

Planning Commission Policy Options

CRITICAL: Impact on Comprehensive Plan & Road Priority List

Before the Planning Commission can develop an effective Comprehensive Plan or prioritize future road improvements, we must first resolve which streets the city is legally responsible for maintaining.

Without this foundation:

- **Cannot accurately plan capital improvements** - Don't know which roads require city funding
- **Cannot prioritize maintenance/reconstruction** - Unclear which streets are city obligations
- **Cannot forecast infrastructure budgets** - Unknown scope of maintenance responsibilities
- **Cannot plan future development** - No clear standards for new street acceptance
- **Cannot coordinate utility planning** - Uncertain about long-term street commitments

Resolving street maintenance responsibility is prerequisite to meaningful comprehensive planning and capital improvement programming.

OPTION A: Grandfather Existing Maintained Streets

Accept all currently city-maintained streets; designate all others as private

Key Elements:

- Automatic acceptance for streets city currently maintains
- All other dedicated streets become formally private maintenance
- Apply current code only to new development

Planning Impact: ✓ Immediate clarity for Comprehensive Plan and CIP list

OPTION B: Comprehensive Street-by-Street Evaluation

Apply objective standards to every street regardless of current status

Key Elements:

- Engineering assessment against Municipal Code standards
- Accept streets meeting criteria (may include some not currently maintained)
- Reject substandard streets with transition timeline
- Offer upgrade pathways for streets that don't qualify

Planning Impact: Δ Delayed clarity (6+ months for evaluation) but most equitable outcome

OPTION C: Modified Acceptance Standards for Existing Streets

Create alternative "as-built" standards for older streets

Key Elements:

- Streamlined inspection for existing streets
- Reduced requirements vs. new subdivisions
- Fast-track acceptance process
- Focus on safety rather than full code compliance

Planning Impact: Δ Moderate timeline (3-4 months) with some flexibility

OPTION D: Property Owner Petition Process

Allow property owners to request city acceptance with cost-sharing

Key Elements:

- Majority petition from property owners required
- Property owners pay for street upgrades to meet standards
- City retains discretion to accept or reject
- Formal application and review process

Planning Impact: Δ Ongoing uncertainty - streets could change status over time through petitions

OPTION E: Hybrid Approach (Multiple Pathways)

Combine strategies for different street categories

Key Elements:

- Currently maintained streets → Automatic grandfather acceptance
- Unmaintained dedicated streets (Dragnet, Squaw Creek) → Evaluation-based
- Substandard streets → Property owner petition with cost-share
- Private easements → Remain private with clear agreements

Planning Impact: Δ Moderate timeline (4-6 months) with phased implementation

OPTION F: Formalize Current Status Quo

Legally document existing practices without substantive changes

Key Elements:

- Retroactive formal acceptance of currently maintained streets
- No change to current maintenance decisions
- Clear designation of private streets going forward
- Establish proper documentation and agreements

Planning Impact: \checkmark Immediate clarity but doesn't resolve inequity issues

PLANNING COMMISSION DECISION FRAMEWORK

Primary Questions:

1. **Which option provides clearest foundation for Comprehensive Plan development?**
2. **Which option allows fastest development of Road Priority/CIP list?**
3. **What street acceptance standards should apply?**
 - o Current Municipal Code standards (strict)
 - o Modified "as-built" standards (flexible)
 - o Safety-only standards (minimal)
4. **Should property owners have pathway to petition for acceptance?**
5. **How to handle currently unmaintained dedicated streets?**
 - o Dragnet Drive, Squaw Creek Road, others
 - o Evaluate for potential acceptance?
 - o Formalize as permanent private maintenance?

Timeline Considerations:

FAST TRACK (1-2 months):

- Option A or F - Grandfather/formalize current status
- Allows immediate Comprehensive Plan and CIP development
- May not resolve equity issues

MODERATE (3-6 months):

- Option C or E - Modified standards or hybrid approach
- Balanced timeline for planning documents
- Addresses most equity concerns

COMPREHENSIVE (6-12 months):

- Option B - Full evaluation of all streets
- Delays Comprehensive Plan completion
- Most thorough and equitable approach

Recommended Commission Action:

Select preferred option(s) with emphasis on:

1. ✓ Timeline compatibility with Comprehensive Plan development
2. ✓ Clarity for Road Priority List and Capital Improvement Program
3. ✓ Community impact and fairness