

City of Colville

PLANNING COMMISSION

June 13, 2012

7:00 P.M. – City Hall

MINUTES

The Colville Planning Commission held a regular meeting on Wednesday, June 13, 2012, in the Council Room at City Hall. Chairperson Jody Hoffman called the meeting to order at 7:05 P.M. with a quorum present.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jody Hoffman, Russ Larsen, Dee Hokom, and Alan Bedford. MEMBERS ABSENT: Brenda Buckner. Two vacancies exist. STAFF PRESENT: Assistant Planner Melinda Lee. RECORDING SECRETARY: Susan Davis.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes from the previous meeting of May 23, 2012 had been distributed to each member prior to the meeting. Russ Larsen moved and Alan Bedford seconded the motion to approve the minutes as written. Voice vote showed all in favor.

OLD BUSINESS

A. Continued discussion of potential changes to the Colville Development Regulations.

i. Private Road Design Standards:

Discussion of potential changes to the design standards for private roads was continued from the previous meeting of May 23, 2012. Assistant Planner Melinda Lee explained that currently private roads are allowed provided they meet city street standards. In some instances where it was not feasible, negotiations have occurred, which have netted different results. Private roads are not maintained by the City. In order to provide opportunities for future development, she stated staff would like to try to standardize private road design standards. Examples of Stevens County guidelines were available for reference (copy on file).

Dee Hokom expressed the opinion that private roads should not be allowed at all. She felt if a road/street is in the city limits the developer should be required to construct it to city design standards and it needs to be maintained by the City. She agreed that the design standards should be consistent or there could be legal issues. Dee and Alan Bedford felt once the design standards have been established they should be enforced.

Relative to concerns about maintenance and repair issues, Melinda distributed a sample agreement that demonstrated how private road maintenance can be achieved (copy on file).

Based on the examples from Stevens County, which were distributed at the previous meeting, Melinda advised that staff has given some thought to proposing a lesser standard for private driveways. Photos were distributed illustrating an existing private driveway on S. Alder Street, which provides access to a duplex (copy on file). Melinda explained that on S. Alder Street, as well as S. Madison Street, right-of-

## PLANNING COMMISSION

June 13, 2012

Page 2

way was dedicated but the streets were never developed all the way through. As single family development occurred, the property owners were allowed to use the right-of-way as private drives and they are responsible for maintenance. Melinda pointed out without the flexibility to allow private roads there would be situations where this type of development just would not happen. Another example of a private drive on S. Miner Street was presented (copy on file). Melinda explained that the property owner has an access easement to serve his residence. He inquired about short platting the property but couldn't afford to comply with the required street standards to serve additional lots and declined to proceed. Alan questioned what the cost of the lots would be if the street was constructed to city standards. Melinda felt that road development costs for a short plat (2-4 lots) could be substantial. She noted for a long plat (5+ lots) it is different because there are more lots and it is more cost effective for a developer to spread the cost burden. Relative to Mark Beardslee's short plat east of Pheasant Ridge, Melinda noted that the private road serving the four lots was constructed to meet the minimum width requirement but curbs/sidewalks were not required, which was a cost savings in the long run. Alan questioned whether the City could meet the developer part way on something like that and set it up so that future improvements could be done as necessary.

Based on the examples from Stevens County for private road development, Jody Hoffman suggested that consideration be given to establishing a basic requirement for roads serving 1-2 houses and have other requirements as the density increases. Melinda pointed out Type 3 in the example is for very limited access, which could serve a couple of houses, and be surfaced with gravel. The minimum right-of-way width could still be required. If the density ever increased the property owner(s) would have to come back to the City and at that point the road would have to be brought up to higher standards. It would not be the City that would do it – it would be whoever is generating the need. Dee felt that would be acceptable if that stipulation were written into the ordinance. She questioned whether there is some clause in the ordinance that no street will be accepted into the City street system or maintained until the street is constructed to city standards. Melinda confirmed that plat approval is conditioned upon that clause. She noted that the City does not actually have specific design standards – the Land Division Ordinance states that construction materials and methods shall be in accordance with standards and specifications for Municipal Public Works Construction prepared by the American Public Works Association (APWA). Developers are required to use the APWA Standards.

Discussion of this item was continued to a future meeting.

### ii. Pedestrian and Bicycle Routes; Design Standards.

Melinda distributed a photo of a new residential garage located on a collector, which has a new sidewalk (copy on file). She explained that currently concrete sidewalks are required for new construction on arterials and collectors, school walk routes, and in the C-2 District. She noted there is a creek just beyond the garage and in her opinion it is not likely that the sidewalk will ever connect to anything. She was concerned that the sidewalk could deteriorate over time and could need replacing if and when another sidewalk occurs to connect it to. Melinda suggested coming up with some way of deferring sidewalk construction in this type of situation until further development occurs which would create continuous sidewalks.

Dee Hokom questioned whether there is an alternative for walkways and surfacing that could be considered. In that regard, Melinda brought up the issue of future design standards for pedestrian and

## PLANNING COMMISSION

June 13, 2012

Page 3

bicycle routes. She suggested that consideration be given to allowing different surfacing materials pointing out that pavement or packed gravel is becoming popular not just on pedestrian trails but in some communities as an alternative to sidewalks. Melinda stated that drainage could become an issue because sidewalks help channel storm water and that would have to be addressed somehow. She suggested the possibility of just requiring curbs to channel storm water.

Jody Hoffman expressed support for seeking alternatives to sidewalks. Relative to the previous example of the garage project, she indicated she would rather see a pathway there than a sidewalk. She felt for a situation like that it just makes more sense and would be easier for the developers. Dee agreed with Jody and felt it would be desirable especially if it connected with a pathway all around there. Melinda confirmed that the idea would be to ultimately have a system of pathways. She pointed out adequate right-of-way would still be there to put sidewalks in if we wanted to – it would be an option.

Melinda reported that staff recently saw a grant opportunity to help develop pedestrian/bicycle facilities. The grant however is a reimbursement program and it is just too costly for the City to do that. She felt if the facilities could be developed to a lesser standard and still meet the city's objective, it might have been worth pursuing. She suggested if some pathway alternatives can be proposed maybe some cost estimates can be done to see what the difference is.

Melinda advised that staff was approached by Dillon Schanz, regarding the development of a trail for his Senior Project next year. Initially he wanted to develop a trail up on Colville Mountain but after talking with staff and looking at maps which showed numerous private property ownerships, he decided not to pursue that route. With the help of Recreation Coordinator Jake Wilson, Dillon is now focusing on the possibility of coming off Rotary Trail to the east by the new reservoir and up through the trees for its scenic value. Because city property would be involved, staff recommended that he approach the City Council for permission to develop the trail. It was recognized that liability is always an issue. Melinda stated Dillon is planning on organizing a group of people to keep the trail maintained. Alan pointed out the importance of establishing a sustaining group to keep the trail maintained into the future. Although Dee felt trail maintenance should be part of the City Recreation Department budget, she suggested an "adopt a trail" program as an option, similar to what is done on roads.

Russ Larsen reported that the Tri-County Health Department received a grant to pursue the proposed Kettle Falls-Colville bike/pedestrian trail along Highway 395. He stated the Rotary Club has indicated a willingness to maintain the trail upon construction.

In conclusion, it was the general consensus of the Commission to have staff explore alternatives for trail development. Melinda advised that she will develop some proposals based on the Commission's discussion for further review.

NEW BUSINESS: There was no New Business to be presented.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: There was no public present.

## REPORTS

### A. Status of proposal for permitting the keeping of chickens in residential districts.

Melinda reported that she was not able to do more research on the keeping of chickens since the last meeting. Based on past conversations, it appeared to Melinda that the Commission seemed to prefer a specific enclosed area (not free range) with a coop and a run. She questioned whether the Commission would like to see a maximum number of hens allowed. In discussion which followed methods for calculating the maximum number of chickens permitted included minimum lot area, square footage per chicken, or minimum size for enclosures. Jody and Dee expressed support for allowing a maximum of 5 hens. Al suggested using lot area as a means for the calculation. Russ felt that the regulations should allow the average person to enjoy their surroundings and not know that chickens are there. The intent is to keep chickens from becoming a public nuisance.

Melinda pointed out that in previous discussion Brenda Buckner had expressed opposition to clipping the wings, which would be the reason for having an enclosed coop.

Melinda brought up corner lots which do not have a rear yard. She questioned whether chickens should be allowed in a front yard in that situation. It was a general consensus to restrict the keeping of chickens to a back yard area in a minimum sized enclosure. Jody felt if people who have larger lots want to make a bigger enclosure, then that is their right.

Discussion followed relative to permit requirements. It was felt that the permit would basically serve as a tracking tool and should not be cost prohibitive. It was a consensus to propose a one time fee of \$20. Melinda pointed out if a violation occurs it could be followed up on as a nuisance. Dee agreed that it is important to include a violations section so that action can be taken.

Based on the discussion, Melinda indicated that she will prepare a draft for further review.

### B. Inquiry regarding the former Excel building.

Melinda reported that staff recently received an inquiry regarding the former Excel building. A feasibility study is being conducted for possible demolition of the existing building and construction of a new McDonald's on the site. It was her understanding that the existing McDonald's would be sold. The new building would be about the same size as the existing McDonald's with site improvements.

Alan questioned how the new diagonal parking arrangement is working on Main Street. Melinda reported at last night's meeting, apparently the City Council received good reports from people.

## ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business, Alan Bedford moved and Russ Larsen seconded the motion to adjourn. There were no objections and the meeting was adjourned at 8:40 P.M.