

**City of Buckley
Planning Commission Minutes
January 7, 2008**

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

The following members were present: Bill Dorn, Bridget McNassar, Dale Clark, and Cindy Maas. Lisa Cramer was absent. Also in attendance was Associate Planner Suraiya Rashid.

Clark moved to approve the minutes of the December 17, 2007 commission meeting. McNassar seconded the motion. Clark stated he knows there was discussion about a priority list but to refresh his memory, was there an actual decision about the priority list. Secretary Boyle stated she was listening to the minutes today and there was not a firm decision about the priority list. The motion then carried.

Review Objectives, set priorities and establish timeline for 1st and 2nd quarter of 2008.

Liebel stated he put on the agenda to review our objectives and establish some timelines. In response to that Suraiya sent a note that broke it down rather simply. From the cities position there are three basic things we need to get done rather soon. They are the zoning code, the subdivision regulations and a comprehensive plan amendment. Rashid stated for the comprehensive plan amendment, it will be more a staff issue so it shouldn't take a lot of time. There are some individual property owners that are looking to do rezones. There was a brief discussion about where these properties are located. We need to try and have good drafts of these and consensus by the end of February with the thought of having a public hearing at the beginning of March. Rashid stated she has some good information for the planning commission that she will hand out next meeting regarding the differences between the subdivision regulations and the zoning code. The subdivision regulations are more administrative and the zoning code tells you what you can do with individual lots.

Decisions on Open Space

Rashid asked what the Planning Commission wants to get from the open space discussion, the priority list. Maas stated we decided on 10% or did we. Liebel stated he doesn't think we decided on anything definitely. Secretary Boyle stated the commission did vote on 10% active open space. McNassar stated we did talk about a priority list for the 10% open space but we never put anything in writing. Dorn asked why can't a park fee be charged and the city buy property. Wouldn't it be smarter to have property in mind that the city wants to buy for parks and then charge a park fee for each house that is built then the city could buy that property, rather than the Planning Commission second guessing on how much property should be taken and where the parks should be placed within each development?

Liebel stated he agrees if we could make decisions on which developments we want the land and which ones we just want the impact fee. Clark stated he agrees with Dorn, he likes that idea a lot. In the perfect world we would hope that the money goes where it is supposed to but this is not a perfect world. Dorn stated he feels guilty taking 10% of someone's property and if there is an alternative it should be on the table. Rashid stated maybe we need a more defined park plan with stricter guidelines with how the money is spent. As far as charging a greater impact fee so we can get more money to purchase land is not necessarily that easy to do. There has to be an impact study done and that is how you come up with fee that should be charged. Dorn stated he has never seen clustering inside the city limits; he has seen high density but never clustering. In rural sprawling areas you see everything. When you have pockets of high density with open space, that is what he considers clustering and he has never seen that in city limits. Discussion ensued. Dorn stated he thinks 10% is a lot to ask property owners to give up. Rashid stated you all have to remember that it is just an option. They don't have to cluster; they can build out at all 6,000 square foot lots. Liebel stated we need to set the priority list for 10% open space. His ideas for the priority list are trails, parks and connectivity. Liebel stated the park impact fees need to be used for new parks, not for maintenance of our existing parks. Rashid stated you could put some stipulation in there that park impact fees cannot be used for maintenance. Everyone then gave their opinions again about whether or not they wanted 10%. McNassar wants to stay with the 10%. Liebel stated he prefers 5%-10%. Maas thinks 10% is too much and would rather see 5%. Clark is okay with 10%. Maas asked if we are going to revote on the 10%. Liebel stated if we are not going to have an open space set aside, there is no reason to have the clustering option. Rashid stated you have to think about how big you want the parks to be when you are thinking about the 10% versus 5% open space.

There was a lot of discussion about using the wetlands towards the 10% open space.

Liebel stated what he would like to do for the next meeting is go back to the clustering and try to finish this enough to the point that it is an option, which is going to include a decision on open space and a decision on density. He would rather do that than move onto an entire new section.

The next meeting will be January 14, 2007 at 7:00 PM.

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

Gordon Liebel, Chairperson