

City of Colville

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

March 6, 2012

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, and Councilmember Dorothy Bergin. MEMBERS ABSENT: Municipal Services Administrator Eric Durpos. OTHERS PRESENT: Assistant Planner Melinda Lee. GUESTS PRESENT: Dave Croy. RECORDING SECRETARY: Susan Davis.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes from the previous meeting of January 10, 2012 had been distributed to each member prior to the meeting. Bob Cleaver moved and Terry LeCaire seconded the motion to approve the minutes as presented. Voice vote showed all in favor.

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

NEW BUSINESS

- A. Application to Encroach Upon Public Rights-of-Way, by Sara Poffenberger/David Croy, at 509 N. Elm Street

A completed application by Sara Poffenberger & David Croy to encroach approximately 15 ft. upon the Elm Street right-of-way and approximately 10 ft. upon the 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue right-of-way with a 48” high chain link fence had been distributed to each member prior to the meeting (copy on file).

Assistant Planner Melinda Lee explained that Brian Kenworthy, TRICO Fence Co. had inquired on the applicant’s behalf about constructing a fence right behind the sidewalk adjacent to the subject property. Mr. Kenworthy pointed out a neighboring property across the street that had been allowed to have a fence encroachment. Melinda advised him that the neighbor’s encroachment had been approved in the past but in 2009 the encroachment resolution was amended to prohibit further fence encroachments. Melinda gave the applicant the option to apply to the TRC for an encroachment permit if he felt he could demonstrate that special conditions or circumstances exist.

Jim Lapinski provided additional background information about the City’s encroachment policy and the decision making process. It was his opinion that there do not appear to be any special conditions or circumstances in this situation that would warrant granting approval. He added that the TRC can make a decision regarding this application and if the applicant chooses, he can appeal to the City Council.

Dave Croy spoke on behalf of the request noting that he did not feel that they were asking for anything more than what the surrounding neighbors enjoy. He explained that the front yard area within the

## TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

March 6, 2012

Page 2

property boundaries is very small. The encroachment is being requested to maximize as much yard area as possible to fence in their dog and provide a safe area for their child. He recognized his reason is not compelling and they do have an alternative plan for the back yard.

In the discussion which followed Terry LeCaire addressed the issue of snow storage advising that he had no issues with that but pointed out overall encroachments are problematic. Bob Cleaver clarified that based on adjacent right-of-way widths, the property lines are approximately 14 ft. behind the sidewalk. He noted that consideration would need to be given for a future 4-5 ft. wide sidewalk replacement. Jim Lapinski also suggested that another option would be to request a vacation of a portion of the street right-of-way but he was uncertain if the city would be receptive to that.

Bob Cleaver moved based upon the current encroachment resolution that the TRC deny the request, as presented. Terry LeCaire seconded. Motion passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: There were no public comments.

### REPORTS

Melinda Lee reported, as part of the GMA update, the Building & Planning Department staff is moving forward with the process of reviewing the development regulations for possible revision. She suggested scheduling a special TRC meeting in the future to discuss the development standards and decide whether or not to change them. Jim noted that the TRC has had discussions in the past regarding design standards, specifically for private roads. He encouraged the TRC members to submit any suggestions related to areas of particular concern to him or Melinda. He also suggested identifying other issues in the Colville Municipal Code that need to be revised that are beyond zoning and land use, such as parking regulations and enforcement, the references to "Public Works Director," which we do not have, and other "house-keeping" items.

Bob pointed out the only development standards that have been adopted are in the subdivision ordinance and they only pertain to subdivisions. He recommended that the City differentiate between private roads and driveways in the subdivision standards. Most jurisdictions will allow a driveway which is not as developed as a private road to serve a designated number of lots, generally about 4 lots, which helps reduce development costs. For public works projects that are not part of subdivisions, the only standards we have to refer to are "APWA and WSDOT Standards". Bob identified "quality assurance" as the most important issue on any of the public works projects. He felt we need to have requirements for special inspection to ensure that compaction is achieved so that the City does not end up with a situation like we have at Pheasant Ridge. Bob noted he met with Ron Frostad relative to proposed standards that have been put together over the years, which are cumbersome. He researched the City of Cheney, which is similar to our area, and found that they developed a concise set of standards that are a lot more condensed than ours. He shared Cheney's website with Ron to look at the design standards for possible application here with amendments, as necessary. It was Bob's feeling that it is a huge service to the design community to have some concise standards to go by.

Melinda suggested opening up the topic for public discussion at the Planning Commission; gather input and bring comments back to TRC sometime after the City Council retreat. Dorothy Bergin noted that there had been some talk about having a second City Council work session sometime during the year,

## TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

March 6, 2012

Page 3

which could deal specifically with these types of items. Alternatively, Dorothy suggested if staff is uncertain about the time line, just let the Council know that this is what you are working towards.

Jim Lapinski reported that the Tri-County Health District will be presenting a proposal for a par course in the City Park at a future City Council meeting. He explained that a par course is an outdoor track or course with a series of stations where specific exercises are performed.

Bob Cleaver advised that he received a full plan submittal from Avrum Baum for his At Creek development at 3<sup>rd</sup> & Oak Streets. He distributed the civil drawings to the Street and Water/Sewer Departments for review and comment (copy on file). Currently the proposal is to build only the shell of the two-story retail/professional building and develop tenant spaces in the future. Consequently, there will be some on-going permits on the project. Bob noted it appears Mr. Baum is still pursuing the second phase of the project, which is the removal of the houses to the north and development of more retail/professional space. Bob reported on a remodel at the Community College IT Center and a proposal for 5,000 sq. ft. of RV/Boat storage next to Joel DeVall's towing business on Louis Perras Rd. He stated it appears the HUD Senior Housing Project is moving forward and Jim confirmed that they are finalizing paperwork and awaiting the funds. Bob stated he is starting to receive more project proposals and is trying to fit the plan reviews and inspections into his reduced schedule. He noted that he recently alerted Avista to a situation at Pheasant Ridge where a vehicle evidently hit one of their ground transformers next to the pedestrian trail and exposed high-voltage wire connections. They were able to fix the problem right away.

### ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business, Terry LeCaire moved and Bob Cleaver seconded the motion to adjourn the meeting. There were no objections and the meeting was adjourned at approximately 9:30 a.m.