

City of Colville

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

August 2, 2011

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: Building Official/Inspector Bob Cleaver, Planning Director Jim Lapinski, Street/Park/Recreation Superintendent Terry LeCaire, Municipal Services Administrator Eric Durpos, and Advisory Members Doug Kyle and Dorothy Bergin. OTHERS PRESENT: Melinda Lee. RECORDING SECRETARY: Susan Davis.

MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

The minutes of the previous meeting of July 12, 2011 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. Discussion – Options for Street Design Standards.

Jim Lapinski explained that the issue of private road development in the city is item #2 on the list of Council pending items that was assigned to him and the TRC. He questioned whether TRC would like to pursue discussion on whether or not to continue to allow private roads and whether it is desirable to change the standards applied to private roads. He indicated in past discussions no recommendations had been finalized. He noted the timing for discussion could coincide with the review of the Development Regulations following adoption of the revised and updated Comprehensive Plan.

Attached to the agenda was Land Division Ordinance, Chapter 16.16, Design Standards (copy on file). Page 16-10, Section 16.16.060, Streets – General Requirements, item F.2, set forth the standards for private lanes, which are allowed if a variance to street specifications is obtained. At a minimum, private lanes shall be a 30-foot wide easement, paved 28 feet wide curb to curb.

Eric Durpos referred to item #15 on the list of Council pending items, which is discussion on a proposal/strategy to maintain City streets and infrastructure. He advised that he and Councilmembers Janke and Mance are reviewing different options to address priorities laid out by Council. Future discussions regarding street design standards in general will need to take place as far as maintenance costs, annexations, etc. As part of that discussion, Eric expressed the opinion that we need to lessen our requirements and our street standards if we want to promote growth and development.

Eric felt that private roads should be reviewed on a case by case basis. He brought up the private frontage road on the Hudesman Colville Commercial Plat noting zero maintenance has been done. In addition, a private frontage road was also approved on the adjacent Bowman Plat. In view of the maintenance issues,

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

August 2, 2011

Page 2

Eric recommended that private frontage roads not be approved in the future for commercial developments. It was his feeling that it may make sense to allow residential private lanes in our rural area as long as our standards are consistent. He used Pheasant Ridge Estates as an example of a rural area where private lanes might be appropriate.

Doug Kyle suggested another situation where it might be appropriate to allow private lanes would be in a PUD. He thought that type of development as well as gated communities would be restricted if private lanes are prohibited.

Jim asked if the TRC had any kind of a recommendation on this or wanted to wait for more detail on some of the other assignments on the Council pending issues list.

Eric suggested removing the private road discussion from the pending list and providing Council with an explanation of where staff is at - recognizing that in some cases private roads are a benefit and should be allowed but in other cases, such as commercial development, they may not be.

Bob indicated it would be helpful in future revisions to describe some parameters as to when a private lane would be allowed. He thought a distinction between driveways and private lanes should be made pointing out most jurisdictions in Washington define a driveway as serving "X" number of lots or less, up to or not to exceed four lots, for instance. Alternatively, Jim suggested adding some future language about a private drive that extends from the public way.

Bob felt the location of the Haney and McMillan lots beyond Pheasant Ridge could have met the definition of a private drive off of the cul-de-sac, which would eliminate the private road standard. He pointed out that the current specifications for private roads deal with subdivisions only. He was unaware of any standards for projects that do not involve subdivisions. Bob further felt that there are a lot of issues that need to be considered as street standards are discussed. Streets need to be developed at the minimum standard that the City of Colville is willing to accept – not the developer. Based on future maintenance, not only resurfacing or maintaining the surface, but the question has to be asked is it going to result in the Street Department having to buy a road grader because we have dirt shoulders which require grading several times during the year. Another scenario could be if the City went to a 28 ft. wide paved surface with parking on the dirt – is it going to increase the amount of sweeping and the wear and tear on all the sweepers that are wore out now?

Terry LeCaire stated it goes back to the definition of improved or unimproved street - improved is a paved street and unimproved is a gravel street.

Dorothy Bergin questioned whether there are examples of when private roads or lanes have become regular City streets. She also questioned what problem that poses if we don't have basic standards set?

Bob responded that Evergreen Way, by the high school, was built to City standards with the exception of sidewalks. It was built to City specifications because it was projected to extend across the golf course and tie into the Beardslee property at some point. We have got all the right-of-way or easement established now for future construction of the undeveloped part of the street.

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

August 2, 2011

Page 3

Doug felt a problem could arise in an urban development, such as a gated community with private lanes and open spaces, when you want to change to city streets - instead of 30 ft. of width you need 60 ft. but it is not achievable because of nonconforming setbacks. Bob stated if the developer chose to go with private lanes and then after all the lots were sold the people wanted to go to a dedicated right-of-way then they would have to ante up bring it up to our standards to be accepted by the City.

For information, Bob reported that Ponderosa Rd., Mayflower, and Charter Communications has no legal access to Buena Vista Drive other than by prescriptive use over the years. The Bowman property technically extends across Buena Vista Drive.

Doug thought Eric's suggestion about having a distinction between residential development and commercial development with different guidelines or specifications is a valid one because you do it for different reasons, i.e. traffic volume, emergency services, etc.

Bob pointed out that another important consideration during development review is a maintenance agreement tied to the property - how the road is supposed to be maintained, drainage swales, etc. He pointed out maintenance agreements for the private roads for the retail center plat were discussed and they were supposed to be implemented but they never were. Bob questioned when we get a proposal for annexation or even a major subdivision - at what point do we say "We don't have the facilities to provide the service." It was his opinion that if the property is in the growth area we have already determined that we can provide service. Eric pointed out as far as utilities, the City pretty much has to provide service if they are in our service area.

Jim responded if the UGA were to start developing quickly we might have some problems just the way it is now. In the past we haven't had rapid development - but that doesn't mean we won't. He felt it goes against the purpose of growth management not to consider the changing world noting changes to the economy, demographics, and projections.

Doug commented that the other thing to remember is that Beardslee's project is adding little additional revenue because there is no development. The streets are paved but no houses have been built. When houses are built the property taxes will go up accordingly and that will be new revenue. He stated that is why planning is important to build the infrastructure appropriately in the beginning.

Bob expressed the opinion that the streets in Pheasant Ridge Estates are still settling. He indicated that on these particular standards, even bridging over into all rebuilds in the city, we don't have any quality control built in. Something should be built in that requires the expertise of a geotechnical engineer and have them there while they are backfilling 20 ft. sewer ditches or just installing the road base to determine if it is being done properly.

Jim concluded that even if Council hesitates with the adoption of the revised and updated Comprehensive Plan, staff is still on our GMA update schedule. Based on informal discussions staff could do some of the revisions to the Development Regulations, especially the ones pertaining to Building & Planning for further staff review. He suggested maybe by that time Eric and the others will have a proposal/strategy developed insofar as how to make development more desirable to developers. It was decided that staff will recommend removing item #2, private road development, from the Council's pending items list, and combine it with item #15.

TECHNICAL REVIEW COMMITTEE

August 2, 2011

Page 4

PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD: There were no public comments.

REPORTS

Eric presented a status report about on-going development on Buena Vista Drive. He stated geotechnical engineering was required for compaction testing and conformance to the approved plan on Buena Vista Drive. He is still waiting on the final reports from them. Ron Frostad is inspecting both the Border Patrol utilities and Buena Vista Drive jobs. The Bowman frontage road is a private road and they are supplying their own engineer and inspection work on that. The City is requiring them to submit all their reports and compaction testing and the geo-tech work that they do when they build that road.

Bob questioned whether sidewalks are required on Buena Vista Dr. If so, why weren't they installed before they paved? Eric responded that the sidewalks will be on the other side of the drainage swale. The issue there now is the sidewalk elevation. The approved plan that the City signed off on has the sidewalk at existing grade, which would put it way down in a hole where in the springtime it may be under water. Now we are trying to tell them that they need to bring the sidewalk up to the grade of the road or at least a 2% drop off the road, which would require 500 more yards of fill. He indicated in his discussions with Maygan Bowman she is suggesting that they will bring the sidewalk up to grade if the City would delete the required curb on the frontage road. Eric was uncertain about what authority or leverage he has in this situation. He indicated a desire to try to stay consistent with other sidewalks in the area.

Dorothy questioned whether or not it would be a safety issue if the sidewalk were located in an area where it could be flooded. Jim suggested seeking the advice of the City Attorney. It was his thought that the public welfare should be considered, i.e., maintenance cost to the City, etc.

Jim suggested that the plat alteration could have changed the scope of the original plat. He thought if the changes and alterations result in some of this then you could probably negotiate on that. But, at this point, he felt that is a lot of guessing.

Doug questioned what provisions there are for the Border Patrol changing the grading on their site plan?

For information, Eric reported that the 1998 McCammon latecomer agreement has come into play. It alludes to the fact if the original lots in the benefit area, which includes the Bowman property, were changed or subdivided in anyway then the latecomer fees should have been paid before final plat approval. He has been talking with Maygan Bowman and sent her and City Attorneys McGrane & Schuerman all of the information. At this point, Eric felt he has no other choice but to assess the latecomer fees to the Border Patrol for their lot.

Jim reported that Mark Beardslee called yesterday and requested a short plat application be sent to him for one of the lots beyond Pheasant Ridge. The property was originally platted in the County and is now in the City. Staff will review the application upon submittal.

ADJOURNMENT

Eric Durpos moved and Terry LeCaire seconded the motion to adjourn. There were no objections and the meeting was adjourned at 9:30 a.m.