

March 29, 2012

**Ellensburg City Planning Commission – Regular Meeting Minutes  
City Council Chambers**

Members Present: Chair Bruce Simpson, Bill Beattie, Beverly Heckart, Gretchen Thatcher, Fred Padjen, Bob Hood  
Members Absent: Vice Chair Sarah Bedsaul  
Others Present: Planning Supervisor Lance Bailey, other members of the audience

Chair Bruce Simpson opened the meeting at 5:45p.m.

**Minutes:**

**March 8, 2012 Regular Meeting**

The minutes were approved with a couple of minor typo corrections

**Public Meeting**

**A. Continue discussion of the Draft Land Development Code**

Alex Eyre addressed the Planning Commission regarding the Art Commission's recommendation to include art projects as a way for a developer to get a density bonus. The proposal from the Arts Commission would allow Owners/Developers of property with planned private building development costs in excess of \$300,000 in R-M, R-H, R-O and I-L zones would to be eligible for density bonuses of 15-25% in return for their voluntary contribution of no less than 1% and no more than 1.5% of the total project budget for the acquisition and installation of publicly accessible art on the development site. In lieu of on-site public artworks, a developer may make an equivalent contribution to the Ellensburg Public Art Fund. The Arts Commission would like this idea to be considered for inclusion in the new Development Code.

The way the proposed language is currently written, it addresses development in the residential zones, because those are the only zones in the new code where a density bonus is available. Moving forward it might be a good idea to look at incentives that could be provided for commercial developments.

The Planning Commission was favorable towards including the proposed language from the Arts Commission into the density bonus section of the LDCU. Criteria would need to be developed. The following criteria were proposed for discussion:

The Arts Commission will apply the following criteria when considering approval of a public art project claiming a density bonus:

- 1) The project has no other function than to be appreciated for aesthetic and/or intellectual reasons;
- 2) The project has no corporate logos;
- 3) The project is an original piece or part of a limited edition;
- 4) The project is emblematic of local themes or depicts the shared past our City, region, state or nation;
- 5) The project includes no mass-produced items;
- 6) The project has no religious or sectarian purpose;
- 7) The project portrays no school, team corporate or organizational mascot;
- 8) The project portrays no violence, inappropriate nudity, no denigration of individuals or cultures, and no desecration of significant cultural symbols;

- 9) The project's structure and its surface must be sound and resistant to theft, vandalism, and weathering;
- 10) The project must not present a hazard to public safety.

Participation would be optional for any developer. The Public Art Fund does not currently exist, so a mechanism to create and manage that fund would have to be developed and adopted.

**Motion**

**The Planning Commission conveys to the Arts Commission general agreement with the policy of density bonuses for public art and encourages the Arts Commission to go further and bring back a more refined proposal.**

**The motion was seconded and passed 5-0**

The Planning Commission discussed the "Review of Potentially Contentious Items for The Planning Commission in the Land Use Development Code" document.

There was concern expressed about having more narrow streets that could potentially go for miles, and how could traffic be managed for such streets. It was pointed out that the widths for streets that are generally longer (collector, arterial) are wider than the widths for local access streets. It was also pointed out that the Planning Commission's previous recommendation was to limit to the most narrow local access street option to be allowed only in conjunction with alleys.

**Motion**

**For Section 15.40.040 the Planning Commission recommends that the width of local access streets tie higher densities to wider streets with 30ft, 24ft and 20ft wide options allowed, with the caveat that the 20ft option be allowed only in conjunction with an alley and that the street not exceed more than ½ mile in length.**

**The motion was seconded and passed 5-1**

15.41.030(C) - Integration with Natural Amenities

The Planning Commission realizes this section doesn't have the teeth of a specific requirement, but supports leaving it in.

15.41.030 (D) - Gated Communities

The current language discourages but does not prohibit gated communities

**Motion**

**15.41.030 (D) should be worded as follows:**

**Gated communities and other residential developments designed to appear as continuous walled-off areas, disconnected and isolated from the rest of the community are prohibited.**

**The motion was seconded and passed 3-2**

15.41.030 (D) (1) – Reverse frontage lots

**Motion**

**15.41.030 (D) (1) should read as follows:**

**Subdivision design that incorporates reverse frontage lots is prohibited. (All of the rest of the section is deleted)**

**The motion was seconded and passed 4-1**

15.41.050 (A) – Zero Lot Line

There were a number of concerns expressed – your neighbor could build right up to your property line, extend their roof eaves 18 inches over the property line thereby dropping all rain/snow onto your lot. The first person to build seems to get the benefit.

**Motion**

**Add#4 to 15.41.050 (A) to read as follows:**

- 4. The provisions of this subsection shall apply only within subdivisions**

**The motion was seconded and passed 5-0**

15.51.040 Street Frontage type maps

**Motion**

- 1) Extend the Storefront Street designation along Pearl St all the way to University Way**
- 2) Extend the Storefront Street designation on 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue all the way to Water Street**
- 3) Extend the Storefront Street designation on Main Street all the way to 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue**

**The motion was seconded and passed 5-0**

Figure 15.51.040 (C)

The designation of that portion of Umptanum Rd and the roads to the south as Secondary Street 2 does not seem appropriate.

**Motion**

**The Secondary Street 2 designation along Umptanum Rd and the roads to south as depicted on Figure 15.51.040(C) should be removed, and those streets should be designated as Secondary Streets.**

**The motion was seconded and passed 5-0**

15.51.050 (C) - Storefront Street standards, parking location

There was concern expressed about allowing up to 60ft of frontage being occupied by parking and vehicular access. There was a motion made to remove the sentence allowing 60ft of frontage being occupied by parking and vehicular access, but the motion died for a lack of a second.

The next meeting was scheduled for April 12, 2012.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:00pm

Respectfully submitted

Lance Bailey, Planning Supervisor