

## PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

February 27, 2002

---

---

Chair John Dewhirst called the regular meeting of the Planning Board to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Public Safety Complex, 250 – 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North.

### PRESENT

John Dewhirst, Chair  
Jim Crim, Vice Chair  
Virginia Cassutt

Beverly Lindh  
Joanne Noel  
Cary Guenther  
James Young  
Wayne Zhan

### ABSENT

### STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager  
Steve Bullock, Associate Planner  
Arvilla Ohlde, Parks and Recreation  
Manager  
Don Fiene, Assistant City Engineer  
Dave Gebbert, Engineering  
Star Campbell, Assistant Planner  
Karin Noyes, Recorder

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION BY MS. CASSUTT, SECONDED BY MS. LINDH, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 13, 2002 WITH THE FOLLOWING CORRECTIONS:

- PAGE 2, LAST PARAGRAPH, SECOND LINE, CHANGE “PARTICULARLY” TO “PARTICULAR.”
- PAGE 4, THIRD PARAGRAPH FROM BOTTOM, FOURTH LINE, CHANGE “QUITE” TO “QUIET.”
- PAGE 4, THIRD PARAGRAPH, LAST LINE, DELETE THE WORD “DEVELOPMENT.”
- PAGE 4, LAST PARAGRAPH, SECOND LINE, CHANGE “AND” TO “A.”
- PAGE 5, THIRD PARAGRAPH, LAST WORD, CHANGE “IDEAL” TO “IDEA.”
- PAGE 11, FIFTH PARAGRAPH FROM BOTTOM, FIRST LINE, CHANGE “ARCHITECTURAL” TO “HISTORICAL.”

MOTION CARRIED.

### ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

No changes were made to the agenda as presented.

### REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

There was no one in the audience who desired to address the Board during this portion of the agenda.

**PRESENTATION BY HISTORIC PRESERVATION ADVISORY COMMITTEE ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ECDC TITLE 20 CREATING AN EDMONDS REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES**

Michael Plunkett, Edmonds City Council Member and Chair of the Advisory Committee for Historical Preservation, reviewed that about a year and a half ago, he came before the Board and made reference to an ordinance he wrote to establish a preservation advisory committee. This ordinance was approved by the City Council, the committee was formed, and they have been working together for the past year and a half. The committee was charged with the following:

- **Survey historical properties in Edmonds.** This project has been done, and the committee was very surprised at the results, which will be shared briefly later in the presentation.
- **Determine whether or not a permanent historical preservation commission should be formed.** This project has also been done. The advisory committee determined that a permanent historical commission is necessary and that there are sufficient historical sites to warrant its formation. The permanent historical commission was approved by the City Council and in approximately 35 days the permanent commission will be in place.

Councilmember Plunkett advised that the intent of the proposed amendment to Title 20 is to form a partnership between the City and the State and is based on a model from the State, as well as ordinances that other communities have used. Once this partnership is in place, Edmonds will become a certified local government. The State would then be able to provide grant funding and training to assist the City in establishing their own historical register. The first step in this process would be to create a professional inventory to determine the number of historical sites within the City. These properties would receive an evaluation by the State and there would be tax and other incentives offered to these property owners to encourage them to protect the historical value of their site.

Steve Waite, a participant on the Historic Preservation Advisory Committee, pointed out that the City Council already passed the amendment to Title 10. The purpose of this amendment is to safeguard the elements of Edmonds' history and unique identity, foster civic pride and a sense of identity, stabilize and improve historical assets, assist and provide incentives to property owners, facilitate conflict resolution in preservation and alternative land uses, and encourage conservation through adaptive reuse.

Roger Hertrich, another participant of the Historic Preservation Advisory Committee, briefly reviewed the summary results. He noted that the purpose of the survey was to develop an overview of the historic structures that still exist in Edmonds. This was only a preliminary survey, and a more extensive review could be done once the Commission is formed. The survey identified all structures in the City that were built prior to 1950. The list also identified 24 structures that were built between 1873 and 1900. He concluded by stating that the number of historical structures existing in Edmonds now is 1,000. There are a tremendous number of structures that were built between 1900 and 1950. He advised that the survey was important in the beginning to give an idea of the general location of these structures, most of which are in the lower Edmonds Bowl area. He also noted that in the year since the advisory committee was formed, there have been 16 historical structures that have either been demolished or have permits to be demolished. It is important that the Board consider the amendment to Chapter 20 and make a favorable recommendation to the Council. This provides an opportunity to make a difference by offering incentives for property owners to save the historical structures.

Chuck LaWarne, an advisory committee participant, provided a brief history of how the Edmonds area was developed, starting out as a small mill town and ending up as a small town on the shores of Puget Sound. A lot of the historical flavor remains in the City, but much has been lost because the City did not have any clear codes related to historical structures. The two ordinances prepared by the advisory committee provide a logical manner to deal with these sites. The Council has already adopted an ordinance to establish an historical preservation commission. The second ordinance that is now before the Board for review would implement the ordinance that was already approved. He said that he served on the State Historical Preservation Council for nine years, and there are many examples of how communities and businesses worked to save old structures by finding innovative ways to use them while preserving their historic integrity. Edmonds is behind in this effort, but they still have the good fortune to have historical structures within the City. He urged the Board to consider the ordinance and recommend approval of the proposed amendment to Title 20.

**APPROVED**

Mr. Dewhirst inquired where, in the process, the Commission would develop guidelines as to what can and cannot happen to change historical structures. Councilmember Plunkett answered that the Commission would follow the State guidelines as a partnership with the State. He suggested that the Board invite Megan Kelley, from the State Historical Preservation Council to speak to them regarding this issue.

Mr. Dewhirst recalled that the Board has recently been going through the lengthy process of developing design guidelines for the City. He said that having worked with historical preservation commissions in other communities, he would suggested that the historical preservation guidelines should be incorporated into the City's new design guidelines. Councilmember Plunkett suggested that once the community and the historical Preservation commission becomes familiar and competent with the new ordinances, many of these concerns could be addressed. If not, the commission will have to come back to the Board for further discussion on the issue. Mr. Chave advised that for now, the City would follow the State and Federal Standards for Rehabilitation as a guide.

The Board agreed to place this issue on the March 27 agenda for a public hearing.

### **PRESENTATION OF ANNUAL CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (CIP) UPDATE**

Mr. Fiene referred the Board to the capital improvement program that was provided in their packet. He briefly described each of the following funds:

- **Fund 112**—Combined Street Construction Improvement fund (transportation projects), managed by the Engineering Department.
- **Fund 113**—Multi-modal Transportation Fund to deal with the Edmonds Crossing Project, managed by the Community Services Director.
- **Fund 116**—Building Maintenance Fund, managed by the Public Works Director.
- **Fund 125**—Parks Beautification Fund, managed by the Parks and Recreation Director.
- **Fund 126**—Special Capital Fund for parks acquisition projects, managed by the Parks and Recreation Director.
- **Fund 130**—Cemetery Improvement Fund, managed by the Parks and Recreation Director
- **Fund 326**—Public Safety Building Construction Fund which is the new Fire Department, managed by the Community Services Director.
- **Fund 330**—Street Limited Tax General Obligation Bond Fund for various capital projects, managed by the City Engineer.
- **Fund 412**—Combined Utility Construction Fund, managed by the Public Works Director.
- **Fund 414**—Waste Water Treatment Fund, managed by the Public Works Director

Next, Mr. Fiene referred the Board to the Capital Project Description Booklet, which provides a description of each of the projects identified in the CIP for the next three years. He briefly reviewed the following new projects:

- A walkway in the Perrinville area that was annexed into the City in 1996. There are currently few walkways in the area, and the proposed walkway would not only serve the schools in the area, but Lynndale Park, as well.
- 74<sup>th</sup> Place West has experienced some failure due to the slope, which needs to be stabilized this year, if possible.
- Pedestrian improvements in the College Place area could be done with grant funding.
- A pedestrian walkway on 96<sup>th</sup> Avenue West, south of Westgate Elementary School, leading to the school.
- Stabilization in the Firdale area along the 100<sup>th</sup> Avenue right-of-way. This is not as immediate a problem as the one noted on 74<sup>th</sup> Place West, but the City has already had a geotechnical engineer review the project with the hope of starting construction in 2004.
- A pedestrian walkway system on 164<sup>th</sup> Street near Meadowdale Road.
- 220<sup>th</sup> Street improvements. The City received a grant from the Transportation Improvement Board to widen this road, including a bike lane and a pedestrian walkway on both sides. Some site distance and grade issues will also be addressed. The City will begin seeking qualifications from consultants for the design of this project in the near future.

- Olympic View Drive pedestrian improvement project. This project is actually located in right-of-way owned by the City of Lynnwood, and they will take the lead. However, because the sidewalk would provide a benefit to the Edmonds residents living on the other side of the street, Edmonds has agreed to provide some funding in 2003 and 2004.
- Pine Street ferry access project. This project is the subject of a study over the past year to deal with the access problems that occur when ferry traffic backs up on SR-104 beyond Pine Street. There is a good chance the City will install an automated gate closure to close the street during peak ferry traffic.
- Water Comprehensive Plan. This plan is still in progress and details should be available for all of the individual waterline projects by the public hearing date.
- Stormwater project on 220<sup>th</sup> Street. This project is in conjunction with the other significant improvements on 220<sup>th</sup>.
- Replacement of two outfall lines at Dayton Street at Marina Beach Park. Staff is working on the design and construction of these projects, but permitting will take a significant amount of time.
- The Southwest Edmonds Basin Study is near completion, and this is the last basin study that needs to be done for the City. Staff will begin to identify projects this year.
- Stormwater Comprehensive Plan. By March of 2003 the City is required to apply for a Pollution Discharge Elimination Permit. The staff will try to address all of the stormwater needs and the permit issues in the Stormwater Comprehensive Plan, and this will become the City's application for the required permit. The plan will also lay out the stormwater projects for the next several years.

Mr. Dewhirst noted that there is a resurfacing project identified for 76<sup>th</sup> Avenue between Highway 99 and SR-104. He encouraged Mr. Fiene to contact Darrell Smith to coordinate the City's plans for the Interurban Trail with the plans for resurfacing 76<sup>th</sup> Avenue. He said the schematic drawings of the Interurban Trail may not work, and the trail may have to be located along the street in that area. Mr. Fiene answered that Mr. Smith is involved in both of these projects, so he is well aware of this issue.

Mr. Dewhirst referred to Page 4 of the spreadsheet and noted that there are some incredible amounts noted on the revenue side. He questioned where that money would come from. Ms. Ohlde said the 125 fund notes that grants and other governmental monies will be coming in for various projects, but this is not reflected on the spreadsheet. She particularly noted that the Aquatics Center Project Description makes reference to Note 1, which explains that general obligation bonds would be required to obtain this funding.

Mr. Dewhirst complimented the staff for their work in preparing the project description notebook. It helps make the projects more understandable. He suggested that a few of these notebooks should be placed in the library, both in the reference and circulation section, so that the public has access to the document, as well.

The public hearing for this item was tentatively scheduled for March 27.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON FILE NO. R-02-5 TO CONSIDER AN AMENDMENT TO AN APPROVED CONTRACT REZONE (FILE NO. R-97-28)**

Mr. Dewhirst inquired if there was anyone in the audience who wanted to challenge any of the Board members' participation in the public hearing process. No concerns were voiced.

Mr. Bullock recalled that a number of Board members were on the Board when the original contract rezone was considered and approved in 1998 as Ordinance 3217. The contract that was approved (Attachment 3) added a number of conditions, the second of which (Item 1.2) is the subject of the proposed amendment. This condition stipulates that development cannot occupy more than 21 percent of the net buildable area. For the most part, the findings and conclusions that were found by the Planning Board and City Council still apply to the project. However, the applicant is proposing to delete Condition 1.2 from the contract.

Mr. Bullock advised that since the contract rezone was approved, the City has adopted a new PRD ordinance. Since one of the conditions of the contract is that the property be developed as a PRD, the applicant would have to meet the requirements of the new ordinance. One of the significant concerns expressed by the neighbors regarding this project was compatibility,

and staff believes that the new PRD ordinance would do a better job of addressing this issue. As a result of the neighbors' concerns, the Planning Board and applicant had an extensive conversation at the February 11, 1998 public hearing concerning a condition that would limit the footprint of the buildings to 21 percent of the net buildable area. He advised that the minutes from that hearing provide a better understanding of the Board's intent in placing that condition in the rezone. The condition specifically states, "The building pads shall occupy a maximum of 21 percent of the net buildable area. Net buildable area means the total area of property minus right-of-way area in accordance with the ECDC." He noted that there were no caveats stating that open space or other areas should not be included. This condition was not to be applied on a lot-by-lot basis so the building pads for the entire net buildable area could not be greater than 21 percent.

Mr. Bullock said that in looking at the site, there are a number of areas on the property that have steep slopes, and development is precluded from these areas. Staff does not see this as a hardship that would necessarily prevent the applicant from meeting Condition 1.2, and they do not feel the applicant has really presented a strong argument as to why the contract rezone condition should be eliminated. At the same time, the staff feels that the new PRD ordinance would address a lot of the concerns that this condition was intended to address. Therefore, they are not opposed to removing the condition, either.

Steve Cobb, 100 Second Avenue South, said he is present to represent the applicants, Dr. and Mrs. Han Park. He disclosed that he sat on the Planning Board at the time the original contract rezone was approved and was part of that decision. He inquired if anyone had any objections to him proceeding. No objections were voiced.

Mr. Cobb reviewed the history of the project. The project dates back as far as 1992 when an application was made to rezone the property. The contract rezone was approved in 1998 after changes were made in the Comprehensive Plan because of the need to accommodate more residential opportunities in Edmonds as a result of the Growth Management Act. Today, the applicant is asking for a fairly simple change.

Mr. Cobb displayed a list of the conditions approved as part of the contract rezone on the overhead projector. He particularly noted Condition 1.2, which the applicant would like to have eliminated from the contract. Staff has indicated that they see no real hardship provided by this requirement, but this condition has actually kept the project from being developed—especially in light of the new PRD ordinance. The applicant has put together a team of professionals whom they feel can get the development going to the benefit of the City, the subject property owners and developers, and the surrounding property owners. The new PRD ordinance would protect the surrounding property owners, even without Condition 1.2.

Mr. Cobb provided an overhead map of the subject property. He noted that Olympic View Drive is on one side of the subject property, and 80<sup>th</sup> Avenue West is on the other. The City owns Lot 12 and included in the contract rezone is a condition that the applicant would purchase this property from the City. Recently, he has worked with the City to come up with a way to make sure the City gets paid more promptly and that they get top dollar for the property. The \$100,000 purchase price is greater than the appraisal amount at the time the contract rezone was approved. It is also higher than what the City would be able to get from anybody else who would buy the property as a separate lot because of the utility lines that run through the center of the City's property. In order to develop the property singularly, the utility lines would have to be relocated at a significant cost.

In addition to benefiting financially, Mr. Cobb said the City would also benefit by having the applicant pay for the widening of the preexisting 20-foot wide 184<sup>th</sup> Street SW to a width of 40 feet to connect 80<sup>th</sup> Avenue West to Olympic View Drive. When completed, the entire street would be dedicated to the City.

Mr. Cobb said that while the City has said that they see no real strong argument for changing the contract rezone, he feels there are several—particularly when considering the new PRD ordinance. There are several things in the new ordinance that are considered drastic changes from the previous PRD regulations. One of the most significant changes is the new design guidelines which help determine both the design and location of the proposed buildings. He specifically referenced Section 20.35.050, which identifies the criteria that must be considered including: improved circulation pattern, increased landscaping and buffers, preservation of natural features, etc. None of these criteria were included in the old ordinance.

Next, Mr. Cobb referred to Section 20.35.060, which goes much deeper into the building design than the old PRD ordinance did, and this further limits development of the site. For example, a pedestrian access from the street to the front door must be

provided and this will require more impervious surface. This section also requires that garages be deemphasized and that entrances and porches be provided. All of these requirements increase the necessary size of the building footprint, making it difficult for the applicant to meet the 21-percent requirement. He suggested that because the new PRD ordinance is more restrictive, this condition is no longer necessary. He also noted that the setbacks have to be the same as they are for the underlying zoning unless a variance is obtained.

Mr. Cobb noted that the applicant had originally had a conditioned sales contract with the City that called for a payment to the City by the time the project reached final approval. They now have an agreement with the City setting out the dates that the project must maintain as the development moves forward. They have also stipulated a payment schedule that the applicant would purchase the City's property within 30 to 60 days after preliminary approval of the PRD, which is considerably sooner than the original contract rezone stipulated.

Mr. Cobb concluded his comments by stating that the project is a good one. It is likely that Rob Michel will be the developer for the project, and he has a reputation for building quality development in the City and for working well with the City staff.

Rob Michel, 7907 – 212<sup>th</sup> Street Southwest, pointed out that the maximum buildable area requirement for the underlying zoning of the subject property is 35 percent, and this is the same requirement that any other development in Edmonds would have to maintain. He said he is not quite sure why the buildable area was reduced to 21 percent, but if the development is limited to that small amount of buildable area they would end up with only about 1,000 square feet of living area on the ground floor of each unit—especially given the requirements for garages and entries. He concluded by stating that limiting the units to 1,000 square feet on the ground level is not feasible.

David Johnson, 7810 – 182<sup>nd</sup> Place Southwest, said that he lives on the lot immediately adjacent to the subject property. He said that while he understands that the contract rezone was approved by the City Council, he was opposed based on several concerns. He said most of the neighborhood is zoned as RS-12 and the homes are very well spaced. Even those properties developed as RS-8 are spaced well. When the subject property was changed to RS-8 zoning, the neighbors' concern was that because of the very steep slopes on the property, the actual building space would be much smaller than the area as a whole. Even if limited to a buildable area of 21 percent, the homes would be places close together and be inconsistent with the rest of the neighborhood. Mr. Johnson said it was his understanding that the 21 percent requirement was an effort to make the development more consistent by preserving space between the homes. Mr. Johnson used a map to note the number of steep slopes located on the subject property. Mr. Johnson said the City Council approved the contract rezone despite the significant neighborhood opposition, and his concern remains the issue of spacing between the houses. He inquired if all of the Board members have visited the property. The Board members answered affirmatively. Mr. Johnson noted that the surrounding area is developed as single-family homes with considerable space between each. Even with the development being limited to 21 percent, the homes will be too close.

Mr. Johnson referred to Mr. Cobb's comments, which were made at the February 11, 1998 public hearing when he was a member of the Planning Board. Because of the neighbor's concerns about the space between the homes, which Mr. Cobb agreed with, he suggested that the building pad be limited to 21 percent of the total buildable area. That condition was accepted by the applicant, as well. Mr. Johnson pointed out that Mr. Cobb's position as a representative of the citizens of Edmonds was much different than it is now that he is representing the property owner.

Mr. Johnson pointed out that any development on the slope would undermine the slope and minimize the privacy that the surrounding property owners currently enjoy. Given the fact that a large portion of the property is unbuildable, even a 21 percent limitation would allow the homes to be constructed much closer than any of the surrounding properties. The applicant suggests that this condition must be eliminated in order for the project to be profitable, but this profit should not come at the expense of the surrounding property owners in the area. He said this is not a question of property value, but is more of a neighborhood character issue. Again, he noted that Mr. Cobb recommended the 21 percent condition when he was a member of the Planning Board, and the applicant readily agreed. He urged the Board to deny the request to change the contract rezone.

**APPROVED**

Wally Danielson, 7822 – 182<sup>nd</sup> Place Southwest, said that Mr. Johnson’s comments represent many of the neighbors’ views, and he said he agrees as well. He pointed out that the meeting location printed on the notice to the neighbors indicated that the public hearing would be held at City Hall. Perhaps that is why not very many neighbors are present.

Roger Hertrich, 1020 Puget Drive, suggested that the applicant’s reference to the new PRD ordinance is not applicable to this rezone because it was approved under the previous set of rules. Mr. Hertrich said he agrees with the surrounding property owners, and noted that their concerns are the same ones he expressed at the public hearing regarding the new PRD ordinance—buildings that are too close and incompatible with the surrounding properties. Fortunately, the old PRD ordinance provides more protection. When the developer does not have any restrictions for taking the steep slope out of the building area, the 20 percent limitation is reasonable. If the developer were dealing with the actual building area, perhaps different dimensions should be allowed. Lastly, Mr. Hertrich suggested that it is inappropriate for the applicant’s representative to be presenting a project that he voted on when he was on the Board. He asked that the Board not recommend approval of the amendment to the contract rezone.

Mr. Cobb advised that one of the main reasons he made the disclosure at the beginning of his presentation was so that the public could voice any objections they might have. None were presented. Mr. Cobb said that when he took on the responsibility to represent the applicant as a consultant, it was in a land use capacity and not as an attorney. He pointed out that the new PRD ordinance is a dramatic change from the PRD regulations that were in place when the contract rezone was approved. He agreed that he had a considerable amount to do with the original contract rezone, but at the time they were working with different rules. To correct Mr. Hertrich’s statement, Mr. Cobb explained that the applicant has to make a complete application under the new PRD regulations and not the old ones. There has been no application submitted for the development of the property other than the contract rezone, which was originally proposed under the old PRD regulations. It is the applicant’s belief that the contract rezone needs to be changed in order to work easily with the new regulations that have been adopted by the City. He noted that he also had quite a bit to do with the creation of the new PRD ordinance, and he thinks that it is a good addition to the City regulations.

Mr. Cobb said that if the neighbors review the new PRD ordinance, they would see that there are required buffers between the subject property and the surrounding properties. Any development of more than five lots requires a ten percent dedication for usable open space, as well, and this cannot include critical areas. The purpose of the PRD ordinance is to protect the critical areas on sites that are difficult to develop. The applicant will be working closely with the City staff and the ADB as they go through the PRD hearing process. The City staff has agreed that the change would help move the project along and that the remaining criteria in the approved contract rezone would remain intact. Mr. Cobb said he sees this as a very good project that would help the community by providing a through street from Olympic View Drive to 80<sup>th</sup> Avenue West, which will be dedicated to the City upon completion. However, the only way the property can be developed into a quality project is if the contract rezone is changed as proposed.

Mr. Michel explained that the setbacks would remain the same between existing development and the new PRD development. Mr. Bullock clarified that the new PRD ordinance does not allow a change in the perimeter setback requirements unless a variance is obtained. However, the interior setbacks can be adjusted based on the design of the project and approval from the City. He said it would be extremely difficult for the applicant to obtain a variance for the perimeter setbacks, so this would not be an issue of concern.

**THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.**

Mr. Bullock said the strongest argument made by the applicant in support of the amendment came from Mr. Michel. He stated that if the project is limited to 21 percent of the buildable land area, the footprint of the homes would be limited to 1,100 square feet or less in size because of the garage and entry requirements, etc. Staff also believes that the 21 percent limitation was an arbitrary figure imposed on the contract rezone at the time of the hearing. The new PRD ordinance, which would be required as part of the development of the subject property, has a lot more design criteria built in to ensure that the issues related to neighborhood compatibility are addressed and the impacts are mitigated. However, that does not mean that the PRD ordinance would require the new development to be exactly like the existing development as far as size and spacing. It will ensure that there is some measure of compatibility.

**APPROVED**

Mr. Bullock concluded that staff's position is that they do not feel there would be any increased impact to the surrounding property owners if Condition 1.2 were eliminated from the contract rezone as proposed by the applicant. The provisions provided by the new PRD ordinance would address the neighborhood concerns.

Mr. Chave clarified that the statements by the applicant's representative regarding the City receiving payment for the property acquisition is a separate set of negotiations between Dr. and Mrs. Park and the City as a proprietary entity. This issue does not have any bearing on the contract rezone amendment proposal. The Board must measure this request against the Comprehensive Plan and zoning ordinances that are currently in place.

Mr. Dewhirst inquired what the setbacks of the subject property would be if a developer were to do a short plat or subdivision. Mr. Bullock said that if the short plat or subdivision was done as an RS-12 zone, the setbacks would be 25 feet from the street, 10 feet on the sides and 25 feet in the rear. If developed as an RS-8 subdivision or short plat, the setbacks would be 25 feet from the street, 7½ feet on the side and 15 feet in the rear. He pointed out that rear setbacks would not be an issue because there are so many slopes around the perimeter of the property. The only setbacks that would be an issue of concern to the neighboring property owners are the side setbacks.

Mr. Guenther requested clarification as to how the 21 percent limitation could be compared to a limitation of 35 percent, which is what the underlying zoning would allow. Mr. Bullock explained that the PRD ordinance requires that a PRD abide by the underlying zoning lot coverage percentages, which is based on the net lot area. In this case, it would be 35 percent, and would be measured the same as the 21 percent requirement.

Ms. Lindh referred to the staff's analysis (Page 3 of Staff Report) and noted that staff feels that the lot coverage issue can be adequately addressed through the bulk zoning requirements and the PRD process. Therefore, she said she would be in support of allowing the PRD ordinance to run its course by recommending approval of the amendment to the contract rezone. She felt this property is a great example of using the PRD ordinance to develop a very difficult piece of property. Mr. Chave clarified that staff's conclusion is that the PRD ordinance should be allowed to run its course rather than limit the development to 21 percent lot coverage.

Mr. Young inquired if the PRD project would have to be reviewed by the ADB, as well. Staff answered affirmatively. Mr. Young suggested that the public hearing before the ADB is a good place for the neighbors to voice their concerns regarding how their legitimate interests would be protected. He said he does not have any problem with recommending approval of the amendment, as proposed. While he has not heard any explanation regarding how more houses would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, if the developer can afford to build more units in a timely fashion and do a nice job, then the people living along Olympic View Drive would benefit from the effort. However, he said he still has a concern about building more houses that will put more traffic on Olympic View Drive. He suggested that the neighbors raise these concerns at the public hearing before the ADB. He concluded that the property would be developed one way or another, and it is best to have a responsible developer do the project. However, the neighbors have every right to be protected against the adverse impacts of this development.

Mr. Dewhirst said he understands the applicant's point of view, and he would like to see the PRD ordinance given a chance to prove itself. But this application was previously approved and the surrounding property owners weigh Condition 1.2 as a controlling mechanism. If it hadn't been for this condition, the contract rezone might not have even been approved. He said he agrees that the situation has changed with the new PRD ordinance which does guide development of these difficult properties. .

Mr. Crim said he would like to give the PRD ordinance an opportunity to perform. That is probably the overriding consideration as far as he is concerned. Ms. Cassutt agreed.

**MOTION BY MR. CRIM, SECONDED BY MS. CASSUTT, TO RECOMMEND THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE FILE NO. R-02-5 THAT WOULD DELETE CONDITION 1.2 FROM THE PREVIOUSLY APPROVED CONTRACT REZONE (FILE NO. R-97-28) AS PROPOSED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**APPROVED**

Mr. Dewhirst advised that this item would go before the City Council for a final decision. He also asked that staff make sure the problem of having the wrong location on the notice that was sent to the surrounding property owners is corrected. Staff indicated that they would resolve this problem immediately.

THE BOARD TOOK A TEN-MINUTE BREAK AT 8:50 P.M. THEY RECONVENED AT 9:00 P.M.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 20.10 OF THE ECDC IN ORDER TO ESTABLISH A REVISED PROCESS AND THRESHOLDS FOR ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW (FILE NO. CDC-01-27)**

Mr. Chave briefly recalled that the Board completed their review of the new design guidelines and in working them into the development code they found that the process would have a lot to do with how the guidelines function. After consulting with the City Council, they concluded that it is appropriate to tackle both issues at the same time. The purpose of the public hearing is to solicit public input regarding the proposed design review process. There will be another public hearing on the combined design guidelines and design review process once it is written in code language. He emphasized that at this time, the Board is seeking public input regarding the design review process only.

Mr. Chave referred the Board to the flow charts that were displayed on the overhead projector. One chart identifies the current process and the other identifies the proposed process. He explained that one of the significant issues discussed by the Board was the need to have the design review occur early in the process before the design plans are solidified. In order for this early review to be effective, there needs to be an open conversation with the applicant. The problem is that if the ADB is going to be involved in a meaningful way during the preliminary review phase, they would be precluded from acting as a decision making body later in the process.

Mr. Chave advised that the proposed plan would have the ADB involved in the preliminary review process. While this would not be an official public hearing, the public would be invited to participate and provide their comments. Written public input regarding any project would also be allowed throughout the design review process. At the end of the design review process, the ADB would again review the project and issue their decision. The ADB decision is appealable in an open record public hearing.

Mr. Chave said another significant change in the proposed design review process is that it only applies to major projects that would require SEPA review, as well. All of the new projects that fall under the SEPA threshold would become a staff decision rather than require an ADB review. There would still be an opportunity for a preapplication meeting with the staff, but the process would be streamlined.

Mr. Bullock referred the Board to the description of each of the steps in the proposed process that was provided by the staff. He briefly reviewed the steps as follows:

1. **Conceptual Design:** This is solely the applicant's responsibility. During this step, the property becomes available for development, and a potential developer considers different options for developing the property and narrows down those options to a couple of preferred proposals.
2. **Pre-Application Meeting with the City:** This is a preliminary meeting between the applicant and the potential interested departments within the City to identify critical issues that likely will be associated with their project. Departments typically involved will be building, public works, fire, parks and planning, etc. Issues to be addressed will include utility capacity, design standards to be used, zoning requirements and improvements that may be required.
3. **ADB Public Workshop:** The ADB will hold a public workshop/meeting to consider the one or more preferred development proposal the applicant creates in the conceptual design step. This workshop would require notice and the general public would have an opportunity to give input about things they consider to be key issues related to the site and development on the site.

**APPROVED**

4. **Summary/Suggestions:** This is the product of the ADB Public Workshop. The ADB will give feedback to the applicant about what the critical or important compatibility issues are related to that particular site. They will also give feedback about how the proposed project meets or should meet the Design Guidelines that apply to the project.
5. **Detailed Design:** This step is again the sole responsibility of the applicant. They must take the feedback from the pre-application meeting and the ADB workshop and incorporate it into their detailed design.
6. **Application to the City:** the applicant will make a formal design review application for the City to review the detailed design of their development.
7. **Staff Review and Report:** Upon receiving an application for formal design review, the City will provide notice of a formal application and announce a comment period by which any interested party can indicate their support or opposition. City staff will review the proposal for compliance with City codes. The Planning staff will also review how the project complies with the direction of the design guidelines and the previous direction of the ADB. SEPA review will also be completed at this time.
8. **ADB Design Decision:** The ADB will review the final plans submitted by the applicant and any comments submitted during the comment period and make a decision as to whether the project complies with the design guidelines. Although this decision will be made at a public meeting, it will not be a public hearing and no testimony will be accepted at this time, with the exception of perhaps the applicant. Any desire to have the ADB consider a particular point of view or opinion will need to be submitted to the Board in writing during the comment period.
9. **Appeal:** The ADB's decision on these matters will be final unless the design review is a part of a consolidated application that is going on to the Hearing Examiner for a final decision with other discretionary permits or if the Board's decision is appealed. The appeal of an ADB decision currently goes to the City Council. The current review of the design review process may identify a more appropriate forum for an appeal of a design review decision. He suggested that perhaps both SEPA and ADB appeals should go to the Hearing Examiner, so that both appeals go to the same place. Appeals to the Hearing Examiner decision would go to court.

Mr. Crim referred to Step 8 in the process and recalled that the Board discussed the idea that if the applicant is allowed to provide testimony during this phase of the review process, then perhaps the public should be allowed to participate, too. However, staff has indicated that they feel it is appropriate to allow the applicant to make a presentation of their project before the ADB during Step 8 of the process as opposed to having the ADB try to gather all of the information they need just by reviewing the submitted application. Mr. Bullock likened this step to the building permit, which is an administrative decision made by the staff. The staff reviews the project to make sure it meets the codes. If they have questions, they can notify the applicant for further explanation to confirm that the project meets all of the requirements. The ADB would review the submitted applications for compliance with the design guidelines. If there is something that is unclear or does not meet the guidelines, the ADB would have the ability to talk with the applicant and have him/her provide clarification or make changes. The ADB would then make a decision, which is appealable. The body hearing the appeal would hold an open record quasi-judicial public hearing. If there is no appeal of the ADB's decision, there would be no quasi-judicial open record hearing necessary.

Mr. Dewhirst referred to Step 8 and noted that staff reviewed the Board's concerns with the City Attorney. Even though it would be legal to allow the applicant and not the public to participate in this step of the review process, Mr. Dewhirst said he can foresee a lot of frustration on the part of the opponents if they are not allowed to speak, as well. He said he could also see this step turning into an unfair situation if there are controversial issues. The proponent would have a last change to sway the ADB and the rest of the public would not. Mr. Chave said that if people have a problem or objection with a proposed project, they can submit their comments in writing for consideration during this step in the process.

David Toyer, Manager of Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish County, said the Master Builders Association represents over 2,900 different individual companies in the home building industry. He said he is present to discuss the design review process that is being proposed. However, it is difficult for him to make any technical comments without the concrete design guidelines before him. He said his comments relate to the issues of certainty, timeliness and predictability,

**APPROVED**

which are essential to the development process. These issues are usually the most contentious issues related to design review. He said he would lean towards support of the current process with a minor modification. Rather than having appeals heard by the City Council, it would be better to send them to the Hearing Examiner instead. The Hearing Examiner's decision could be appealable to the City Council, if necessary. Often the issues that are the subject of appeal are technical in nature. It is important that these issues be heard by the Hearing Examiner in an open record hearing. If the issue is not resolved, it could go before the Council for a closed record appeal hearing.

Mr. Toyer said one of his major concerns is related to timeliness. There are no real good timelines identified for the proposed design review process, which makes it hard to determine how predictable it would be. Based on his observation, the new process would take significantly longer. If an applicant is required to go through a public review process early on and then adhere to the comments that are made, the application could end up being stuck in the process while the applicant tries to address all of the many suggestions that are provided by the public, staff and the ADB. He is concerned that the force of the initial suggestions and recommendations that are made early on would have greater weight as to whether or not a project is approved. His fear is that rather than judging a project on whether it meets the flexibility and intent of the design standards, the project would be judged on whether or not the applicant meets the demands of the opponents.

Mr. Toyer said that he also has a concern about the significant upfront costs associated with preparing documents for preliminary review before the ADB. The plans would have to be fairly advanced in order to give a clear understanding of what is being proposed to both the ADB and the public who will attend the preliminary meeting. The problem will be coming up with the necessary capital to move the project through the early phase of the process when there is no certainty that the project would be approved in the end.

Tony Shapiro, 600 Main Street, said he is baffled by the proposed new design review process and he questioned the motive for the change. If it is to expedite the process as directed by the Council, he suggested the proposal would do anything but streamline the process. He said one of his major concerns is the up front time that will need to be expended to prepare the early studies. It would be difficult for an architect or engineer to convey concepts to the public who has very little professional training in this area. Requiring applicants to convey elementary design elements to the public early in the process would be a major burden.

Mr. Shapiro suggested that the proposed process would actually lengthen the review time. It would front load the effort and design costs to the developer, as well. He requested clarification as to which meetings identified in the process would be attended by the public. He suggested that if a public notice is sent out to the constituents, then the meeting would be considered a public hearing, and it takes two weeks to notify the public before each of the meetings can be held. He questioned how long it would take for a body to digest the issues discussed at a meeting and issue the findings to the applicant. He suggested that each of the steps in the proposed process would take two to four weeks to complete. He noted that in a recent project he is working on at Fifth and Walnut, they estimated that about 25 percent of the design fees were consumed in applying for the permits and providing information to the public regarding the project. He said he is curious as to why the public needs to have such great access to early concepts being generated for a private development.

Mr. Shapiro said that it has been his experience that designing by committee does not generally produce the best designs, and the proposed review process would be more in that realm. The building permit process is objective. The building code is objective and in many ways a discernable method. The design process is a much more subjective aspect. He said that he has been involved with the Chamber of Commerce group in reviewing the proposed design guidelines and expressing their concerns. There are two parallel efforts going on at the same time: a very extensive design guidelines document and a design review process. He said it strikes him that one or the other might be the best approach. But trying to change both at the same time places a huge burden on the developers in the community.

Bob Gregg, 16550 – 76<sup>th</sup> Avenue, said he is the owner and developer of the project at Fifth and Walnut, which went through the existing design review process. He said that he chose to take advantage of the preliminary design review with the ADB, and this proved to be very helpful. He attempted to incorporate all of the ADB's suggestions into the project and ended up with a unanimous approval. He said he is in favor of making the optional preliminary review process a requirement. Mr. Dewhirst clarified that the City Attorney has advised that, according to state law, the City cannot make the preliminary review before the ADB a mandatory requirement.

Mr. Gregg said he is in favor of establishing a design review process that would move projects through as quickly as possible. If those people who are most likely to be the appellants of a project are given an opportunity to review and comment on the proposed plans early in the process, it is less likely that the project will be denied because of neighborhood opposition. However, he suggested that the language proposed for Step 5 (Detailed Design) is too severe. He suggested that rather than requiring that an applicant incorporate all of the suggestions from the pre-application meeting and the ADB workshop into the final design, they should be required to consider the suggestions and make appropriate adjustments. The Board should remember that while the public has a right to be heard and applicants welcome their input, they should not allow the public to use the process as a way to bend the code to protect their own specific interests.

Mr. Gregg said that while the objective of the new design review process is unclear to him, he remains optimistic because they have had nothing but success in working with the City of Edmonds. He said he is optimistic that the intent is not to lengthen the process, but he would like a comparison between the existing process and the new process to make sure the improvements that are intended will actually happen.

Rob Michel, 7907 – 212<sup>th</sup> Street Southwest, expressed his feeling that the proposed design review process would add significantly more time. He said he quickly sketched a timeline for the proposed process, comparing it to the existing process. From Step 6, on the process would be similar to the existing process. However, the first five steps would add time. He pointed out that pre-application meetings with the staff are only available on Wednesdays from 1:00 to 3:00 p.m., and it will take at least two weeks for staff to respond to the applicant's design. It will take at least four weeks to advertise and conduct the public workshop, and then another three to four weeks to prepare a response. He felt that the proposed process would add about 12 weeks to the time it takes to obtain approval of a project.

Mr. Michel referred to the threshold that has been proposed to determine which projects would be required to go through the entire design review process and which projects can be approved administratively by staff. If the threshold is established at four units, there will be a significant number of four-unit projects being built so that developers do not have to go through the design review process. This might not be the best and highest use of the property. He pointed out that the HyattPalma Study and the Cedar River Study both identified a need to streamline the ADB process. However, the proposed process would not accomplish this objective.

Mr. Michel referred to the ADB minutes from a meeting at which this issue was discussed. All of the ADB members expressed their desire to leave the design review process as it currently exists to give the ADB an opportunity to work with the new design guidelines to see if they address the concerns that have been expressed previously. The ADB suggested that the intent of changing the design guidelines was to make the review process easier and more straightforward. The ADB feels that many of the issues of concern can be addressed with the new design guidelines, without changing the design review process.

David Peterson, Executive Director, Edmonds Alliance for Economic Development, said he realizes that the City has been struggling with the issue of streamlining the design review process for the past two years. However, the proposed process would not accomplish that goal. He said the current process has a professional character to it, and unlike zoning issues where neighborhood politics and personal values should have a place, the design review process should be a professional process. Step 3 of the proposed design review process would take away the professional quality of the design review process. He concluded that portraying neighborhood feelings to this level does not encourage good quality design.

Roger Hertrich, 1020 Puget Drive, said that it appears from the comments provided at the hearing and those that have been submitted in writing, that the main issue of concern is time. He suggested that in the process of trying to come up with a better design review process, the Board might have, in fact, pointed out how good the existing system is. He pointed out that the proposed design review process leaves the public out. If the public hearing is eliminated from the process, the City would be eliminating the chance for those that are interested to speak out and they are the ones that count in the community. The question is, "How can the City retain the existing design review process while, at the same time, make the optional preliminary review a requirement?" He suggested that perhaps the staff could conduct the preliminary review and identify design issues that they feel are important for the applicant to address.

Mr. Hertrich inquired what type of legal notice would be required for the public workshop that is identified in the proposed process. He said there are people living outside of the notice area that might have a concern about the project's impact on the City, as a whole. He suggested that the notice of the public meeting should be advertised in the newspapers, as well. He said that while written input is allowed, he questioned how all of these comments would be recorded so that these individuals could become part of the party of record. He also questioned how the public workshop would be conducted and if a recording would be kept of the conversations. Would the parties of interest get some sort of written summary of the conversation? He stated his belief that when a public hearing is eliminated, the City has to go through an extensive effort to involve the public. He would rather continue the public hearing process as it currently exists and find some other option for the preliminary review.

**THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.**

Mr. Bullock explained that the law limits the City from requiring two public hearings. Typically, a project that requires design review goes to the ADB for a public hearing. However, if there is a SEPA appeal, the public hearing for the SEPA appeal and the public hearing for the design review would be consolidated into one hearing before the Hearing Examiner. The ADB would still review the project and send a recommendation to the Hearing Examiner, but there would be no public hearing before the ADB.

Mr. Bullock advised that the City Attorney has counseled that the City cannot require a preliminary review as shown on the current process. As currently written, with the preliminary review being option, the existing process is okay. However, the City Council has asked that the Board consider ways to bring the ADB review into the design review process as early as possible to give applicants direction before they spend a lot of money on their designs. Mr. Chave added that was also one of the consistent recommendations from the consultant studies, that the design review process comes too late after the developers are well down the road in determining their best design. Mr. Dewhirst noted that the Edmonds Stakeholders Group also identified this concern. Mr. Chave advised that if there is a way to receive input early in the process, it should become much easier to proceed through the remainder of the design process because the applicants will have a clear understanding of the issues and requirements. While he did not feel the proposed process would lengthen the time it takes to obtain approval of a project, it lengthens the amount of time the applicant will have contact with the City and the public. The idea is that the contact with the public would be longer, but the applicant should be doing this anyway, and early in the design review process. An applicant should not settle on a design before the public meeting, but should perhaps come up with a couple of different concepts for consideration.

Mr. Chave suggested that Steps 2 (Pre-Application Meeting with City) and Step 3 (ADB Public Workshop) could be done simultaneously. The timeline for the proposed design review process depends upon the language that is ultimately adopted into the code to address issues of when meetings can occur, what type of legal notice is required, etc. The statement that the proposed process would add up to 12 weeks is not necessarily the case, but the timeline still needs to be sorted out.

**MOTION BY MS. LINDH, SECONDED BY MS. CASSUTT, TO REOPEN THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING TO ALLOW AN EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION BETWEEN THE BOARD, STAFF AND CITIZENS. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Mr. Dewhirst advised that the Board would be interested in hearing ideas and suggestions from the public and not just criticism about what has been proposed. He noted that the Board received a lot of input from various people, and the number one consideration was to get the ADB input very early in the process. According to the City Attorney, this eliminates the ADB's participation later in the review unless the process is changed.

Mr. Gregg said that after listening to the comments provided by other members of the public, he would support the concept of having the preliminary review process optional. He noted that if a developer wants to get through the design review process quickly, they would be wise to take advantage of the preliminary review process. He suggested that this optional review be marketed to the developers as a faster way to get through the design review process.

Mr. Shapiro said he appreciates the opportunity that is provided in the preliminary review process to confer with the ADB and staff early. The pre-application concept was started about 10 to 15 years ago to convey specific criteria that individual

**APPROVED**

cities have. He considers this to be a very desirable element of the design review process, and most cities only expect broad conceptual drawings for this review. However, if there is not enough data to analyze the project, the feedback will be limited. Therefore, it is to the applicant's advantage to provide as much data as possible up front.

Mr. Shapiro referred to the design guidelines that are being proposed for approval. Once approved, he suggested that developers would attempt to incorporate the guidelines into their designs prior to presenting them to the ADB for review. He said that perhaps the criteria will provide early input into the design review process without having to require a preliminary design review meeting.

Mr. Hertrich recalled that one of the driving forces that started the design review process discussion was complaints received from the building trade that they were unable to get through the process in a timely manner and that the ADB was making decisions based on personal rather than design review standards. However, they have not heard these complaints at this public hearing. He takes that to mean that the ADB is doing a better job of analyzing the projects before them. The developers have suggested that the original process, with some slight modifications, would do the job. He suggested, however, that it would help if the developers would quit complaining about the existing design review process and start complimenting its positive aspects, instead. Then people making the decisions at the Council level might decide to support the existing process.

Mr. Michel said that he has been presenting his projects to the ADB for review for nearly 20 years. He learned early on that the designs better be good or projects would be rejected. He recalled that in the 1980's projects were frequently rejected, but that is no longer the case. In the past years, the ADB has voiced their complaint that the design guidelines are too vague. They feel that if the new design guidelines are effective, designers can use them to create a project design that will receive ADB approval. He suggested that, if properly written, the new design guidelines could help guide the early phases of design, similar to what the pre-application meeting does now. The early design review might not be as crucial because the applicants will have design guidelines that are easy to understand and apply. If they develop within the parameters of the design guidelines, a developer will easily be able to get a project approved by the ADB. Mr. Michel concluded by stating that the proposed design review process would end up taking a lot of staff time and costing the City a significant amount of money they cannot afford to spend right now.

Mr. Crim said that perhaps the Board should reconsider the issue of implementing the design guidelines into the code without changing the design review process at this time.

Mr. Dewhirst said he likes the marketing concept suggested by Mr. Gregg. Perhaps they could offer some rewards or incentives to encourage developers to do the preliminary review, but not make it mandatory.

Ms. Lindh said she appreciates hearing from the people who use the design review system. She agreed that perhaps the Board should report to the City Council that for the time being, or for a trial period, the ADB should be given a opportunity to use the new design guidelines with the current process to see if the concerns can be addressed without changing the design review process. If they find that the current design review process does not work, they can reconsider the issue.

Ms. Cassutt agreed that perhaps they should forward the design guidelines to the City Council without a new proposal for design review. This would give the ADB an opportunity to use the guidelines and provide their comments regarding whether the existing design review process works or not.

Mr. Guenther said the intent of the guidelines was to allow flexibility instead of being so prescriptive. If the guidelines are to be flexible, the ADB must be allowed to provide their input. If the guidelines are more prescriptive, the City staff can review the preliminary designs using a checklist. Ms. Cassutt noted that the developers have emphasized the importance of having flexible design guidelines.

Mr. Shapiro said the marketing approach could be that if a developer comes in early for ADB input, then flexibility could be allowed. But if the applicant chooses not to come in early, the design guidelines would be implemented verbatim.

Mr. Toyer pointed out that the proposed design guidelines are lengthy and could be used as a road map, even with flexibility, to identify what the City is looking for. If an applicant chooses to go through the optional preliminary design review process, they could get a more solid understanding of what best meets the criteria. If they choose not to go through the preliminary design review they would have to accept the risk that the project will not be approved. He said the design guidelines clearly identify the City's expectations for development. As far as incentives, there are a lot of cities that promote the preliminary design review by offering to waive a permit requirement. There are other creative things that can be done to encourage the preliminary design review.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Mr. Dewhirst concluded that the comments received from the public have been very valuable to the Board. He said that sometimes, after reviewing alternatives, it is possible to come back to the current process and view it in a whole different light. He suggested that because of the lateness of the hours, the Board would put off their deliberations about this issue until the next meeting.

Mr. Young said that he recently served six years on the ADB. The reason this Board exists is to encourage developers to work hard to construct good development in Edmonds. Most feel that the extra effort is worth it. While he was on the ADB, he does not recall that any projects that looked good and met all of the requirements were ever turned down. He suggested that perhaps there is not a significant problem with the current process. He said he is pleased to hear feedback from the developers regarding the optional preliminary design review process. Mr. Dewhirst agreed, and suggested that the developers provide their same comments to the Council because their perception of the process is totally different.

#### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

Mr. Dewhirst referred to the findings that were prepared by staff to support the Board's recommendation on File Number R-2001-180, a contract rezone from RS-8 to RM-1.5 to allow for an 80-unit assisted living facility. He suggested that the findings be changed to better explain the Board's reasons for recommending denial.

Mr. Chave advised that for a period of time the Planning Board was preparing their own memorandum to the City Council with each recommendation. However, in more recent years, they have just forward their recommendation, along with the staff report and a copy of the minutes from their meeting. This seems to work fine. The Board agreed to forward the findings, conclusions and recommendations to the City Council as written, recognizing that the minutes from the meeting would accompany the document.

#### **REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA**

Mr. Dewhirst suggested that the Board schedule a retreat on the extended agenda. The Board discussed options for scheduling the retreat and decided to tentatively schedule it on April 10, 2002 in place of the regularly scheduled meeting.

#### **PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS**

Mr. Dewhirst requested that corrections to the Planning Board Roster should be provided to staff as soon as possible. He also asked that staff provide all of the necessary information to the new Board members.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 10:40 P.M.

**APPROVED**