

October 13, 2011
Ellensburg City Planning Commission – Regular Meeting Minutes
City Council Chambers

Members Present: Vice Chair Sarah Bedsaul, Bill Beattie, Beverly Heckart, Fred Padjen, Gretchen Thatcher
Members Absent: Chair Bruce Simpson, Bob Hood
Others Present: Planning Supervisor Lance Bailey, Ron Cridlebaugh, Doug Stalder, George Bottcher, Justin Ridens, Tony Aronica, Robert Terrell, Gordon Thatcher

Vice Chair Sarah Bedsaul opened the meeting at 5:45p.m.

Public Meeting:

Review of Draft Land Development Code Update – Articles 4 and 5

Copies of the comments received to date were provided to the Planning Commission and the public attending the meeting. At this point the comments are still in the format in which they were submitted.

It was decided for the meeting to have the Planning Commission go through the comments that have been submitted, and then to provide an opportunity for public comment and discussion.

Staff explained that in regards to the recommendations made by the NMT Committee, some of those changes would be adopted into the Development Code, and others would be adopted into the Public Works standards. So some of the changes recommended by the NMT Committee are not currently reflected in Draft Article 4, but will be adopted into the Public Works standards.

There was a discussion about the road widths proposed by the NMT Committee. The recommended widths are greater than what we currently require, but not all of that increased width is actually travelway width, the width includes bike lanes, sidewalks and planting strips.

15.40.040 Local access street design

It was reiterated that the Planning Commission agrees with the concept of providing 3 options for the width of local streets, but wants the options tied to the density of development along the streets.

Public comment was made that in terms of the 3 options for local streets, most developers will choose the lowest cost option. With the smaller lots allowed in the draft code, you might not want wide streets. But designing streets without any on-street parking can be a problem because people will try to park on the street and it could become an enforcement issue.

It was pointed out by staff that in draft Article 5 (Figure 15.54.020(B)) that the proposed garage setback will result in a 25' driveway. Planning Commission is leaning towards recommending that the garage be setback at least 5 feet more than the front entry.

Figure 15.51.040 Street Frontage Types

Planning Commission agrees with Nancy Lillquist's suggestion to extend the storefront designation on 5th to Water and Main to 6th.

15.53.020(B)(2) Franchise architecture

Public comment was that prohibiting franchise architecture seems like a difficult standard to hold a business to. The reason people invest in a franchise is to get the visual identity that franchise provides. It was pointed out that there haven't been a lot of franchises go out of business in Ellensburg, and there are examples of some that have where the buildings have successfully transitioned to other uses. It was also pointed out that in the past Ellensburg has required other franchises, notably Fred Meyer, to provide a design alternative to their standard corporate look.

15.53.040(D) High visibility street corners

There was agreement, both among the Planning Commission and public comment to delete this section. The City's current design guidelines contain language regarding development on corners in commercial zones.

15.53.070 Energy efficient design

It was noted that Energy Star ratings are not that difficult to achieve. The Planning Commission agreed with Nancy's comment that the "should be" in 15.53.070(B) and 15.53.070(C) should be changed to "shall be"

There was public comment regarding Roof Design stating that the effectiveness of doing white roofs depends on where you are located. A reflective roof in Seattle has different results than a similar roof in Ellensburg. The City should be careful trying to dictate standards that might not be locally appropriate.

There was discussion on the comments submitted by George Bottcher.

15.32.130 Fences, walls and hedges

This section (d)(2) allows barbed wire in the I-L and I-H zones. Storage facilities were discussed as a business that typically uses barbed wire in these zones. Do they really need barbed wire? Public comment was made that these businesses must all be using barbed wire for a reason, because its not inexpensive to install.

15.54.020(D) Driveway Standards

PC agrees with Nancy's comment there needs to be a cross reference inserted to refer to where driveways are allowed.

15.55.030(E) Bicycle Parking

1(A) - PC agrees that this could probably be deleted

5(d) - using the requirement to be visible within 30ft of the employee's work station makes no sense

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10pm

Respectfully submitted
Lance Bailey, Planning Supervisor