

**CITY OF SEDRO-WOOLLEY**  
**PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**  
**March 16, 2010**  
**Minutes**

**CALL TO ORDER:** Chairman Rick Judd called the meeting to order at [6:33 p.m.]

**PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:**

**ROLL CALL:** Present: Commissioners, Rick Judd, Terry Carter, Pat Huggins, Jim Johnson, Tracey Donovan, Stephanie Lokkebo

**STAFF:** Jack Moore, John Coleman and JoAnn Lazon

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA:** Approved

**CONSENT AGENDA:** Minutes from the previous meeting-Approved

**GENERAL PUBLIC COMMENTS:** None

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

**1. Private park requirements within developments-**

City Planner/Building Official Jack Moore briefed the audience on the topic for tonight's meeting. He explained to everyone the Planning Commission's 2010 work plan that was put together by the City Council and the Planning Commission. Jack advised that at the February meeting the Planning Commission decided to split the project into two topics and the first item for the 2010 work plan is improving parks within developments. Jack also summarized the recent field trip that was taken on March 4<sup>th</sup> 2010 by members of the Planning Commission and local citizens.

**PUBLIC COMMENT:**

Rochelle Holmgren 407 State Street SW- Rochelle expressed her thoughts and desires to the Planning Commission reference the City providing an adequate skate park for the kids in town. She mentioned that an excellent examples of town orientated skate parks are Oregon's Hood River skate and Community Park and the Lincoln City Skate Park in Oregon. She introduced a picture board for the Planning Commission to look at. She believes that an adequate Skate park would bring more people to town along with more business to town.

There was a brief discussion on several locations in town that could work as a community skate park. (Southend of Riverfront Park and over by the Sedro-Woolley High School tennis courts)

Rochelle advises of other elements within the skate park could be a rock climbing wall, art projects supplied by youth etc. She explained that if the youth get involved in the designing of the park you are likely to see less vandalism at the park.

Bob Ruby-133 State St. Sedro-Woolley- Bob Ruby advised that as a developer and builder of several multi-family units he believes the public park introduced tonight is the right approach. He also advised that he is seeing younger set of parents with young children living in his developments and an on-site park should be available in the developments for these families.

Bob would like to see the Planning Department have the flexibility in the requirements and policies for parks in developments. He would like to see policies established with a default policy but let the Planning Department have the authority to work with the developer.

Alex Ruby- 133 State St SW- Alex advised that he would like to see more parks that have something for all ages.

Carl Johnson 48696 Burkland Rd. Mt. Vernon- Carl would like to see more wood carvings and benches around town. He also would like to see a better skate park built with better ramps and half pikes.

Pola Kelley-407 State St SW-Pola advised that she would like to see a small park with water features. She said that good examples of small water parks are in Hood River Oregon and at the Mabien Park in Burlington.

Staff and the Planning Commission ensued in discussion reference private parks within subdivisions and multifamily developments to include:

- The recent field trip taken on March 4<sup>th</sup> by citizens and members of the Planning Commission to five City parks.
- Discussion on minimum sizes for parks in developments. Staff and the Planning Commission discussed one example of an 800 sq foot park within a development. (Sapp Place). Does it accomplish the goal of a development park?
- Discussion of a 6000 sq ft park
- Park Cottage's development park (2500 to 3000 sq ft park) and its issues with younger and older children playing too close to each other and children getting hurt.
- Spring Lane's park (7000 sq ft. park with the fence around the park and also in the backyard of houses).
- Discussion of the idea of smaller developments to donate money to land bank to purchase land for more parks.
- Discussion on using drainage site/ponds as the play area and having the developer put the drainage underground.
- Discussion of requiring 8000 minimum sq feet per so many units or donate money or land for larger parks.
- Suggestion to implement areas inside parks for all age levels including senior citizens.
- Discussions on the Fidalgo Commons play area. (27,800 sq ft). Everyone agreed that this park area is excellent due to its size and the location. The Fidalgo Common's park area is in

the drainage area in the middle of the development surrounded by all the residences. The homeowners like this due to everyone can see the children playing from their houses.

- Brief discussion on the Klinger Estates (7700 sq ft park). Klinger Estates put in 2-3 different size parks within the development.
- Request for community gardens, benches, cover areas and water features in parks.
- The need for more bike, skate and roller blade parks(middle school age children activities)
- Commissioner Pat Huggins turned over some suggestions and ideas he had for Chapter 17.38.
- Discussion on centralizing the park within a development and give examples. Look at the setbacks to arterial streets.
- Discussion on getting more restrictive within the design standards, obtain more clarifications in the standards and work on acquiring examples of parks for developers.
- Discussion of the current design standards for common spaces/usable recreation areas on page 31 of the Sedro-Woolley standards and guidelines (updated May 2009).
- Discussion on a process of finding a balance between the number of units, square footage and the minimum size of a park within a development.
- Discussion of the pros and cons of the Homeowner Association and their responsibility as an association reference the common areas and drainage ponds.
- Discussion on the sizes of the trees and maybe the need for clarification on trees within the design standards for parks.

City Planner Jack Moore advised that he will do up a draft on some language for proposed changes to the design standards and guidelines.

## **NEW BUSINESS:**

### **Introduction of the 2010 docket-**

1. Review and possible revisions to the Parks and Recreations element of the Comprehensive plan.
2. Update the school's section of the Capital Facilities Element to include the Sedro-Woolley School District's most recent version of their Capital Facilities Plan.
3. Consider zoning designation change for properties east of the Fruitdale Road.

## **COMMISSION DISCUSSION/INFORMATION ITEMS:**

- Discussion on the future development of the Golf Course on the Fruitdale Rd/McGarigle Rd. Brief discussion on the Conditional Use Permit reference the open space within the golf course. Commissioners advised that the CUP was filed with Skagit County). City Planner Jack Moore advised that he has not seen the CUP and asked the Commissioners to bring any information they might have by the office and he would be glad to look at it.

- Discussion on the State's requirement of the City to make sure Homeowners Associations maintain their drainage ponds.
- Question on the relocation of Brickyard Creek within the Golf Course and along McGarigle Rd.
- Discussion of the Public Works memo to the City Council. – Jack Moore summarized the 2011 Stormwater Retrofit and Low-Impact Development Grant Program. A brief discussion on the possible SR 20 Metcalf to Township Lane widening and Pedestrian/Bicycle Facilities Project.
- Question on the special connection fee over on the Fruitdale Rd. Jack summarized the last City council meeting that this connection fee was introduced and discussed by the council. (1<sup>st</sup> reading)

**ADJOURNMENT – [Time 8:33 p.m.]**

---

**PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIRMAN**

---

**PLANNING COMMISSION SECRETARY**

Attendance : 6