

**KITTITAS COUNTY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
Tuesday, July 25, 2006 @ 6:30 P.M.**

COMMISSIONER’S AUDITORIUM  
205 W. Fifth Street, Ellensburg

Those present: Chairman David Black, Doug Harris, Well Bartsma, Grant Clark, Don Williamson, and Scott Perna.

Also present: Community Development Services Director Darryl Piercy, Staff Planners Noah Goodrich, Joanna Valencia and Scott Turnbull, Public Works Planners Randy Carbary, Planning Commission Clerk Susan Barret and approximately 36 individuals representing applicant and public interest.

**I. Call to order and introduction of members and staff.**

Having a quorum present the Chair called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

**II. Correspondence** – none presented.

**III. Approval of Minutes**

**Grant Clark moved to accept the minutes for the July 11, 2006 meeting as written. Doug Harris seconded and the motion carried with all in favor.**

**IV. Old Business**

**A. Tillman Heights Cluster Plat P-06-16**

**The Chair opened the hearing to Planning Commission deliberation and motion**

**Black** stated that the matter is still unclear.

**Darryl Piercy** stated that the county position is that until there is a dedicated right of way to the public the county would not be inclined to take on the maintenance and ongoing responsibility of the road way and suggested that in the future requirements that may be necessary to ensure that ownerships, secondary access, and adequacy of the roads are issues that should be resolved earlier in the process. Piercy stated for the record that this is a good project and a good example of cluster plating.

**Harris** stated that this is a traffic and safety issue. **Bartsma** concurred. **Williamson** stated he felt it is the developer’s responsibility to insure the ownership and adequacy of the road and suggested conditions be added for approval. **Clark** stated that it is unrealistic for the developer of this plat to resolve all these issues. **Williamson** suggested that it would be to everyone’s advantage to give the road to county.

**Piercy** suggested that under current road standards that the Planning Commission would be unable to recommend approval of this plat unless conditions were included securing the public road standard and secondary access.

**Randy Carbary**, stated the development in this area has increased rapidly and that there is a need to get back on target to establish a concise plan for what is in existence now and the future development and that the responsibility needs to lay with the developers. **Carbary** gave brief overview of what would need to occur to bring the road up to standards. Further discussion ensued.

**Bartsma made a motion to pass the Tillman Heights Cluster Plat P-06-16 forward to the Board of County Commissioners with a recommendation of denial. Don Williamson seconded and the motion carried with a 5/0/1 poll of the board with Perna abstaining.**

**The Planning Commission voted 5/0/1 to approve the suggested Findings of Fact with the addition of a seventh finding.**

**V. NEW BUSINESS**

**A. LYMAN/COE REZONE Z-060-09**

**The Chair opened the hearing to Staff presentation;** Staff Planner Noah Goodrich presented his staff report by reading portions of it into the record. Attached hereto and incorporated herein is a full copy of that Staff Report.

**Piercy** spoke of planned development and the inclusion of a SEPA review condition regardless of its meeting threshold to look at the cumulative impact of the rezones.

**The Chair opened the hearing to applicant presentation**

**Rick Cole**, representing the applicant, pointed out previously rezoned property; BPA easements; Comprehensive Plan designation of the area and the reduction of allowable uses by rezoning. He stated that the rezone will add value to the property; that it is not in a commercial use right now; that the bridge has been upgraded; there is a road maintenance agreement in place with the property owners; the rezone maintains the character of the neighborhood; the topography creates a natural buffer; and there is good access. **Harris** questions the road designations.

**Dave Nelson**, Encompass Engineering & Surveying, responded with details of the roads and access.

**The Chair opened the hearing to Public testimony**

**Randy Carbary** gave an update on the upgraded bridge and roads, stating that this road will be certified, but if any other properties are going to be accessed off it, the road would have to be brought up to a higher standard. **Williamson** questioned how many crossing are over the canal and the secondary access threshold. **Carbary** stated that this is the only certified private road and that there are no applications for this area at this time.

**Darryl Piercy**, Fire Marshal, spoke to the specific threshold requirements for emergency vehicles in relation to the bridge and road standards. Discussion ensued on the permit process for the bridge.

**The Chair opened the hearing to Planning Commission deliberation and motion**

**Clark** questioned the applicant if the bridge requirements would impact the rezone plan. **Cole** responded that it would not. **Black** voiced concerns over adequacy of road access and that he feels

this is not in the best interest of the public. **Pernaa** and **Clark** disagreed with **Black**. **Bartsma** concurs with **Black**. **Harris** stated that before an occupancy permit can be issued the road has to meet the private road standards, but the bridge should be done right from the start. **Pernaa** stated that the rezone does not affect the bridge. **Williamson** stated the preliminary plat is the right time and place to add conditions. He stated that the developers must be expected to pay for the upgrades. **Black** reiterated his belief that access issues of must be dealt with at the rezone stage.

**Scott Pernaa moved to pass the Lyman/Coe Rezone Z-06-09 forward to the Board of County Commissioners with a recommendation for approval. Grant Clark seconded and the motion failed with a 2/4 poll of the board with Pernaa and Clark voting for; Harris, Williamson and Black voting against.**

**Well Bartsma moved to pass the Lyman/Coe Rezone Z-06-09 forward to the Board of County Commissioners with a recommendation for denial. Don Williamson seconded and the motion passed with a 4/2 poll of the board with Harris, Williamson, Bartsma and Black voting for; Pernaa and Clark voting against.**

**The Planning Commission voted 4/2 to approve the suggested Findings of Fact with the addition of a tenth and eleventh finding.**

#### **B. EVERGREEN PARK PLAT P-06-13**

**The Chair opened the hearing to Staff presentation;** Staff Planner Scott Turnbull submitted additional comments into the record **Exhibits A-1, A-2, A-3** then presented his staff report by reading portions of it into the record. Attached hereto and incorporated herein is a full copy of that Staff Report.

**The Chair opened the hearing to applicant presentation**

**Wayne Nelson**, 301 West First Street, Cle Elum, representing the applicant, stated that this project meets all criteria, is in compliance with county code and state law and opened himself up for questions. **Harris** questioned who would maintain the Sno-Park. **Nelson** responded that it would be handed over to a public agency to manage. This part of the process would facilitate the dedication of the five acres to the public. **Harris** expressed concern over the maintenance of the sno-park. **Williamson** questioned the undesignated land. **Nelson** stated that the land is one R-3 lot. **Pernaa** questioned the Class B water system. **Williamson** questioned septic. **Nelson** responded with details. Nelson submitted into the record comments and supplemental information as **Exhibits B-1, B-2, & B-3**.

**The Chair opened the hearing to Public Testimony**

**Howard Carlin**, 802 E. Third Street, Cle Elum, representing Kittitas County Parks and Recreation District #1, read comments into the record, submitted as **Exhibit C**. **Harris** questioned if they planned to maintain the area. **Carlin** responded to the affirmative.

**Bob McGuinness**, 500 Chelan Lane, Cle Elum, representing the Washington State Snowmobile Association, spoke in support of the project. He stated that snowmobiling is important to the county's economic well being. **Black** questioned the current parking on the Woods and Steele Road. **McGuinness** described the parking as parallel to a county road and briefly described the trail system.

**Paula Thompson**, 551 Goodwin Drive, Thorp, questioned if the dedication process is legally binding at this point in the process; read a portion of her comments into the record, submitted as **Exhibit D**.

**Pico Cantieni**, 5920 Red Bridge Road, Cle Elum, spoke in support of the sno-park and that he agrees with Mr. Carlin’s testimony. He wished to stress the importance of preserving access.

**Louis Musso**, 305 East 2<sup>nd</sup>, Cle Elum, secretary of the Parks and Recreation District, gave a brief history of the Parks & Recreation District. People already park in this area, but this project creates a safer, designated access via a true public sno-park. Musso stated that a binding agreement exists with the developers.

**The Chair opened the hearing to Planning Commission deliberation and motion**

**Piercy** clarified the Cluster Subdivision moratorium and announced the special meeting of August 15, 2006 for discussion of the moratorium at 6:30 p.m. in the Commissioner’s Auditorium.

**Williamson** questions Piercy on the development of lot 14. **Piercy** responded that any further development would require substantial public process including a rezone and re-plat. Piercy suggested that conditions for approval be applied to this plat, which would make statements made by the applicant into the record binding.

**Wayne Nelson** reiterated that they stand by their statements and clarified that subdividing is within their legal rights but does require public process.

**Bartsma** commented that clustering is not a great boarder for Forest Service land. **Clark** stated he felt the applicant made a tremendous effort to do something for the public benefit.

**Grant Clark moved to pass the Evergreen Park Plat P-06-13 forward to the Board of County Commissioners with a recommendation for approval. Scott Perna seconded. Further discussion ensued.**

**Harris** voiced concern for the residential growth and who assumes the responsibility for complaints. **Howard Carlin** stated that this issue has been discussed, but at this point that they do not know what will happen. Security and control are important issues that they are aware of and will need to deal with as they come up.

**The motion carried with a 5/1 poll of the board, with Bartsma voting against.**

**The Planning Commission voted 6/0 to approve the suggested Findings of Fact with additional findings.**

**C. BILL HOLMES PRELIMINARY PLAT P-06-18**

**The Chair opened the hearing to Staff presentation;** Staff Planner Noah Goodrich, on behalf of Patrick Butler, presented his staff report by reading portions of it into the record. Attached hereto and incorporated herein is a full copy of that Staff Report.

**The Chair opened the hearing to applicant presentation**

**Dave Nelson**, Encompass Engineering and Surveying, representing the applicant, stated this is a clear cut subdivision. **Black** questioned the access.

**The Chair opened the hearing to Public Testimony.** There was no public testimony.

**The Chair opened the hearing to Planning Commission deliberation and motion**

**Harris** stated that this was a straight forward situation with good access.

***Don Williamson moved to pass the BILL HOLMES PRELIMINARY PLAT P-06-18 forward to the Board of County Commissioners with a recommendation for approval. Doug Harris seconded and the motion carried with a 6/0 poll of the board.***

***The Planning Commission voted 6/0 to approve the suggested Findings of Fact with the addition of a ninth finding.***

#### **D. VAUGHN REZONE Z-06-11**

**The Chair opened the hearing to Staff presentation;** Staff Planner Noah Goodrich presented his staff report by reading portions of it into the record. Attached hereto and incorporated herein is a full copy of that Staff Report. **Harris** questioned the access. **Clark** questioned the difference between the Agriculture-3 versus Rural-3 zones. **Piercy** clarified the zoning.

**The Chair opened the hearing to applicant presentation**

**Jeff Slothower**, 201 W. 7<sup>th</sup> Ave., Ellensburg, representing the applicant submitted into the record **Exhibit E**, Rezone Analysis and Exhibits Supporting the Rezone.

**Thad Vaughn**, 1501 Elk Run Road, Cle Elum, stated the primary reason behind the rezone is to control potential future uses; gave a brief history of the land and explained the access.

**The Chair opened the hearing to Public Testimony.** There was no public testimony.

**Slothower** went over the rezone criteria and Exhibit E.

**The Chair opened the hearing to Planning Commission deliberation and motion**

**Black** verified the seven criteria. **Williamson** brought up the comments from Bill Preston on the restricted vision area on 970. **Goodrich** stated that he did meet with Mr. Preston and addressed these issues, and that all future development, regardless of exemption, shall be subject to SEPA review.

***Doug Harris moved to pass the VAUGHN REZONE Z-06-11 forward to the Board of County Commissioners with a recommendation for approval. Grant Clark seconded and the motion carried with a 6/0 poll of the board.***

***The Planning Commission approved the suggested Findings of Fact.***

#### **E. THE GROVE PUD Z-06-14**

**The Chair opened the hearing to Staff presentation;** Staff Planner Joanna Valencia presented her staff report by reading portions of it into the record. Attached hereto and incorporated herein is a full copy of that Staff Report. Valencia submitted into the record **Exhibit F-** Development Agreement, **Exhibit G-**letter fro Washington State Department of Transportation, **Exhibit H-**Memorandum, **Exhibits I 1-4** Correspondence.

**Darryl Piercy** gave a brief background as to how this project came to the Planning Commission and spoke of the infrastructure being developed under city of Ellensburg standards. The proposal has been modified to meet those requirements.

**Black** stated that the deliberation and decision will be put as the first agenda item for old business on August 8, 2006 meeting to allow adequate time to review of the testimony and exhibits. Secondly, the record will be left open until Friday at noon for extended or revised written comments.

#### **The Chair opened the hearing to applicant presentation**

**Dan Norman**, 112 Syracuse Drive, Newark, Delaware, representing Campus Crest Development, gave a brief history of the company and his power point presentation.

**Jay Derr**, 2025 First Ave., Suite 500, Seattle, spoke of the transitional phase between county and city jurisdictions and clarified the utilities and land use issues.

#### **The Chair opened the hearing to Public Testimony**

**Ed Hawn**, Sun City West, Arizona, spoke against the project, he stated that he has property on Airport Road and he has concerns on the increased traffic, water, and parking at the university.

**Jerry Stanton**, 610 E. Kylo Road, Ellensburg spoke in opposition to the project commenting on the lack of housing need; safety concerns of additional traffic and speeding; the shoulders are not sufficient to handle bike or pedestrian traffic; flooding of the creek and ditch; and safety concerns with swimming pool and creek; and the insufficient law enforcement.

**Charles Wassell**, 810 Sanders Road, Ellensburg, voiced concerns over the density; the location; lack of need for housing; inconsistency with CWU's emphasis on walking access; he attested to the increased traffic danger and annual flooding in the area; and the potential view blockage of the Manastash Ridge. He stated that he is not opposed to development but high density.

**James Cole**, 2606 Airport Road, Ellensburg, stated that the water table is high and that the whole area is flooded and wet every year. He is also very concerned with noise.

**Don Childress**, 2411 Airport Road, Ellensburg, feels that there is not a need for university housing and questioned increased land taxes or if the land will be devalued due to the project. He voiced concerns over increased traffic; water; noise and aesthetics. He read into the record his wife's letter and commented on the loss of good grazing land.

**Ken Fyall**, 303 W. Third Ave., Ellensburg, stated that too much water is not an issue but trying to get water there is the problem. He stated the walk to the university is 10 minutes. The view shed is all new development, the area is high density UGA, he stated students will walk or bike and so car

traffic is not an issue.

**Don Childress** contested the previous testimony on the water.

**Continue public testimony for written testimony only until Friday, July 28, 2006 at noon.**

**Jay Derr**, rebuts public testimony by stating that this project is private apartments and not subject to the CWU housing plan; according to the city comprehensive plan this property is designated for a combination of high and urban residential zoning, submitted into the record as **Exhibit J- City of Ellensburg Future UGA Land Use Map**; in response to the view shed concerns the proposed building heights are consistent with both city and county code; storm water and water quality must meet ecology storm water manual; flood management must meet city ordinances and the buildings are designed to not impede storage or flow; in response to pedestrian safety, the city is requiring improvements and additional sidewalks: trees and vegetation are protected and requirements include maintenance of existing vegetation and additional planting. **Williamson** questions the density. **Derr** clarified the with the current and proposed future city densities.

**Dennis Whitcher**, Civil Engineer, responded to the water quality concerns stating that catch basins are not allowed except to treat water before disposal. Current plans are in accordance with Eastern Washington Storm Water manual. He addressed Mercer creek and stated that a JARPA permit will be filed, that there are several issues with the creek and that they are working with other entities to resolve those issues and enhance mercer creek; he addressed the high water table stating that soils report done and the project plans reflect that information with the placement of drainage swales and in accordance with the Eastern Washington manual; he addressed the 100 year flood plane stating the proposed design takes this into account so as not to impede water nor flood the buildings; in regards to irrigation water, the proper amounts will be diverted to the project as per the Cascade Irrigation District and therefore will not impact others downstream.

**Ann Winkler**, Sunburst Engineering, Veradale, Washington, did the traffic study for this project and stated that for this study they used apartment complex with corresponding number of residents for comparison. She gave details of her study which is part of the record. **Pernaa** questioned on site studies. **Williamson** questioned the counts for winters and walking in that season. **Winkler** responded that she relied upon the City of Ellensburg's traffic counts and that she was unfamiliar with Ellensburg in the winter.

**Don Norman** addressed the "party" issue by stating that there is a "three strikes and your out" policy and signed covenant; there is a police officer and peer advisors living on site; and they take care of their facility and as a result the students take care of the facility. **Black** and **Harris** questioned the cost. **Norman** stated it is priced within the high side of competitive and gave an approximated cost of \$475 per room. **Williamson** asked if being a student was a requirement. **Norman** responded affirmatively.

The public testimony was left open to accept written comments until Friday, July 28<sup>th</sup> at noon. The Planning Commission will open the hearing of the Grove PUD Z-06-14 for Deliberation and Decision on August 8, 2006 at the next regularly scheduled meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:55 p.m. The next scheduled meeting is August 8, 2006 at 6:30 p.m. in the Commissioner's Auditorium.

---

Susan Barret, Planning Commission Clerk