

**January 13, 2011**  
**Ellensburg City Planning Commission – Public Meeting Minutes**  
**City Council Chambers**

Members Present: Chair David Miller, Bruce Simpson, Bob Hood, Sarah Bedsaul  
Members Absent: Doug Mitchell  
Others Present: Planning Supervisor Lance Bailey, Beverly Heckart

Chair Miller opened the meeting at 5:45p.m.

Supervisor Bailey informed the Planning Commission that he had received one communication from a community member potentially interested in applying for one of the vacant Planning Commission positions. He also informed the Commission that Jill Arango had been appointed to fill the City Council position vacated by Obie O'Brien .

Supervisor Bailey informed the Commission that a letter regarding Doug Mitchell's appointment on the Commission had been forwarded to the City Council, for their consideration at their Jan 18<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### **Recommendations on the Nonmotorized Transportation Plan**

Supervisor Bailey reminded the Commission of the materials and presentation made to the Commission by the Nonmotorized Transportation Code Committee

Supervisor Bailey presented the street section recommendations made by the Nonmotorized Transportation Code Committee.

#### **Local Streets**

The Planning Commission discussed that the Nonmotorized Transportation Code Committee intended to provide 3 options that a developer could choose from when building a new local street. It was noted that a 34ft option was voted down by the Nonmotorized Transportation Code Committee, so a 4<sup>th</sup> option was not included in the recommendations.

The Planning Commission pointed out that driveway spacing would impact the ability of queuing to actually work on a local street. Without an adequate number of driveways, there will not be enough space to provide for queuing.

It was pointed out that queuing results in slower vehicle speeds, which are safer for bike traffic. Slowing traffic on local streets was one of the intents of the plan recommendations

The Planning Commission noted that as a group they are not necessarily against a road width that would result in queuing, but that it would only work in an area with very low density. It was suggested that maybe there should be criteria to only allow such a narrow street with lots that are a minimum size.

From members' experience, it was noted that on Cliff Ave (a 20ft street), cars tend to be parked on the curb and partially in the street.

It was suggested that maybe there should be an option between 24ft and 30ft.

Examples were provided of how different parking designs can be implemented to make various street section designs function properly.

The street design options need to be tied to the density of the development along the street.

Lance Bailey pointed out that bike travel along a street with parking creates obstacles and dangers for cyclists, and this was one of the reasons there were street design options considered with parking on only one side of the street. A design option with parking on only side of the street would require the city to post no parking signs on one side of the street.

The Planning Commission discussed and suggested tying the street design option to density of development. Mitigation could be provided if the 20ft option were chosen, such as providing alleys. The 24ft option would be appropriate for any of the city's current single family residential zones. Option 3 (30ft) would be more appropriate for areas with 4 plexes and higher density development. Option 1 (20ft) will only work when you have adequate off street parking.

It was asked if there is a maximum width. It was answered that currently option 3 (30ft) would be the maximum width allowed.

The Planning Commission decided to forward their recommendations as a whole, as opposed to making official motions on each item.

### **Recommendation:**

The Planning Commission concurs with the options of the Nonmotorized Transportation Code Committee with the caveat that regulations occur whereby higher densities are tied to wider streets, with 30ft (Option 3) the maximum width and the 20ft option (Option 1) occurring only in conjunction with an alley.

### **Cul de sacs**

It was pointed out that the Nonmotorized Transportation Code Committee recommends against allowing cul de sacs unless it can be demonstrated that development of a through street is constrained by natural features or existing plats and development

### **Recommendation**

The Planning Commission concurs with the recommendation of the Nonmotorized Transportation Code Committee to prohibit cul de sacs unless it can be demonstrated that development of a through street is constrained by natural features or existing plats and development.

**Recommendation**

The Planning Commission concurs with the recommendation of the Nonmotorized Transportation Code Committee to allow gated communities where there is a PUD with private streets enclosed by locked gates, providing all streets appearing on the Road Classification map are preserved.

**Recommendation**

The Planning Commission concurs with the recommendation of the Nonmotorized Transportation Code Committee for the streetscape design for commercial areas (arterials)

**Block Length**

The City's current street frontage requirement is 60ft. Developers typically want longer block length to reduce the expense of building street intersections.

Bob Hood pointed out that long blocks can contain a large number of houses. The block length should be tied to density

**Recommendation**

The Planning Commission recommends that there be no differentiation between block length for pedestrian access and vehicular access. The recommended block length is 660ft for both pedestrian and vehicular access.

In other business, the Planning Commission chose Bruce Simpson to be the new Commission Chair, with Sarah Bedsaul as the Vice Chair.

There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 7:55 PM.

Respectively submitted,  
Lance Bailey  
Planning Supervisor