

City of Colville

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

May 22, 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, Municipal Services Administrator Eric Durpos, and Councilmembers Dorothy Bergin and Lou Janke. OTHERS PRESENT: Assistant Planner Melinda Lee. RECORDING SECRETARY: Susan Davis.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes from the previous meeting of May 1, 2012 had been distributed to each member prior to the meeting. Bob Cleaver moved and Eric Durpos 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. SEPA Checklist/Threshold Determination  
Applicant: Oxarc  
Location: 328 W. 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue  
Proposal: 17' x 60' roof extension for equipment storage, which increases the total building area beyond the 4000 sq. ft. SEPA threshold

A completed environmental checklist and building permit application by Oxarc had been distributed to each member prior to the meeting (copy on file). The proposal is to construct a 17' x 60' roof extension for equipment storage, which increases the total building area beyond the 4000 sq. ft. SEPA threshold. The property is located at 328 W. 1<sup>st</sup> Avenue, in the C-3 (General Commercial) District.

Upon review staff comments were added to the environmental checklist for clarification and information.

Bob Cleaver moved that the TRC recommend the issuance of a Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) for the proposal. Terry LeCaire seconded and voice vote showed all in favor.

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: There were no public comments.

REPORTS

Jim Lapinski reported that staff is in the process of reviewing and updating the development regulations. It was his feeling that in previous discussions staff decided to retain private roads. The private road standards in the Land Division Ordinance will be reviewed for possible revision to further define them.

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

May 22, 2012

Page 2

Melinda advised that the Planning Commission would be discussing the private road issue at its May 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting.

In the discussion which followed it was recognized that there are several private residential and commercial roads in the city. Maintenance was identified as the biggest concern with private roads. It was pointed out that property owners are responsible for the maintenance as stated in private covenants recorded at the time of plat approval. Further, it was noted that private roads will not to be accepted into the City road system until they are brought up to City standards. Lou Janke expressed a desire to tighten up private road agreements so the City is not left "holding the bag."

Bob Cleaver suggested including language relative to permitting "driveways" and limiting the number of lots they can serve. Jim and Melinda felt for short plats, which serve a maximum of 4 lots, different development standards could possibly be considered.

Benefits of allowing private roads included the fact that they are less expensive to develop and may promote development that might not otherwise occur; less maintenance for the City because maintenance is done by the property owner(s); and they must be brought up to City standards to become part of the City road system.

Jim felt the purpose is to protect the City's interest but not discourage or make it cost prohibitive for people to develop. He pointed out in certain instances, such as a commercial development, the City can require a dedicated right-of-way even though there might be the option of a private road. There might be situations where the City wants absolute control over the road and drainage system. It would be a condition of approval on a long or short plat; but it still gives the applicant the option to withdraw or comply with the condition. Building & Planning staff will look at these types of things and discuss them with the Planning Commission during the review process.

ADJOURNMENT

As there was no further business, Eric Durpos moved and Terry LeCaire seconded the motion to adjourn. There were no objections and the meeting was adjourned at 8:50 a.m.