

**Planning Commission
November 8, 2004**

Chairperson Schneider called the regularly scheduled meeting to order at 7:41 PM.

The following members were present: Lisa Cramer, James Montgomery, Sandy Ramsey, Cristi Boyle Barrett and Ken Smith. Cindy Maas arrived late. Also in attendance were staff members Gwen Rousseau and Dan Staley.

Cramer moved to approve the minutes of the November 1, 2004 commission meeting as corrected. Boyle-Barrett seconded the motion and the motion carried.

Finalize Comprehensive Plan Updates:

Rousseau stated she doesn't have the corrected copy of the four elements for tonight's meeting. Cramer asked if we received the information from Cindy that needs to be added for the median home prices. Rousseau stated yes we do. Rousseau stated the main issues that were discussed at the last meeting were the Future Land Use Map (FLUM) which we will not discuss any further and the overlay map that will be added which is a tool to let us do what we have already discussed and decided. The only other thing that has been brought up is there were not acronyms in the glossary. Rousseau does have that list that was passed out to the commission. Boyle-Barrett stated she had a question about the appendices. In the A2 Annexation one, it talks about the UGA being created in 1994, however, it hasn't been approved, so should the language be changed? Schneider stated we actually do have a UGA, it just happens to be the existing City limits. Rousseau stated technically we have to have a UGA even though it is the existing City limits.

Transportation Element:

Staley stated the intent for this evening is to talk about anything that is substantial that needs to be changed in the transportation element. Schneider stated if we have changes that don't contain content; the grammatical and formatting changes could be made on copies and given to Staley and Rousseau for the corrections to be made. Staley stated he would prefer it to be done that way. Boyle-Barrett stated within the other elements, there were discussions before each goal and she feels they need to be added to the Transportation Element to make it consistent with the other elements. Montgomery stated he didn't see anything in there that pertains to the rush hour traffic that we constantly get every weekday. Rousseau stated we could investigate the timing of the traffic lights on the Highway. We could find out how much control the City has over that and write a goal to pertain to it. Schneider stated when the City was preparing their Highway 410 Plan, we were told there was nothing in the works for even the long term future to widen the highway or build another bridge over the river. Staley stated the one thing we can do here at least is start being the squeaky wheel. Schneider stated there have been some concerns raised by the School District regarding Mundy Loss Road from 112th to 120th. It is not a safe place for pedestrians or bikes and yet it serves three of the schools within the District. It is listed as a top priority within the transportation element even though it is not within the City limits. In talking with Staley it appears the best option is to possibly get an interlocal agreement with the City, School District and

County to try to get this road upgraded to include sidewalks. Staley stated this could possibly be a project added within the transportation plan. Schneider stated he will be meeting with a group from the School District tomorrow night regarding this. Boyle-Barrett asked where Wickersham and Butler are slated to be. Staley and Rousseau stated it is on the current future street map. Rousseau stated being we are talking about the future street map, she would like to know the planning commission's feelings as to the proposed future street map that she has developed. Within this map, it puts grid streets out in the area between Ryan and Collins. Rousseau explained how the grid system works. Staley stated in the existing street plan there are established rights of way however there is no defined connectivity. Rousseau stated it is a question of whether or not you want points of connectivity between the arterials. The commission would like to see this added to the transportation element. Boyle-Barrett asked about Page 4 (Policy 1.1.3) under the level of service priority order (2D), this is out in the country, why would it be included in our level of service priority? It was the commission's consensus to delete this from the plan. Boyle-Barrett stated under Policy 1.1.4 it talks about labeling the bikeways and was very vague; however in the rest of the plan it is emphasized strongly. She feels this should be re-worded. Staley stated this is standard plan language. Rousseau stated under this plan you may want to look at the objectives and think of them as goals and they can work on adding discussion under each of these. Schneider commented on the concurrency issue and stated that his question is at this point we have such limited funds and this requires that we already have the money and commitment for any improvements that need to be made before development is allowed. A member of the audience then commented on concurrency and levels of service. Schneider asked if the levels of service are set high enough in this plan. Staley stated Gray and Osborne performed a study to come up with these levels of standards and he is encouraging the planning commission to review these and make sure they are comfortable with them.

With nothing further the meeting was adjourned at 9:04 PM.