

City of Colville

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

February 12, 2013

8:30 a.m. – City Hall

MINUTES

Chairman Jim Lapinski called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m. with a quorum present.

MEMBERS PRESENT: Planning Director Jim Lapinski, Building Official/Inspector Bob Cleaver, Street/Park Superintendent Terry LeCaire, Municipal Services Administrator Eric Durpos, and Councilmembers Dorothy Bergin and Lou Janke. OTHERS PRESENT: Assistant Planner Melinda Lee. GUESTS PRESENT: Lori Matlock and Alan Gorst. RECORDING SECRETARY: Susan Davis.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes from the previous meeting of February 5, 2013 had been distributed to each member prior to the meeting. Bob Cleaver moved and Terry LeCaire seconded the motion to approve the minutes as written. Voice vote showed all in favor.

OLD BUSINESS: There was no Old Business to be presented at this time.

NEW BUSINESS

- A. Discussion regarding potential annexation and subdivision of approximately 8 acres by Lori Matlock.

Planning Director Jim Lapinski explained that a request was received from Lori Matlock to discuss potential annexation and subdivision of approximately 8 acres in the City's urban growth area. Pertinent information was distributed to TRC members for review prior to the meeting, including minutes from previous TRC discussions related to the subject property (copies on file).

As outlined in her attached letter, Lori Matlock explained that her property is in the county and if she subdivided it per County standards she would have to pave the access road or reconfigure the proposed lots. The road is a private drive from Avista's gate north to the gate accessing the city wells. There is an existing utility easement for water.

Lori indicated she has questions with regards to annexing and short platting her 8 acres into four lots - one 2-acre lot with an existing home, septic and well, and three additional lots. She noted in previous discussions with City staff regarding annexation and subdivision, it was mentioned that she would not have to pave the private drive, which would provide individual access points to the proposed lots. It was her understanding that the septic system for the existing home could remain until it fails and water is available to connect to. Due to the location of the existing sewer line and the need to tear up pavement, Lori stated it is not economically feasible for her to extend the sewer line to serve the proposed lots. She indicated she would like to see if she could annex with city water and county septic, much like other existing areas in Colville. She proposed to install individual septic systems on each of the proposed lots

per the County's specifications (attached). She expressed the feeling that it is not likely that there will be a lot of future development in the vicinity due topography, the location of the city wells, and other options for serving surrounding land uses with utilities.

Lengthy discussion followed and potential development requirements are summarized below:

Road/Street Improvements

Municipal Services Administrator Eric Durpos explained that the City ultimately wants a total of 60-ft. of dedicated right-of-way for the road. He felt the precedent was set through previous discussions when Avista annexed and developed and the City bought dedicated right-of-way from the Grange to secure 60 ft. of right-of-way through there. The width is necessary to accommodate five utility lines, which require 10 ft. of separation between the lines. It would become a City street and the City would be responsible for maintenance. Eric stated City crews currently maintain the road easement containing the water main all the way to the wells. Based on conversations with Street/Park Superintendent Terry LeCaire, Eric stated the City probably would require some kind of road improvements to serve the proposed configuration, maybe not paved, but something like 8"-12" of base and BST or chip seal topcoat, which would be less expensive than pavement.

Planning Director Jim Lapinski read from previous minutes from 2010 that at the time Ms. Matlock applied for a short plat she would be required to dedicate 30 ft. on the east side of her property, which would make the total right-of-way 60 ft. For clarification, Bob Cleaver asked how wide the utility easement is that runs through Lori's property. He pointed out if there is a 20 ft. easement there, she would only have to provide the additional 10 ft. If it is a 30 ft. easement already there would be no change. Eric was not certain about the exact width without a survey.

Jim asked for clarification on the classification of the road. Lori Matlock stated it is a private drive from Avista's gate north to the city wells. Jim stated the City has revised its standards for private roads and a gravel surface is now allowed upon review and approval of a proposal. There was some discussion concerning easement vs. dedicated right-of-way. It was concluded that even though it is the City's vision to someday have a dedicated street there, it could remain a private road and at the time of further development, when there are more lots, the City could require more improvements. Jim stated it was his opinion at this time, as long as there is an easement; the private road could serve the proposed short plat.

Water

Eric Durpos stated the City will be installing a 20-inch transmission water main up the east side of Ms. Matlock's property and the project is currently out for bid. As part of the City's future capital improvement plan, the City will hook on to the 8-inch high pressure main that is at Avista, which is capped off at the fire hydrant across from Lori's house, and stub that 8-inch main all the way up to the corner and set in a fire hydrant. As a result, water will be available across the front of the potential development, paid for by the City, and Ms. Matlock could hook on to it subject to the connection fees.

Eric pointed out there are five water mains in the road already. When asked what all the lines serve, he explained that the 10-inch serves well #4, the 12-inch serves well #7 and the new 20-inch will take in wells #4 and #5. To address the future treatment issues that are being experienced on one well the City

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

February 12, 2013

Page 3

plans to extend the 8-inch pressure main that comes from reservoir #1 and extend it down there for make-up water for the treatment process.

Sewer

Ms. Matlock reiterated her request to see if the City would allow her to install septic systems on the proposed lots. Mr. Durpos explained that because the subject property falls within the City's wellhead protection area in the 1-year TOT (time of travel) zone, the City would not allow future septic systems to go in. He pointed out sewer is within 600 ft. of the first lot with a stub ready to hook on to. An 8-inch sewer line would have to be extended north along the east side of the road, adjacent to Avista's fence, to serve the proposed lots as well as future development. He estimated that potentially the sewer line extension would be about 1,000 ft. at an estimated \$25-\$30/ft. It was Eric's opinion that compared to the cost of septic systems for three lots (estimated at \$5,000-\$8,000 each) – it would be about the same. Since the property is currently in the county, Eric indicated he has tried to reach Matt Schanz at Tri-County Health to see what his thoughts are.

Jim Lapinski read Section 1 of the 2002 Memo of Understanding (MOU) for interim growth areas between Stevens County and the City of Colville which states "Stevens County recognizes the zoning and subdivision standards adopted by the City and will take measures to consider these standards when reviewing land use and development applications within the City's Interim Urban Growth Area." He pointed out if the subdivision occurred in the County, they would send the City notice and the City's review would address consistency with the City's Comprehensive Plan and the MOU. He stated City staff would pass its recommendations regarding water and sewer service on to the County and they would likely impose those recognizing that eventually the property is going to be in the city.

Jim noted in previous discussions in 2010 it was suggested that through a plat restriction future buyers could assume the cost of extending whatever utilities were required to serve the property when further development occurs. Lori Matlock stated that buyers don't want to assume the high cost of extending utilities. She did not feel it is desirable to try to sell the lots without services. Alan Gorst added that they are just exploring the options and trying to minimize the upfront costs.

Eric pointed out that there is the potential for further development of the subject property. Jim explained that optimum build-out, approximately 7 units per acre, would eliminate any possibility of septic systems. Eric added that the City's desire is getting people to annex and get them off septic systems in this area - not to allow more development right next to the city wells with septic systems. Waivers are granted sometimes in the city for a septic system when sewer service is absolutely not feasible, but when the sewer is that close connection is required.

Bob questioned why this proposal is different than Garden Homes. He stated there is no proposal to extend sewer to the Garden Homes area. Eric explained that there is no annexation or new development being proposed in that area. At the point someone petitions to annex and new development is proposed, the proponents will be required to connect to city water and extend sewer.

Alan Gorst stated he had a problem with crossing the road too many times to make connections. He indicated that it seems like you are just asking for lot of problems vs. just making one sewer tap across the road. He suggested a few different scenarios for the sewer line extension. He noted that there is a stub

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

February 12, 2013

Page 4

that heads west at the last manhole. He questioned whether it would make any sense to head west across the road and get onto Lori's property and run it up the west side in an easement since the line is not going to go any further. Eric responded that scenario is not possible as Lori would have to give the City another 30-40 ft. to get the required 10 ft. horizontal separation. Alan asked if it would be possible extend the line to the beginning of those three lots and cross the road there with the sewer. Eric felt that might be possible but it would still be at considerable cost. He noted all the cost is in the first 300 ft., which requires tearing up the pavement.

Alan agreed that the big issue would be tearing up the brand new street just to extend the sewer line to the north. Eric confirmed that four individual sewer taps off the sewer main, with 4" lateral connections for single family residences, could be made over or under the existing water main. Due to separation issues he felt those 4" connections would likely have to be encased. Eric suggested another acceptable option would be to allow a 6" lateral and then "Y" off of there with two 4" for two homes - but it only holds true for residential and not commercial.

Bob noted one potential option would be to split the lots with a 20 ft. sewer easement right down the center of them and if they chose to subdivide in the future then the sewer is right there and then do one crossing. He asked whether the inverts are okay for gravity and what the approximate elevation would be at the north end. Eric was uncertain about the elevation at this time.

General Discussion

Alan asked what would happen if Ms. Matlock decided to double the size of those lots. Eric felt that if there are plans for further build-out it would make sense to do something different. He referred to an earlier suggestion to set a manhole on the corner and stub it up to a point over 1000 ft. and strategically place 3 manholes (300-350 ft. between them) at the property lines and put a stub there. If they went with that Eric pointed out they would need a plan first before making the stubs.

Bob asked if the sewer line was installed before the City's water line would that mean that the City would reconstruct the road to city standards, including the surface. As a result, he asked if that would relieve Ms. Matlock of doing anything to the road, except patching. Eric confirmed that the City would repair the road under that scenario. He stated the City will not be tearing out any pavement for the water line. He noted much of the sewer work associated with Ms. Matlock's proposal would be outside the road anyway – they would have some potential crossings there.

Lori requested clarification regarding the location of the easement. Bob re-stated it would be 30 ft. off of her east property line. Lou asked if the City would have to buy that easement from her or would she have to donate it as part of the project. Eric suggested that it be a condition of annexation to provide the dedicated right-of-way.

Alan Gorst asked at what point would further improvements be required, such as pavement, curbs, and sidewalks. Jim responded that more improvements could be required if a long plat (5 or more lots) were being proposed. Based on the development regulations outlined in the Land Division Ordinance, staff would recommend to the Planning Commission what improvements should be required and following a public hearing the Commission's recommendation would be forwarded to the City Council for action.

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

February 12, 2013

Page 5

Jim explained that during preliminary review of a long plat consideration is given to street classification and design, anticipated traffic and/or pedestrian volume, etc. Long plats must go through a full public process involving other agencies who may have jurisdiction such as the Department of Ecology (DOE) or Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT).

Alan recognized that there is considerable risk and investment involved to develop something that ultimately benefits the City. He commented it is the investor that has to make sense of everything and try to capture some kind of return. Alan stated he is just trying to find some reasonable lots to build on.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: There were no public comments.

REPORTS: There were no reports.

ADJOURNMENT:

As there was no further business, on a motion and a second the meeting was adjourned at approximately 10:05 a.m.