

**City of Madras  
Planning Commission Meeting  
Official Minutes  
May 20, 2009**

**I. Call to Order**

The City of Madras Planning Commission meeting was called to order by Interim Chair James Neff at 7:05 p.m. on Wednesday, May 20, 2009 in the Madras City Hall Council Chambers.

**Members in Attendance were:**

Interim Chair James Neff; Commissioners: Allen Hurley; Lynn Kowaleski; Shelly Tack and Michelle Varley. Special guest Commissioner Tom Brown, City Council.

**Members Absent:**

Kasey Cousens.

**Vacancy:**

There was one planning commission vacancy.

**Staff Members in Attendance were:**

Community Development Director Nick Snead and Community Development Specialist Tammy McHaney.

**Visitors**

There were no visitors.

**II. Consent Agenda**

- a. Adoption of Agenda
- b. Minutes from the April 15, 2009 meeting

**A MOTION WAS MADE TO APPROVE THE CONSENT AGENDA BY COMMISSIONER TACK, SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KOWALESKI. THE MOTION PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**III. Visitors Comments**

There were no visitors present.

**IV. Public Hearing**

**1) Open Public Hearing**

The public hearing opened at 7:06 pm.

**4) Those in Attendance to be Provided with an Opportunity to Challenge Planning Commission Impartiality**

There were no conflicts, no ex parte contact, no abstentions, or challenges.

**5) Staff Report**

Director Snead referred to the two separate maps that were included in their packet and explained that the whole goal for the Parks Master Plan was to guide development for all trails, parks and open spaces. He noted that this proposal would remove the existing “Figure 10” map in the Master Plan and supplant the new Willow Creek Trail map. He clarified that if the Planning Commission chooses this change, the Willow Creek Trail Map would become the “Figure 10” map and that the old map would be eliminated.

He noted that the old map (existing Figure 10) did not show all the proposed trails for the City. He explained that this new map would allow staff the authority to require specific areas to be dedicated for trails at the time of development.

He reminded them that at past meetings he had previously discussed changing the language of park requirements and referred to the El Dorado Estates. He noted that a great debate had taken place between staff and the applicant regarding the location of their park. He said that staff was able to convince the applicant with sound, logical argument where to place their park; however, there was no language that allowed staff the authority to actually require a specific location of a trail.

He said after discussion with the City Administrator, they decided that the criteria in the Parks and Open Space Master Plan did not need to be amended. What needed to be amended was a text amendment to the Subdivision Ordinance. He said that was why the only change he was proposing to the Parks and Open Space Master Plan was the map “Figure 10”

Commissioner Tack questioned why all the trails were not on the map.

Director Snead replied that they were newly planned. He pointed out the “grid format” but noted future the trails won't always be a pure grid trail because connectivity will determine the best location. He noted the “yellow” line on the map across The Ridge’s property which portrayed a southwest/northeast manner for the trail; however the applicant had proposed a northern trail which met the requirements of the Parks and Open Space Master Plan, so new language in the Subdivision Ordinance would provide staff with a little flexibility.

Councilor Brown noted that it was nice to travel around town and see people using the trails.

Director Snead noted that people complain about sidewalks, but if you don't have sidewalks, people won't walk. (Commissioner Varley entered the meeting).

- 6) Applicant Comments**
- 7) Proponent Testimony**
- 8) Opponent Testimony**
- 9) Neutral Comments**
- 10) Rebuttal – Applicant**

## **11) Close Public Hearing**

The public hearing closed at 7:17 p.m.

## **12) Planning Commission Deliberations**

Commissioner Hurley noted that he thought this was a positive step in the future.

Commissioner Tack asked if the adoption of the map, adopted the trails.

Director Snead explained that the City did not have the money, so trails were built with grant money or through a developer. He said staff relied upon the plan to require connectivity. If the trail is not on the plan, it cannot be required.

Commissioner Tack clarified that the location is the issue.

Director Snead answered yes and no. He pointed out these decisions are ultimately made by the Planning Commission and that they ultimately have the authority to amend the plan as they saw fit. He said that staff just provides a recommendation.

He continued and noted that the idea was if a trail was on the plan, eventually it will be built. However, the details are not always clear.

Commissioner Tack was concerned about showing favoritism.

Director Snead pointed out the ultimate goal is to create connectivity to allow people to walk and ride bikes and recreate in the parks. He said that when development occurs the applicant proposes their idea of where the park should go.

Interim Chair Neff asked Commissioner Tack what her concern was.

Commissioner Tack responded and said her concern was the Commission had not discussed this at all and that they were approving this without any discussion. She said she thought this was a good map, she just wanted more discussion before approving.

Interim Chair Neff noted that in his view this will allow a little bit of leverage to determine the best layout of the trails for connectivity. He agreed that probably no one on the Commission had really reviewed the layout of the trails, but he assumed that staff had.

Director Snead agreed and noted that through grant money, this map was created by professionals. He noted that if you don't plan for it, you won't get it and if you don't get it at the time of development it turned into a multi-generational issue to get a park or trail system for that community.

He explained connectivity and how all the City parks and trail system can be accessed by pedestrians. He noted that plans are only as good as the frequency they are used. He said that periodically they needed to be reevaluated and that was the role of the Planning Commission to plan for the future. He said this updates the current map with new facilities. He said there were

planned trails on private property but the trail won't be required until that property develops. He said this is just a plan and subject to change in the future.

Commissioner Hurley said that in his opinion this will eliminate any doubt of favoritism, because if the trail is there on the map, there can be no question.

Director Snead noted that development and topography will determine the exact location of the trail.

Commissioner Kowaleski noted that the applicant is required to "make the case" for the location.

Director Snead noted the Planning Commission had done a great job considering past decisions on trails. He referred to The Ridge and El Dorado subdivisions and complimented them on connecting the system. He asked Commissioner Tack if she understood.

Commissioner Tack noted she understood the map and how it worked she just wanted discussion and preferred not to provide a "rubber stamp."

Commissioner Kowaleski thought it looked great and believed Director Snead had done due diligence to put this together. She didn't have any problems.

Commissioner Varley noted no issues and pointed out this was a ~~consensual~~ map which indicates changes as time goes by.

*Conceptual as changed per June 3<sup>rd</sup> 2009 minutes JM*

Director Snead noted this was a concept and that the whole idea was to acquire a park in that vicinity.

Commissioner Tack questioned if the color of the existing trail could be changed so that the proposed and existing trails could be differentiated?

Director Snead replied and said no because the architects designed this map with a program the City does not own. His goal was to purchase the software, but unfortunately the line color will remain. He noted this was why he presented only a name change of the map. Due to the lack of resources and the desire to pay someone to change the line color on a map that really substantively didn't change the map, was not worth the cost.

Commissioner Tack questioned how the Planning Commission would know by looking at the map which was proposed and which was reality? She also questioned how staff would reference this map with other documents.

Director Snead noted that most of the parks and trails can be generally figured out once you know the road system.

Commissioner Tack confirmed that in the future the City will own a map that is interchangeable.

Director Snead replied yes.

Interim Chair Neff noted that having the trails and open spaces mapped out was a great tool for future planning and that this was good planning for the community. He liked the idea of

changing the leverage to allow staff the ability to make sure the trail will be located in a beneficial way to the community and not just to the developer.

Director Snead noted that his job was to make sure the proposal met the City's goals and that the way a City gets parks and trails are through development. He said the west side of Madras is a huge challenge as it is already developed with out parks or a trail. He pointed out this is a weakness in the plan, but noted staff was working on this issue.

**13) The Planning Commission will either approve or deny the proposed application, or will continue the hearing to a time and date certain.**

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER TACK TO RECOMMEND TO CITY COUNCIL THE APPROVAL OF THE NEW FIGURE 2 MAP THAT WILL REPLACE FIGURE 3-10, THE POTENTIAL MADRAS PARKS AND OPEN SPACE MASTER PLAN. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER KOWALESKI AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**b. Withdraw Comprehensive Plan Amendment to Adopt Comprehensive Plan Map PA-08-1**

- 1) Open Public Hearing**
- 2) Planning Commission to Declare any Potential or Existing Conflicts of Interest or Ex parte Contact**
- 3) Planning Commission to indicate whether they will be Abstaining From Participation in the Public Hearing**
- 4) Those in Attendance to be Provided with an Opportunity to Challenge Planning Commission Impartiality.**
- 5) Staff Report**
- 6) Applicant Comments**
- 7) Proponent Testimony**
- 8) Opponent Testimony**
- 9) Neutral Comments**
- 10) Rebuttal – Applicant**
- 11) Close Public Hearing**
- 12) Planning Commission Deliberations**
- 13) The Planning Commission will either approve or deny the proposed application, or will continue the hearing to a time and date certain.**

Director Snead noted that he was recommending withdrawal of Application PA-08-1 and reminded the Planning Commission that this proposal was originally brought to them in January. He explained that the City of Madras' Zoning Map and Comprehensive Plan Map were one and the same. He explained that a zoning map represents the current permitted use of the property and a Comprehensive Plan Map portrays a twenty year vision for land use planning. He said that some cities use two separate maps.

He noted that staff thought it would be strategically beneficial to separate the two maps in order to keep transportation concerns separate. However, after researching the issue he was recommending a withdrawal at this time as it is not beneficial to the City.

He noted that considering this was a continuing public hearing it needed to be formally withdrawn.

**A MOTION WAS MADE BY COMMISSIONER KOWALESKI TO WITHDRAW COMP PLAN AMENDMENT PA-08-1. THE MOTION WAS SECONDED BY COMMISSIONER TACK AND PASSED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**V. Planning Commission Initiated Text Amendments**

- Lots and Easements
- Subdivisions
  - \* Extension Time Period (6 mo- 1 year)
  - \* Park Dedication Regulations
- Any Other Text Amendments
- Dark Sky Ordinance
- Parking Lot Surface Standards

Director Snead noted that he had listed some potential text amendments, but would like some discussion on updating the ordinances and cleaning up some problematic language to make the Commissioner's job easier.

He mentioned lots and easements and reminded them the struggles they had dealt with previous subdivisions; he said the subdivision extension time period should be scratched as it could remain. But subdivision park dedication regulations as noted earlier in the meeting were where the changes should occur.

He noted the dark sky ordinance as presented by Dennis Prince would be a phenomenal idea and a great strategic move for Madras as a rural community. He said that light could be harnessed to refrain from influencing the stars. He said that all development should have covered lighting to shine down and noted this was a critical planning tool. He noted existing development would not be required but encouraged to change.

He said that parking lot surface standards are an issue, but at this time he has not come to a conclusion and not ready to present this item.

He requested a list from the Commissioners on their concerns and any language they would like changed. A discussion took place on planning issues such as the wording of architecturally integrated garages; a dark sky ordinance; parking lot surfaces; the number of parking lot spaces (i.e. residential visitor parking); Ideal placement for Shelters; and schools turning into day cares (need language to define)

Director Snead noted that best practices are not to reinvent the wheel and that he would bring to them some suggestions.

**VI. Additional Discussion**

Director Snead mentioned "The Commissioner" magazine that was included in their packet which provided some good articles.

He noted that on May 27<sup>th</sup> a Great Plans/Great Communities Webinar would be held at Redmond City Hall and encouraged them to attend.

On June 10, 2009 a Safe Routes to School work shop would be presented by the City of Madras on how to get children to school safely. He commented that Jefferson County GIS created a map which showed income as it relates to Federal poverty. The map showed the poverty level in Madras was all on the central and western part of town. He said what that meant was that the children who have the least amount of income are required to travel the farthest and cross two highways to get to school

He continued and said the County Health Department surveyed pre-kindergartners, third, sixth, eighth and eleventh graders and learned that all of them exceeded the National average for body mass index. He said the sixth grade's body mass index was skyrocketing.

He said that 10<sup>th</sup> Street between Buff and J Streets was part of this program and the plan was to pave this road with sidewalks. He encouraged the Planning Commission members to attend.

He noted that Sonic had applied to build a restaurant in Madras and that their corporate office wanted it open by August 31, 2009.

## VII. Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 8:20 p.m.

  
Interim Chair, James Neff

  
Tammy McHaney, Community Development Spec.