

requiring them to do so.

Gruen opined that the purpose behind the League's proposal was to create civil discourse in the community. Stated that the Commission does not have definitive information indicating that a pre-application meeting would hinder a development and opined that it could assist the development. Opined that a pre-application meeting is a show of good will on the part of the developer; that a proactive approach is less likely to slow things down than a reactive approach. Stated that he is strongly in favor of the pre-application meeting ordinance.

Crow stated that she tends to be opposed to the proposal because she believes it would delay development.

Garl stated that he also falls on the side of not supporting the proposal and opined that he would consider voluntary meetings but even those cause him concern because without City staff present, there is the opportunity for misinformation and finger-pointing. He also addressed the single public hearing rules; that the Commission is guided by the zoning code and the comprehensive plan, both documents which provide for current and future development; and the risk of future litigation.

Anderson stated that if the Commission is moving towards not supporting this ordinance, then staff should still be requested to provide guidelines or suggestions regarding contacting interested parties and conducting a voluntary meeting for those developers who choose to do so.

Paulson expressed a concern about when in the development process such a meeting would occur.

Gruen opined that the principal concern amongst Commissioners appears to be monetary, and indicated that without more research into the topic it is difficult to determine if that concern is warranted.

MOTION

Garl moved to dismiss the Pullman League of Women Voters' proposal for land use development pre-application meetings. Seconded by Crow and passed 4 to 2 with Anderson and Gruen opposed.

MOTION

Garl moved to request that staff put together a set of guidelines for a voluntary meeting between the developer and impacted or interested parties, and for the Commission to review that set of guidelines at a future meeting. Seconded by Crow. No vote, but not opposition noted.

Karen Kiessling
510 SE Crestview
Pullman, WA 99163

She asked if some record would be kept of those developments holding a voluntary meeting so that this proposal doesn't fall into a black hole but the City in fact learns from what happens.

GARL

Opined that would be a good idea and requested that staff keep a record per Ms. Kiessling's request.

REGULAR BUSINESS
Review and recommend
action on the proposed
2010-2015 Capital
Improvement Program for
Pullman.

Radtke stated that the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) involves the annual formulation of a schedule for financing major public improvements in the City over a six year period and the 2010-2015 CIP was recently prepared by the CIP Committee. The Planning Commission is asked to review and make recommendations to the City Council on the proposed 2010-2015 CIP as it relates to land use or the Comprehensive Plan.

Answered a question regarding a "Sign and Pavement Marking Retroreflectivity Measuring Device".

MOTION

Anderson moved to find the 2010-2015 Capital Improvement Program consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and recommend its approval to City Council. Seconded by Crow and passed unanimously.

REGULAR BUSINESS
Review and recommend
action on the proposed
2010-2015 Transportation
Improvement Program for
Pullman.

Radtke stated that projects on the proposed 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) include street improvements projects on designated arterial streets and major capital purchases for the Transit Division. Staff recommends that the TIP be found consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

MOTION

Crow moved to find the 2010-2015 Transportation Improvement Program consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and recommend its approval to City Council. Seconded by Paulson and passed unanimously.

REGULAR BUSINESS
Review for consistency
with the Comprehensive
Plan the proposal
submitted by Schweitzer
Engineering Laboratories,
Inc. to dedicate as public
right of way NE
Schweitzer Drive, located
off NE Terre View Drive

Garl asked for the staff report.

Radtke stated that Schweitzer Engineering Laboratories, Inc. (SEL) submitted a proposal to dedicate to the city right-of-way for NE Schweitzer Drive. The property provides access to the SEL complex and is 60 feet wide and 500 feet long. A request for street dedication must go to the Planning Commission for review for its consistency with the Comprehensive Plan. Staff has reviewed this matter and finds that the dedication of a public street to serve adjacent commercial development clearly meets Comprehensive Plan Goal

on College Hill.

T.1 and recommends that the Planning Commission find the proposal consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

DISCUSSION

Commissioners discussed the location of the proposed dedication; the existing development that it serves and possible future development that it may serve. Staff clarified that the subject roadway was developed to meet City Standards and answered that there is a sidewalk along at least one side of the roadway.

MOTION

Crow moved to find the proposed dedication of right-of-way for NE Schweitzer Drive consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and to forward it to the City Council with an appropriate recommendation for approval. Seconded by Bergstedt and passed unanimously.

REGULAR BUSINESS

Review for consistency with the Comprehensive Plan the proposal submitted by Birch Hills, L.L.C. to dedicate as public right of way a portion of NE Merman Drive, located north of the intersection of NE Merman Drive and NE Westwood Drive on College Hill.

Garl asked for the staff report.

Radtke stated that Birch Hills, L.L.C., submitted a proposal to dedicate to the city an extension of the right-of-way for NE Merman Drive. The property is 60 feet wide and 404 feet long. This section of right of way is designed to eventually extend along the west side of the Magpie Forest to serve currently undeveloped property to the north and west. In the future, it may connect to right of way within the Port of Whitman County Industrial Park to provide a second street connection to that development. It is also possible that Merman Drive could eventually connect to or cross the SR 276 (North Bypass) right of way. Staff has reviewed this matter and finds that the dedication of a public street to serve adjacent commercial development clearly meets Comprehensive Plan Goal T.1 and recommends that the Planning Commission find the proposal consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

DISCUSSION

Commissioners discussed whether the proposed dedication was developed to meet City Standards.

GARL

Requested that for future business involving dedication of right of way, that a comment be made regarding whether the proposed dedication was constructed to City Standards and the existence, or lack thereof, of sidewalks.

MOTION

Anderson moved to find the proposed dedication of an extension of right-of-way for NE Merman Drive consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and to forward it to the City Council with an appropriate recommendation for approval. Seconded by Crow and passed unanimously.

OTHER BUSINESS

No other business.

**UPCOMING
MEETINGS**

Paulson stated that he will not be available to attend the regular meeting scheduled July 22. Commissioners mentioned that the regular meeting of August 26 is the first week of school, but there were no statements of unavailability. Crow stated that she will not be available to attend the regular meeting of September 23.

ADJOURNMENT

Crow moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Anderson and passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 8:25 pm.

ATTEST:

Chair

Planning Director

Secretary