balances. You are not going to stop growth so instead of making things so restrictive, you have to become a part of it and get what you want.

Liebel stated the hardest frustration we have is getting what we want on paper. Cramer stated that is up to the Planner. Cramer stated the biggest thing we need to do is put together something that the citizens and staff can use that will tell them what it is they need to put together that will satisfy everybody. The organizer in her wants to have one document that will address everything, however, she doesn't know if that is going to work. Cramer stated when Davis returns, we need to sit with him and ask if we can incorporate everything into one document or if there needs to be separate documents.

Cramer stated she would like to contact some other cities approximately the same size as ours and see how their PUD's are working. Dorn suggested picking some cities that don't have a large commercial base like us. She will see Devon this week and get some phone numbers of other cities. Dorn stated he would be willing to go and meet with the other cities.

Liebel stated when we get close to a final draft; we take a couple scenarios, worst case, and best case and see how those pencil out.

Through the discussion during the evening the Planning Commission came up with the following likes and dislikes of the PRD/PUD's.

Likes:

- Open Space
- Flexibility in decision making by Planner
- Range of Housing Prices
- Variety of Housing Types
- Gives builders flexibility with a lot having unusual features (i.e. wetlands)
- Identifying benefits to public; trails, accessibility, active/passive parks, etc.
- Helps us achieve Buckley Planning Commission Development Goals
- Ties in with Comprehensive Plan

Dislikes:

- More staff/administrative time?
- Small lot size doesn't mean affordability
- Would small lot sizes mean tall houses?
- Flexibility in decision making by Planner
- Maintenance of Open Space – Homeowners Association vs. City

There are no more meetings scheduled for August and the first Monday of September is Labor Day, so our next meeting will be on September 10, 2007 at 7:00 PM.

Cramer stated for the Planners position, there are four people on the interviewing committee and they are Building Official Dean Mundy, Administrator Dave Schmidt, Finance Officer Sheila Bazzar and herself. They will be starting the first round of interviews on Wednesday afternoon with seven or eight people getting interviewed.

With nothing further the meeting was adjourned at 9:05 PM