

**Town of Eatonville**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**Tuesday, January 21<sup>rd</sup>, 2014**  
**COMMUNITY CENTER**  
**305 CENTER STREET WEST**

**CALL TO ORDER**

**Chairman Lambert** called the meeting to order at 7:00 PM.

**ROLL CALL**

**Present:** Chairman Lambert, Commissioners Beach, Craig and Justice.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Mayor Schaub, Kerri Murphy and Town Administrator-Doug Beagle

**OPENING CEREMONIES – Commissioner Beach** led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

**Commissioner Beach** moved approval and **Commissioner Justice** seconded. All in favor. (AIF)

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Minutes of the April 15, 2013. **Commissioner Beach** moved approval and **Commissioner Craig** seconded. AIF

**CITIZEN COMMENTS – NONE      COMMISSIONERS COMMENTS- NONE**

**New Business:**

**Election of Officers.**

**Commissioner Beach** nominated **Chris Lambert** for Chairman. AIF

**Commissioner Beach** nominated **Judy Justice** as Vice Chairperson. AIF

**Commissioner Beach** nominated **David Craig** as Secretary. AIF

**Aviator Heights Plat – Discussion only.**

**Town Administrator Doug Beagle** gave a brief summary of Aviator Heights and the modifications that are being requested for the subdivision. He introduced Lisa Kline with AHBL Engineering and Dan Simon with Northwest Development stating that six month ago they had approached the town as to the status of Aviator Heights. We discussed where the plat was and that it had received final plat and he assumed and believed that he was correct that the property owner was going through bankruptcy and these folks were looking at potentially purchasing the plat and moving the process forward. They discussed a game plan as far as the best approach to come to town. It was decided that they should have a package, which they have provided for you this evening. The maps provided show the plat the way it most likely sits today and the conditions. They did go to Council and discuss the potential of bringing the plat forward. They did not want to spend a lot of money on the project for something that was going to be frowned upon by the town. There was opposition from one councilmember because he felt that the previous changes to the plat were circumvented by the previous administration. The other councilmembers seemed to be in favor of moving forward with the project. So this is the project put before the Planning Commission to review what they are trying to accomplish with the plat. This is the history of where we are at today.

**Commissioner Beach** asked Mr. Beagle to briefly say what the councilmember had said...

**Mr. Beagle** explained that there was a taxiway that was taken out of lot one as it came on to the road onto the roadway going into the plat. That was changed and that was his biggest concern. The town started then to look at plat conditions, minor amendments and major amendments for lots 5 and less. Nothing for large lot plats. There are some issues that need to be looked at by the Planning Commission as well as some things that we want you to take a look at and possibly correct. Doug provided samples from the attorney who provided samples from the other jurisdictions on revisions to a preliminary plat to the Planning Commission. They provide different scenarios from other cities. Our

attorney says it the best. We are boot straps and suspenders. We are trying to fix a plat and move it forward with the spirit of knowing that we have a group that is willing to take down lots and start building in our town, which we desperately need but we also want to stay within the confines of what the original plat was. The revisions that this group has proposed, in Doug's opinion, are minor. When you go into major changes, we are talking about roadway changes. Doug explained that he has already had the discussion with Commissioner Beach on this and he felt that he would talk about what he feels is a major amendment. Mr. Beagle explained that he does not have a lot of history on this project; Mr. Bond is really the one that was involved on this, so he is trying to bring himself up to speed and educate himself on changes that were made. He does not know why the previous administration allowed those changes. He does not know if that administrator thought those changes were minor, but clearly it is not when you are changing a roadway/taxiway.

Commissioner Beach asked Mr. Beagle if he indeed was planning on having a public hearing.

**Mr. Beagle** - Correct.

**Commissioner Beach** asked if the Town Attorney has advised him if this should be just a plain old public hearing or if this should be a quasi-judicial hearing.

**Mr. Beagle** stated that he has; he added that he would like to introduce to the Commissioner part of the code. EMC 17.22.100 – Modifications of plats. Mr. Beagle wanted to read what the attorney has advised us after reviewing this code; he added that all along he has had the attorney review everything, trying to identify what the code reads. His statement is: "I have reviewed EMC 17.22.100 and it is my opinion that this code sets forth the process to be used when a developer/applicant seeks to amend or modify any of the general conditions of the preliminary plat approval. (Please note: this code provision appears to prohibit amendment of any special condition. Pursuant to EMC 17.22.100, there does not appear to be any role for the Planning Commission, rather a public hearing is noticed and conducted by the Town Council) In talking to Mayor Schaub here this evening, we found this out late this afternoon, but we still felt that since you guys were the original group that recommended the approval of the preliminary plat that we felt it necessary to at least bring forward what the new applicant was trying to accomplish.

**Commissioner Beach** said he was chairman of the Planning Commission at the time of the original public hearing and there was considerable opposition. He has no idea if there would be any opposition to it now or not.

**Mr. Beagle** asked Commissioner Beach to state what the opposition was.

**Commissioner Beach** said that in general there were two kinds of opposition. One was the neighbors of this, particularly how the exit from the plat to the street was put in...they were not happy with that and he thinks that there were some conditions attached to that. Then there were general opposition that this would in some way jeopardize the airport itself and so a number of issues were brought up on that line. He thinks that the general issues were probably pretty well taken care of. There were still concerns by the people who lived in the immediate area. Some of those have probably been taken care of by the fact that so much work has already been done. A lot of it had to do with the disruption, the work, the dust and all that sort of stuff that would come from the construction. There was also the issue regarding that gate and both the Planning Commission and the Town Council recommended against the gate. Well, the Planning Commission recommended against it to the Council.

**Mr. Beagle** asked if this gate was at the main entrance, the one up by Weyerhaeuser Road.

**Commissioner Beach** said yes. Seems like the other gate is something new. If the attorney thinks we should have a public hearing...he also thinks that there should be a public hearing to see if there still is any opposition. And if so, what is the nature of that opposition. He suggested to his fellow commissioners that they simply hear from the applicants and ask questions of the applicants and then not get involved in the question of whether it is a good idea, a bad idea or indifferent idea. Reserve that for the night of the hearing and whatever indifferent objections there might be.

**Mr. Beagle** said all along when Mayor Harper was in office and we were dealing with the engineers, we intended on having another public hearing because so much time had passed and just felt that it was the right thing to do.

**Chairman Lambert** asked if there was expiration on .....(not audible)

**Mr. Beagle** said that there was but there was extension that was granted and it is still active.

**Chairman Lambert** asked if there were in questions or comments on the preliminary plat?

**Commissioner Beach** felt that they should hear from the applicants.

**Lisa Kline, Land Planner with AHBL. Dan Simon – Managing Partner, Pacific NW Development.**

**Lisa Kline** reviewed the conditions with the Planning Commission. Stating that with some conditions there was no change. Improvements to Weyerhaeuser Rd will be done simultaneously with Randals. Not sure of the timing but it will be done this year and this will be beneficial to both Randals and Aviator Heights. The private portion of Weyerhaeuser RD is owned by Weyerhaeuser Company.

**Chairman Lambert – Not audible.**

Condition 3 – has to do with the roadway change from a taxiway to only a roadway that accesses the houses. They want to remove the requirement that airplanes taxi on this roadway.

**Commissioner Beach** said that this was one of the issues that had some importance last time around. Because some people were very concerned about making sure that this was an airport. The whole idea of being able to bring your plane up there and having a place to put your plane by your house as well as the hangars down below was actually something that got a lot of discussion. It was significant.

**Dan Simon** said that their perspective is safety and marketability. They did not see the limits of that private road being used with a combination of an airplane, a vehicle and small children. We do not see that that would link. They do have the purchase option on both the hangar property and the subdivision. They feel that if someone had a home up top and wanted to have an airplane, they could do that on an adjacent property, and either drive or walk to the hangar. They do not see a big market in plane ownership. Because you have the ability to do it adjacent, he feels it makes more sense and more palatable to the people in the subdivision.

**Lisa Kline** added that they are also proposing a security gate. This is not at the public road section, but at the primary access to the private road.

**Commissioner Beach** said that essentially the gate was at the same place as yours is, essentially. He thinks that it appears on the map (Exhibit DD) even though this is not the map that was actually approved. Because that the gate that is in there was not approved...and they put it back in, they tried it twice to get the gate. It failed both times. He pointed out that the incorrect EMC is cited, it should be 17.18.180. He said that given the light that this was turned down twice, and he realizes that it is being stated because of not having the airplanes, you have eliminated one of the concerns. Whether you have eliminated the access of emergency and so...this can be taken up the next time so that concern may still be there, but why the gate?

**Dan Simon** explained that they are looking to attract the second and third time home buyer. There is every building price range in the market that exists. These are half acre lots which warrant a product that the second and third time home buyer can afford. One of the things that that market group expects is upgrades. And a gate is a large amenity that is an upgrade. There is a prestigious element and security element to it and it is very unique. It does not obstruct traffic to other areas or other folks.

**Commissioner Beach** confirmed that this is a marketing issue.

**Dan Simon** said that this is a security issue, but what we are selling is the quiet home town. You have all the elements of that. A small grocery store, award winning school district, local people, its close proximity to Mtn Hwy / Meridian. Twenty minutes to the mall, but you get to come home to a small town community. It's quaint, safe and where people look to raise their families.

**Lisa Kline** added that the roadway cross section. It does not change the private roadway. It changes the way the easement is drawn up with a 50 ft. roadway easement and 5 ft. utility easements on each side. This will allow for more flexibility. This will be especially helpful on the lots to the east with the drop in some of the lots.

**Lisa Kline - Condition # 9** -said that the original fencing had to do with a wood fence along lots 13 through 23 of Tract D to prevent access and insure safety. They are not proposing fencing in this area due to the lay of the parcels.

**Dan Simon** added that this would allow for the property owners to install their own private fence at the base of that hill around the perimeter of the area they are actually going to use, the yard. To the north on the end they are proposing the vinyl fencing. A cyclone fence to provide security to the airport and along the east side of the hangar property would be a privacy fence.

**Commissioner Beach** asked about the area along the Weyerhaeuser Rd. where they are proposing not to add a fence. He felt that what they were going to do is create a "no man's land". If these people who own the houses build a fence up to wherever the slope is, then you have the slope from the street down to that fence that will be blackberries and whatever else. Nobody is going to be responsible for it.

**Dan Simon** feels that once the people own it they will maintain it. He sees two different uses. It's a lot like when you build a home on a 5 acre track. You have your perimeter 5 acre fence but you also have your privacy fence around ¼ acre.

**Commissioner Beach** said he agrees that some people will clean it up but it may only be two or three out of the whole block it is going to degrade the whole thing. Other people will say they are not doing anything to theirs why should we spend the time to do anything to ours.

**Dan Simon** felt that Commissioner Beach made a good point. They are going to have CCR's (Covenants, Conditions and Restrictions) on these lots. The way to protect that element would be to have a condition in the plat to maintain the landscape in that area.

**Commissioner Beach** asked him to bring the language the next time they come back. Conditions 10-16 did not propose any changes.

**Lisa Kline** explained that this condition (17) was for airplane access only. What it did when it was written was it defined the airplane hangar tract as though that was all it was going to be. What they are asking is for a broader range of uses. The uses allowed for Tract C are more than airplane hangars; they are actually all uses as permitted by the EMC AP zoning. Multi-use was added to the word hangars.

**Condition 18** – No change.

**Lisa Kline -Condition #19** – This condition state that the face of the final plat is required to note that “future uses are as permitted by the EMC”. Exhibit DD, which is the approved plat map, appears to illustrate that the statement applies to Tract A and/or B. The applicant would like additional clarity on the allowed type, number and size of uses in Tract C so that, similar to Tract A/B, uses other than airplane hangars will be allowed as permitted by the EMC. The EMC clearly lists a variety of commercial and light industrial type uses that are allowed in the AP zone.

**Dan Simon** said the reason they are doing this is because they don't see it being built out in airport hangars. We see it being workshops that are 20'X40' or 20'X20' that can take advantage of that zoning. That is where the marketability is in that product. We have found that there is a good market for this.

**Condition 20 – No Change**

**Lisa Kline – Condition 21** – This gets back to allowing airplanes on the private road. If airplanes are not required then we certainly don't need signage.

**Lisa Kline** said they are adding new condition-Condition # 22 – This is one where we are proposing two additional gates. These will be in the commercial area of the project. One is located as you enter Tract B from the public road. The other is the dividing line between Tract B and the airport runway. These are all security measures for the commercial uses.

**Commissioner Beach** said he finds it interesting that you say, signage shall not limit public access such as no trespassing but you put up a gate. There is also the issue of police and fire getting through the gate, along with private parties. He hoped that the next time they come there is more about the nature of these gates and how emergency vehicles will access and how legitimate visitors will have access. He asked that Mr. Beagle check with the fire, police departments and the EMC's as to what they propose to do in the event of an emergency.

**Mr. Beagle** explained that the public safety element of this has what is called “Knox Boxes”. This is installed into each of these gates and it gives them access right through the gates. They have a key.

**Dan Simon** explained that they would do both. They would do the Knox Box and he has found that as easy as you would think it would be to keep track of keys, they get lost. They have elected an opticom and a Know Box. For the opticom there is a frequency in the dash that automatically opens the gate on their way in. This would be the same system like they have a Garage Plus and he would invite Doug to have the emergency people come out and look at the system they have installed there. It would mirror that. As far as the use, at the residents here, there is going to be a “key bob” that is a small deal that goes on your key chain with a reader that will have a code that opens and closes the gate. There are magnetic pads in the concrete so that when a vehicle is stalled for some reason, the gates won't close back on it. A guest would come to a board that would have a read out that would have the resident's name with a button that they would push, this would dial that home, resident would answer and there they could push a button to open the gate. There would be a similar one at the businesses also, it's closed for security but open for those that would call ahead and contact the folks that are at the shop. Currently there are 150 members at Garage Plus and they have this same gate system. If you haven't experienced it, he could see where it would arrange the question.

**Lisa Kline** added that there would be a care-taker's residence next to the existing hangars with a fulltime caretaker. 24 hour security. Lighting, fencing and gates is what protects that. Ms. Kline said that this is the proposal.

**Chairman Lambert** asked if the proposal consisted of the part of the hangar area and converts it into garage storage area.

**Dan Simon** explained that they would design them. Right now they are 60'X40' increments. The future buildings would be designed that same way so that if we have a customer for a hangar, we can accommodate with a 60'X40', with one general door but they would be compartment-ized into 20' width units so that someone could have a 20', 40' or 60' shop. The majority would take advantage of the zoning and light industrial atmosphere of that property. This would not preclude, if the market demand is there to have more hangars available.

**Dan Simon** said in closing that they are looking forward to working with the town bringing in 23 new home owners with families and to maximize the benefits that has been started there. The plat was done in s make sense manner and what was started can be finished on a positive note. He thanked the Planning Commission for their time.

## **Public Comments**

**Dee Baublits-333 Washington Ave N., Eatonville-** explained that she felt that there was animosity between the original developer, the city council as well as others and feels that this was why it was looked down on at that time. She does not think that the loudest vocal person is around any longer because he was at every meeting. The slope is more of a cliff than it is a slope and the blackberries might look very well on it. A gate she thinks is important. It may be a false since of security but it is a sense of security. If people are going to pay this price, pay the taxes, by the groceries and put some new life in the town, let us be known as something besides a “no town”. It is going to take

something more than a gate to have the illusion of being a “snooty” town. She asked that the Planning Commission work with Lisa Kline and Dan Simon. This is something that the town needs.

Doug Beagle confirmed that the town would move forward on setting a Public Hearing with the town council.

**Commissioner Comments**

**Commissioner Beach** said that there are at least two places of business (Cruiser Café and the bakery) that have these new flag signs. The Sign Ordinance says (EMC 18.06.100) that “each single tenant business may erect one freestanding or projecting sign per street frontage”.... they both have two. He wonders if they have the required permits for the flag signs. The code does read one...in the terms of a free standing sign. He thinks it’s unfortunate that the signs have been allowed to be there this long. He feels it is unfortunate that no one has done anything about the signs...that the signs have been allowed to be there this long. Commissioner Beach said that they spent a lot of time on that sign ordinance and he would like to see it stay operative.

No further comments.

**ADJOURNMENT**

**Chairman Lambert** adjourned the meeting at 8:07 p.m.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Chairman Lambert

\_\_\_\_\_  
David Craig – Secretary

ATTEST:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Kerri Murphy, Recording Secretary