

pre-application meetings. matter of voluntary pre-application meetings is discussed. Dickinson stated that staff does suggest to development community that these voluntary meetings be held for significant development. If the Commission wishes to pursue this beyond the current meeting, it is recommended that they hold a public forum.

GARL Opened up the meeting for input from League representatives and other citizens in relation to this proposal.

Karen Kiessling
510 SE Crestview
Pullman, WA 99163

Stated she has lived in Pullman for 41 years. Representing the Pullman League at the direction of its Board. She explained the League's goals and their reasoning behind suggesting this ordinance. She detailed how the League obtained the funds to hire land-use attorneys to make sure the proposed ordinance was in compliance with the laws governing Pullman. She also stated that the League feels so strongly about this ordinance that they are willing to conduct the first community meeting for the first developer for whom it applies, free of any charge, as an example of the ease and value of the ordinance.

Paul Spencer
1745 SW Baldwin Drive
Pullman, WA 99163

Stated he has lived in Pullman for a total of 20 years with 13 years starting in 1950 and moved back seven years ago. Opined that many of the problems between developers and neighbors to a proposed development are caused by citizens feeling surprise by proposed development, and feeling they have little or no effective voice in what is happening. Expressed support for the proposed ordinance and opined that it would give citizens a chance to get questions asked and answered early in the process and lead to better communication between developers and neighbors to the development.

Allison Munch-Rotolo
635 NE Illinois Street
Pullman, WA 99163

Stated she represents the College Hill Association (CHA) and is in her third year as Chair of the CHA and has resided there for 12 years. Expressed that College Hill, though an older neighborhood, is in constant development and that there is very rarely an opportunity for public comment. CHA supports this ordinance because they believe this kind of communications would be helpful in neighborhood relations and in shaping future new construction for the benefit of Pullman.

Dorothy Swanson
1055 NE Creston Lane
Pullman, WA 99163

Opined that a good relationship between developers and the community is necessary for good development in Pullman. Opined that the proposed ordinance would be good planning for the future.

Todd Butler
610 SE High Street
Pullman, WA 99163

Stated he represents the Pullman Pioneer Hill Association (PHA). Opined that Planning Commission hearings are adversarial in structure and expressed that a roundtable meeting would provide a

forum for different parties to come together and voice their sides without necessarily having to come to a consensus.

Answered questions regarding appropriate size of a development that would trigger a public meeting.

DISCUSSION

Anderson explained that this meeting would not apply to all development, but would apply to any development that would require a hearing in front of the Planning Commission. Dickinson clarified that a 4-plex or larger would be subject to the proposed ordinance.

Joan Falwell
1301 Kitzmiller Road
Pullman, WA 99163

Stated that she is a League member. Stated that she currently lives on property located 160 feet outside of Pullman City Limits but she lived at 430 NW Larry Street for 40 years. She was a member of the League committee that proposed this ordinance. Stated she had spoken with planners in Spokane, Bellingham, Moscow and Lewiston and shared some of their comments. Opined that everyone in Pullman would be happier with the results if this ordinance were enacted.

Answered questions regarding what a Type III development in Spokane is; and what the cost would be to hold one of these meetings.

DISCUSSION

Paulson indicated that loss of time would be a factor in the cost.

Alex Hammond
1110 NE Indiana Street
Pullman, WA 99163

Stated he lives on College Hill. Asked the Planning Commission to consider the Wal-Mart issue. Opined that there was no opportunity for the public to express their concerns to the developer without filing an appeal and going before a Hearing Examiner. Also addressed the proposed development at High Street and Paradise Street. Opined that although time is money, a meeting as outlined in the proposed ordinance would be a good pre-development cost.

ANDERSON

Requested clarification of what would triggers would require a community meeting and what would happen to the record of that meeting.

Karen Kiessling
510 SE Crestview
Pullman, WA 99163

Answered questions regarding the triggers for a community meeting and indicated that the required community meeting would occur prior to any City involvement. Opined that it would be an opportunity for all stakeholders to come together.

DISCUSSION

Dickinson answered questions regarding whether any Pullman developers voluntarily conduct these types of community meetings; he said there have been several such meetings, and they have had

mixed success.

Commissioners recognized that the League has identified a viable concern, but would definitely like to hear from the other stakeholders, including information about costs of such a requirement. Expressed concern about the size and/or scope of the developments that would trigger the community meeting requirement. Commissioners expressed an interest in favor of approaching the ordinance as a temporary enactment with the possibility of sunseting if the program does not have the expected result. Required more definite information regarding how the ordinance would apply in regards to threshold, timing and a sunset option.

The Commission reached a consensus to arrange for a Planning Commission public forum to address this proposed ordinance.

DICKINSON

Indicated that staff desires to maintain the proposed ordinance as a proposal of the League, not the City.

DISCUSSION

The Commission urged the presence of stakeholders likely to speak in opposition to the proposed ordinance to the suggested future meeting so that all sides can be heard.

REGULAR BUSINESS

Review and make recommendations regarding the proposed Kopf Annexation.

Dickinson indicated this annexation was submitted by Keith Kopf, LLC. It regards 2.5 acres of land located north of the Pullman-Moscow Regional Airport. This property is pre-zoned C3 General Commercial. Property is currently undeveloped. The City intends to use the land for a water tower for fire suppression service at the airport; the airport is currently operating off a holding tank and it is not a very good situation. The C3 zoning district does allow for public facilities of this nature and so it would be permitted outright if the annexation is approved. Cited Comprehensive Plan Policy LU2.6 which says, 'Discourage the establishment of narrow projections of incorporated land surrounded on three sides by unincorporated property.' Explained that the shape of the annexation is the result of city negotiations with the landowner and despite the Comprehensive Plan policy, staff believes there is overriding public interest in this annexation and staff recommends approval subject to three conditions involving assumption of city indebtedness, acceptance of a C3 Zoning Classification, and incorporation into the hospital district.

In response to the Commission's questions, Dickinson said the planned water tank on the proposed annexation would not serve any areas beyond the airport; the water tank might facilitate growth of the airport; the city, with help from other governmental entities, would cover the costs involved with the water tank; the reason for

annexation to the hospital district is that the district wants its boundaries to be coincidental with the city limits.

MOTION

Crow moved to indicate Planning Commission agreement with staff recommendation to approve the proposed annexation with three conditions. Seconded by Shannon and passed unanimously.

REGULAR BUSINESS

Conduct a discussion regarding reevaluation of the city's urban growth area.

Dickinson reminded the Commission of their previous discussion regarding two preliminary urban growth area expansion options. He stated that city and county officials have been meeting periodically to discuss land use matters including the county's allowance for cluster residential development, potential city utility extensions into unincorporated areas, and city/county tax sharing proposals. Provided the history of cluster residential development around Pullman, city concerns regarding these types of development, and the interlocal agreement adopted in 2004 to address these concerns. Dickinson explained the sense of urgency in developing a new interlocal agreement map to address future growth of Pullman was based on the county's interest in tax sharing with the city.

Dickinson answered questions regarding the current layout on the 2058 Land Use Plan "Option A" map and any changes the county has suggested.

DISCUSSION

Paulson expressed a desire for more ½- and 1-acre lots within city limits. The Commission reached a consensus in having the city maintain control over the access points to the city, specifically at Highway 195 and Davis Way. The Commission also agreed that a public meeting conducted by the Planning Commission, to furnish appropriate government officials, affected owners, and the general public an opportunity to comment on a proposal resembling the 2058 Land Use Plan "Option A" map, is an important step.

OTHER BUSINESS

Garl asked about openings on the Commission; Dickinson stated that there is one confirmed resignation from Commission member Utzman and that Commission Member Ronniger is likely to resign soon.

Dickinson stated that the College Hill Association has requested an opportunity to meet with the Planning Commission to present a series of objectives and issues they have identified.

UPCOMING MEETINGS

Commissioners reached a consensus that the regular meetings scheduled for November 26, 2008 and December 24, 2008 were not good dates as they were on the eve of major holiday events. Commissioners did agree that if meetings were needed in November

or December, then holding a special meeting one week in advance of the regular meeting schedule would be acceptable.

ADJOURNMENT

Shannon moved to adjourn the meeting. Seconded by Crow and passed unanimously. The meeting was adjourned at 9:59 pm.

ATTEST:

Chair

Planning Director

Secretary