

Town of Eatonville  
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
MONDAY 7:00 PM, August 3<sup>rd</sup>, 2009  
COMMUNITY CENTER  
305 CENTER STREET WEST

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

**Commissioners Present:** Schmit, Lambert, Schaub, Treyz, Craig and Harris.

**Town Staff Present:** Nick Bond, Mayor Smallwood and Kerri Murphy.

**Commissioner Lambert** led the flag salute.

**Approval of agenda: Motion by Harris, Seconded by Schmit. Carried.**

**Approval of minutes: July 20<sup>th</sup>, 2009 Motion by Schmit, seconded by Lamber. Carried.**

There were no communications from the public.

**Public Hearing – Review and Recommendation of the Design Guidelines**

**Nick Bond** gave a brief summary of the Design Guidelines. The project was started in 2000, Makers Architects being the ones to do the work with the town both in 2000 and again in 2009 putting the final document together. This document picked up where the original left off. We have tried to make a comprehensive set of guidelines that could be an administrative review of development proposals so that developers wouldn't be out of money and time by having to go through a lengthy process. We have tried to streamline but we did allow for deviations or alternative proposals to come before the planning commission so that developers could do things that are outside of the guidelines as well. These guidelines are a solid vision for Eatonville. The town did not want to follow a "theme" but it does want a consistent style of development that will reflect the natural resources and historical character of Eatonville. The town still needs future growth so that we can continue to be a viable community. He is asking that the Planning Commission will be giving its recommendation tonight to be presented to the council.

**Bob Bengford, Makers Architects** gave a power point presentation and summary of the proposed design guidelines. Explaining that the purpose is to help shape the growth of Eatonville consistent with the towns' vision and provide clear objectives for everybody involved and strengthen the small town character. These design standards give property owners a better idea of what can happen around them and helps to maintain and enhance property values. The approach is to advocate a right balance and flexibility. This is important because the town has administrative review and staff and applicants need clarity of what needs to be done to achieve an approvable project versus what may not. Wherever there might be a conflict, the Design Standards and Guidelines will apply because they are more specific in nature but they all work together.

**Commissioner Treyz** said, it refers to adhering to the construction standards and guidelines of the town's construction and development guidelines and standards but it doesn't give any standard for the height of curbs or for the type of sidewalks recommended. He added that he is an advocate of brick paving or concrete pavers that give a little distinctiveness to the look. He asked if there was something in the guidelines or if there couldn't be something put in there to encourage that type of pedestrian area and also the height of curbs. Maybe limit the height of curbs in predominant pedestrian areas.

**Mr. Bond** explained that as far as the public works standards for sidewalks, we do have a standard sidewalk detail and the height of the curb is specified at 6 inches. This is already established in our code and is not an issue. As far as the material for sidewalks in front of

businesses, businesses have the opportunity to use detailed paving patterns and they even get credit for it as one of the architectural details of their building it is not required. It does state that asphalt or gravel pavement are prohibited, it does not say that concrete pavement is prohibited and the town encourages it.

**Mr. Bengford** explained that the open space is intended to be plaza types of space. Landscaping is allowed in the plaza spaces but it is not a major emphasis. The emphasis is that these are people places where people gather and hang out. An example would be the graphic on page 38 of the Draft Design Standards and Guidelines. Mr. Bengford suggested that under B. VI. that it might also mention to allow for permeability for drainage of storm water, low impact types of development.

**Commissioner Treyz** asked that rolled curbing be added into this document.

**Mr. Bond** explained that rolled curbing is no longer allowed in Eatonville because we have problems with people driving onto the sidewalks creating a safety issue.

**Commissioner Lambert** asked if the standards for landscaped streets refer to commercial areas only.

**Mr. Bengford** confirmed that yes, it is commercial and multifamily zones.

**Commissioner Lambert** added that he is also concerned with the physical street widths. There are 8' parking strips in three different areas and legal width for a vehicle is 8'6". ( Pgs. 27 and 28) If you are within 2' of the curb, you are legally parked and that would make you 10'6". If you only have a 10' drive lane, you're down to a 7'6" drive lane. Parking on both sides would make for very narrow drive lanes.

**Mr. Bond** explained that with the store front street standards, the problem on Mashell Ave. is it is limited by a 60' right-of-way. We are trying to encourage a pedestrian friendly street that is compatible with the surrounding buildings. It is a confined street; we will never have a comfortable width and develop the type of pedestrian environment that we seek for Mashell Ave. The town has actually got the whole street designed for Mashell Ave. Other streets that are mixed use are Rainier, Carter and parts of Center Streets, they are all at 60' already and we want to encourage pedestrian friendly activity and also try to accommodate cars and trucks. The only place where may be the potential to increase that would be the Ohop Valley because if that area ever develops that whole street will have to be reconfigured to an urban standard.

**Commissioner Lambert** reiterated that he does have concerns about having basically 18' of roadway from the centerline to the curb and allowing parking on that street. These are some of the busier streets in town. It is an extremely narrow roadway. With two school buses passing, parked cars on both sides, you will run into some huge issues quickly.

**Mr. Bond** explained that two things happen with a narrow street; one is that people have a tendency pay attention more with strange intersections and narrow streets. People slow down when traffic is constricted through a narrow area and this creates greater safety for pedestrians. He added that if trucks are making deliveries along Mashell, they have alley access for these businesses and if they are delivering on Center St E there is no on-street parking so they would be in parking lots or other areas.

**Chairman Schaub** asked how the concern that Mr. Lambert is mentioning, how does it relate to Washington St., south of Center St.

**Mr. Bond** explained that Washington St. has two 12' travel lanes and two 10' parking lanes and the sidewalks are 4' to 5' depending on where you are and that is all the room there is. There is no kind of landscaping strip. Most traffic tickets are given on Washington because traffic moves so freely. South of Larson St on Washington S is different. There are really no new streets being created here.

**Mr. Bengford** added that you have to ask do we want to have streets with street trees and sidewalks or do we want to make a preference for large vehicles running through.

**Mr. Lambert** said he has a problem with the idea of designing something that on the onset he feels is a bad design to start with as far as the street widths go. Maybe look at parking on only one side of the street, go to a one-way street or reduce the width of the sidewalk.

**Mr. Bond** asked if there was any one street that he really feels that it is specifically problematic. A street that would need to be redone where this is going to create a problem.

**Commissioner Lambert** said that if the final plan is to have a 5' minimum sidewalk and 5' minimum planting strip you are starting to get into trouble.

**Mr. Bond** explained that Hammer Springs has a 60' right-of-way. A 12' travel lane and a 10' parking lane, 5' sidewalks and a little on the outside of the sidewalk that is front yard easement where the town could potentially put utilities. If you look at the amount of room in that development once cars are parked there it is more than adequate.

**Commissioner Treyz** added that when parking in some of the streets in Eatonville, i.e. at Mashell S. near the Roxy Theater or in front of the Community Center the pitch of the road is such that when one parks with a low profile car there is not a lot of room to get in because you are tipped at such an angle. He added that there should be something in the guidelines for the percentage of slope on the streets.

**Mr. Bond** said that the town already has that in the public works standards and it is 2%. There were no further questions from the commissioners.

**Dee Baublits, 333 Washington Ave. N.** – said that at the Lion's Club building at Carter St and Rainier Ave N there is not enough room for two cars to pass if there are vehicles parked on both sides of the road.

**Mr. Bond** said that Rainier Ave. N. is a unique situation where the town had a grant to do the street design and we had a request from one of the property owners to do one side of the street as angle parking and it ended up being that the retaining walls that would be needed because of the grade of the street constricted things so much that we ended up in the design with something that was too tight. That street does not fit any standard that the town is proposing here.

**Chairman Schaub** closed the public portion of the hearing. 7:55 p.m.

There were no further comments from the public or planning commissioners.

**Mr. Bond** explained that when the design guidelines were being written, there was an advisory committee created where there were 2 council people, 2 commissioners and members of the EDDA and a couple of other citizens joined the group as well and they formulated a recommendation on this and we are asking for a planning commission recommendation on this document, and if there are specific changes you would like to see we are certainly open to them. We have been refining this for 6 months now and he is comfortable with what they have come up with.

**Chairman Schaub** read Dee Baublits letter into the record. (See attached)

**Commissioner Schmit** said that she attended several of the meetings and a lot of the community came out and had input. The document does reflect what the citizens want in Eatonville and how it should grow.

**Commissioner Lambert** said he wanted to go on record that he does like the idea of what we are trying to do. He does have concerns that in a town where we are trying to grow the commercial base, making it more expensive to develop commercial property and adding barriers to commercial development when we really desperately need commercial development in this town, he has mixed emotions on what we are trying to do.

**Chairman Schaub** called for a motion.

**Commissioner Schmit** made a motion to approve the design standards and guidelines as recommended.

**Motion passed. 4 to 2.** Commissioners Lambert and Craig voted against the motion.

**Mr. Bond** announced that the next regular scheduled meeting of August 17<sup>th</sup> will be cancelled and the next meeting will be August 31, 2009. The commissioners have a large packet in front of them that will be the subject of that planning commission meeting. The town had a grant of technical assistance from the Puget Sound Partnership to do a Storm water Code revision. The objective was to find ways to improve storm water discharge. AHBL is the firm that put this together, they have done it for numerous other communities. This goes a long way to improve how we manage our storm water and also provides for new opportunities to manage storm waters in greener ways. The packet is in strike through and underline mode. There is also a provision for low impact planned unit development and it is an option, it is not mandatory that you do that type of thing. Commissioners will have a month to review it and come back and make a recommendation to the town council. Town council will then take it up in September.

**Commissioner Lambert** asked with what was recommended this evening, the storm water code revision and the comp plan recommendation east of town.

**Mr. Bond** said that they are right in line with it. The design guidelines, the low impact development option is actually from that. The town council will take action on the design guidelines right after they take action on the comp plan. If the comp plan passes then the design guidelines follow and essentially implement what we did with the comp plan. The storm water code is also right in line with that also. The firm that did the West Eatonville plan is the same firm that wrote the storm water code update.

**Mayor Smallwood** announced that the town has received notice that it will be awarded a \$ 500,000.00 grant for the second feeder coming from the substation located in the Ohop Valley into Eatonville. The grant is from FEMA.

**Next meeting will be August 31, 2009.**

**Motion to adjourn by Lambert. Seconded by Schmit. Carried.**

**Meeting adjourned at 8:10 PM**

---

PC Chairman, Bob Schaub

---

PC Recorder, Kerri Murphy

---

PC Secretary, Abby Schmit