



PLANNING COMMISSION

MEETING SUMMARY

Thursday, April 22, 2004

7:00 p.m., Sammamish Plateau Water & Sewer District

Meeting was called to order. Chair Scot Jarvis called roll.

Members Present: Stuart Carson, Bob Conger, Scot Jarvis, Bob Keller, Will Sadler, Karen Moran, Catherine Kendall (arrived 7:10pm)

Staff Present: Steve Hartwig, Darci Donovan, Ray Gilmore, Susan Cezar, Emily Arteche, Delora Kerber, Ben Yazici

Approval of Minutes:

- January 22nd and February 12th minutes were approved. Motion made and second. Vote was unanimous. The April 1st minutes were approved w/ change to Mike Rundall's name. Motion made and second to approve w/ change. Vote was unanimous.

Discussion Item: Best Management Practices

A memorandum from Emily Arteche, Senior Planner was distributed to the Planning Commissioners to provide a greater understanding of BMP's in regard to protected wetlands. Steve Hartwig, City Engineer led a discussion on the guidelines. The guidelines to be met are in the King County Surface Water Manual & City Storm Water Comp Plan. The current issue in front of the Commission is that we don't have clear permission in the code right now to allow a trail in a sensitive area. There is a deadline of December 1, 2004, when the State will change its requirements, so we have to update our critical areas ordinance.

Discussion Item: Trails in Sensitive Areas – Draft Ordinances

Ray Gilmore presented three draft ordinance options and there was discussion on the differences between Options #1,2, and 3. The commission asked staff to start with Option #3 and make the following changes:

- Add definition of a trail
- Maximum width addition.
- Eliminate multi-purpose and all references to East Lake Sammamish Trail and call it a "public trail"
- Add the language "provided that"
- Staff will look into the question of "what is a qualified Biologist".

There was discussion regarding potential trail(s) at the Sammamish Commons Site. There would need to be ADA accessibility. Suggests language in Option #1 should be modified to say that "Trail surfaces should not be made of impervious materials except that public trails may be made of impervious materials if they meet all other applicable requirements including water quality, etc...."

Ben Yazici made the recommendation to look at trails from a policy standpoint rather than design specifications. The standards that we currently have are the Washington State Transportation Code. They do have some width requirements. Perhaps a different session for the Planning Commission could take a look at what is the “non-motorized Transportation Plan and the “Trails Plan” that the Parks Department is working on.

The staff will provide the commission with a revised draft ordinance next week and a public hearing will be scheduled for May 20th. The commissioners will discuss and review the draft ordinance at the next meeting.

Discussion Item: Schedule for Public Hearing on Development Code Updates and 6-Year TIP Schedule.

Presentation by Delora Kerber, Director of Public Works.

The State requires an update of the TIP Plan each year. We must submit the 2005-2010 plan by July 31st. We had to reorganize the 2004-2009 Plan to include more concurrency projects.

The council has to adopt this before 7/31/04. A move was made to put this up for a public hearing on May 6th

New Business/Agenda Items: None

Public Comment:

Mike Rundall 2470 186th Ave SE. Compliments the Commission on the intelligent questions. He also felt like Commission wasn't getting the best information from staff. Why are we trying to exempt trails from protection from wetland buffers? Why mandate, and give a carte blanche exemption to trails, and allow trails in wetland buffers? I think you are asking great questions. I think there are more questions that should be asked and more answers that should be made available. I don't understand what the hurry is.

Ray Spencer 133 E Lk Sammamish Pkwy. “I am suspicious of the council's interest in changing existing tried and true regulations. The hearing examiner determined that King County didn't follow the rules and that they must reapply following the law. The County now wants the City to get rid of those rules, making the Hearing examiners ruling mute. This is not the way to deal with a significant, permanent development affecting sensitive areas so close to a major body of water and ecosystem. If you are set on changing the code and using the language “best management practice” the only responsible definition should have as its #1 priority “to avoid all sensitive areas when practical alternatives exist”.

Vicki Beres 2305 E Lk Sammamish Pl SE. I also have great concern about the speed that the trail exception language is being rushed through. There is no need for this rush to judgment. I am really very ashamed of what's going on in this City with regard to this particular issue. I am really sad at how the staff is being used – at least that's how it looks to me.

Reid Brockway 167 E Lk Sam Shore Lane NE. Regarding the widening of E Lk Sam Pkwy. He feels it is an artificial reality. The road can support 1800 vehicles per hour now and the intersection at the end of the road can handle about 800 vehicles per hour peak, so the widening of these three sections of parkway can only be for one reason only and that is safety. I hope the

Planning Commission Meeting

April 22, 2004 – Page 3

public is aware enough to see that we don't want safety increased down there badly enough to spend \$30 million of our precious money by having these at the top of the list.

The Trail: All 3 options are operating under the premise that trails are going to be built in sensitive areas and we need to minimize the impacts. I strongly advise you to have some provision to require consideration of an alternative to going through the sensitive area itself in whatever code changes you make.

Carol Eychaner 2348 Franklin Ave E, Seattle, compliments on your questions. The legislation you're looking at will affect all wetlands and all trails public and private so keep that in mind when changing the code. Current code: if someone wants to put in a trail that encroaches into a wetland buffer they do have to get an exception – it mandates a look at alternatives. It actually requires that if there is an alternative with less impact that you have to do that alternative. There is nothing in here that says alternative alignments have to be looked at. Also what very much concerns me – no width limitations, especially in the impervious parts of it, your buffers are rather large. Your questions are showing the right concerns but perhaps you are not getting the right answers and the public hearing will help provide you with some more information.

Ron Haworth 24520 SE 24th ST Why are we referencing KC Surface Water Mgmt Rules? We have our own Surface Water Management rules in our City. Regarding platforms in sensitive areas, there's nothing that speaks to a suspended sidewalk that's going to be necessary on 24th.

Meeting adjourned at 9:40PM