

**Planning Commission**  
**December 6, 2004**

Chairperson Schneider called the regularly scheduled meeting to order at 7:07 PM.

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

Boyle-Barrett moved to approve the minutes of the November 22, 2004 commission meeting as corrected. Cramer seconded the motion and the motion carried.

**Park Plan Element Public Hearing:**

Administrator Schmidt stated the purpose of tonight's public hearing is to solicit comments on the Park Plan Element of the Comprehensive Plan. In May of this year the City adopted a Parks and Recreation Plan. This element is based upon that plan. Nothing of substance has changed, the contents are exactly the way the park plan is, the formatting is the only thing changed to fit in with the comprehensive plan.

Chairperson Schneider stated with the copy we received tonight, there are some tables missing which will be implemented before this document gets sent off to the agencies.

The Public Hearing was opened at 7:09 PM.

Marvin Sundstrom, 881 Sheets Road. He would like to make a few comments on the park plan. He is not against parks; he is only interested in maximizing opportunities with available resources. On page T24 we talk about White River Ridge, will the development still pay a park impact fee? Administrator Schmidt stated they will not because they are installing their own park. Mr. Sundstrom stated when the City accepts the deed, the City accepts all the developers problems related to the storm water pond. The park will be a major maintenance problem, \$.15 per thousand is not a lot of money and he believes that is what you can tax on a parks and recreation district. Administrator Schmidt stated he believes it is \$.50. Mr. Sundstrom stated the plan states \$.15. On page T26, regarding the WSU facility, the State is not a very good leaser; there is a requirement that they charge according to estimated values which is generally inflated. This is also subject to unrealistic increases. His input would be find a way to obtain ownership. Page T33, Objective 3.1 sounds like extortion. Page T44, given the City's financial situation, one would expect more attention be given to low maintenance recreation which is unique to this area. From the questionnaire, there were a large number of inputs for wildlife and bird watching along with passive recreation. He doesn't believe those were addressed. This also shows up on page T49. Page T55, the City's assessed valuation is \$259,296,065. The average residence is Buckley is \$156,934, up more than 10% from last year. If you took the total City of Buckley at \$.15 per thousand, you only get

\$38,888.40 per year for five years. This is not a lot of money; it will barely pay for mowing. That is why you have to be realistic about what you do. Mr. Sundstrom asked how much the skate park is going to cost without the property. Administrator Schmidt stated around \$470,000. Mr. Sundstrom stated this will only serve about 5% of the population of Buckley, which is a lot of money to spend for that few of citizens. To date, \$90,000 has been removed from storm water revenue to cover construction costs of the skate board park. The storm water system has many of its own problems that have not been addressed. In closing, he does not agree with the concept of negotiating with a developer for a park or allowing the impact fees to be waived. These fees could be better utilized for the whole community with more strategically located parks. If the developer wants a park, let them put one in at their own expense.

Ken Smith asked where he is finding all his information, all the numbers. Mr. Sundstrom stated he called the County Assessor.

Boyle-Barrett asked the fee Mr. Sundstrom is talking about regarding the \$.15 versus the \$.50, which is correct? Administrator Schmidt stated it is a state statue that he will check on to make sure we have the correct figure.

Maas asked about the park that is being built by White River Ridge. Administrator Schmidt stated the condition that the Planning Commission and Council put on the plat is for just a pocket park. By them going with a full acre with all the amenities, they are putting quite a bit of money in it. Discussion ensued.

Maas asked for an explanation of Objective 3.1. Staley stated this is standard language for any municipality to try and obtain a parcel or a portion of a parcel from a land owner for a park either by voluntary dedication or through the subdivision regulations.

Montgomery asked Mr. Sundstrom, what areas he had in mind for the bird watching and wildlife parks that he referred to earlier. Mr. Sundstrom stated the City has a lot of property around that are designated wetlands. Also, along the hiking trails, it doesn't take many bushes to attract a lot of birds. We need to place an effort in getting trails that will contribute to that kind of watching.

The Public Hearing was closed at 7:53 PM.

**Deliberations and Recommendations on the Park Plan Element:**

There was a consensus by the planning commission to direct staff to go ahead and proceed with the environmental review and state review so we can bring it back for re-consideration and recommendation.

Administrator Schmidt asked Staley where we are with the Transportation Element. Staley stated they are still waiting for some information from Gray & Osborne. Administrator Schmidt stated then this will be the last meeting in December.

Administrator Schmidt stated he would like to congratulate Dan Staley. He has been offered the job as part time Planner by the Mayor.

The next meeting will be January 3, 2005 at 7:00 PM.

With nothing further, the meeting was adjourned at 7:55 PM.