

## PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

July 10, 2002

---

---

Vice Chair Jim Crim 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  
Cary Guenther  
Joanne Noel  
Janice Freeman  
Wayne Zhan  
James Young

### STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager  
Steve Bullock, Associate Planner

### READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION BY MR. CRIM, SECONDED BY MS. CASSUTT, TO ADOPT THE MINUTES OF JUNE 26 AS CORRECTED, MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, WITH MR. DEWHIRST ABSTAINING.

### ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

Mr. Dewhirst advised that a new item be added under “New Business” regarding construction site signs. This is a specific request of the City Council.

### REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Roger Hertrich, 1020 Puget Drive, called the Board’s attention to the advertisement that appeared in *THE EVERETT HERALD* regarding this meeting. He suggested that, other than the people who actually know about this meeting, the public was not really informed. The ad was much too small and totally deficient. It does not enable the public to participate in the process.

Ron Gard, 1114 Ninth Avenue South, reminded the Board that he addressed them two weeks ago. He referred the Board to the information that he provided to staff. The first page identifies his property, and the pinkish highlights indicate the apartments and condominiums that are located in the vicinity of his property. He asked that the Board focus on the fact that he has been unable to subdivide his property. Hopefully, the Comprehensive Plan can be amended so that property owners, such as he, can at least apply for a variance. At this point he cannot do anything to subdivide his property. He noted that property just to the west of his was subdivided into far smaller lots than would be created if he were to subdivide his property, yet it is located in the same zone (R-6). He asked that the Board consider this fairness issue.

Next, Mr. Gard referred to a copy of the letter he submitted to the Board three years ago regarding an e-mail from Jeff Wilson (previously a supervisor of the Planning Department and now a City Council Member) to Ray Miller. He asked that each of the Board members read this letter again. Next, Mr. Gard referred to previous Planning Board minutes dated January 12, 2000 in which there was a review of the lot size and zoning issues as a way to encourage infill development. This issue was also discussed in the May 24, September 27 and October 25, 2000 minutes. He noted that since there appears to be only a small number of lots in the R-6 zone for which the lot adjustment would apply, he does not see how this change could have a detrimental effect—especially since it has already been allowed to occur in the area.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING ON FILE NO. CDC-00-153/CDC-01-27 RELATED TO THE DESIGN REVIEW PROCESS**

Mr. Chave reviewed that the public hearing is related to a proposal by the Planning Board to make some modifications to the current design review process. At this time, the Board is proposing that a full review, including an Architectural Design Board (ADB) hearing be required for major projects (those that exceed the SEPA Threshold). The Board is, however, considering the option of requiring a mandatory pre-application meeting for all major projects. While, previously, this was only optional, most of the time developers of large projects have some type of pre-application contact with the City. Although this pre-application would now be mandatory, it is not really an exception to the norm. Another point in favor of the mandatory pre-application meeting is that it would require that the design be considered earlier in the process, which is one of the requirements set forth by the Council when they referred the issue of design review to the Board for consideration. They wanted to have design review at the beginning of the process rather than at the end. Their concern is that once a design is completed and brought to a public hearing, there is a considerable amount of time and money invested already. Naturally, developers are reluctant to change their designs that late in the process.

Mr. Chave said that another aspect of the design review process that would be impacted significantly by the proposed changes has to do with the minor projects. Currently, minor projects (those that do not exceed SEPA) that go before the ADB for review are placed on a consent agenda. If an ADB member feels a need to discuss a project on the consent agenda further, they have the option of removing the item from the consent agenda. However, typically, minor projects are approved on the consent agenda. Mr. Chave noted that minor projects are not advertised through mailings to the public because they are minor in nature and do not have a significant impact on the surrounding neighborhood.

Mr. Chave advised that under the Board's proposal, minor projects would become a staff decision as opposed to going before the ADB on their consent agenda. The thought is that this would meet the Council's interest in streamlining the process to the maximum extent. It would provide the combination of major review for large projects and staff review for minor projects. This because they still have to meet the design guidelines.

#### **THE PUBLIC COMMENT PORTION OF THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED.**

Bruce Nichol森, 9829 Cherry Street, said that he is a long-time resident and has participated in the City's design review process in the development of a number of projects. He voiced his opinion that having some type of brainstorming session with the staff at the beginning of the design review process is very important. He said that on two projects he did in the City, he had \$30,000 into one and \$50,000 into the other before he knew whether or not he could even do the developments. That is really hard for developers to swallow. He suggested that one of the prerequisites of participating on the Planning Board and ADB should be that everyone must have done a project in the town. This would give them firsthand experience with the issues that developers are confronted with. Getting early on help in the process is really important, and he highly encouraged the pre-application requirement. He also encouraged them to do whatever they can to streamline the design review process.

Roger Hertrich, 1020 Puget Drive, said that Mr. Chave specifically mentioned that signs can be handled by the staff rather than requiring an ADB review. Unfortunately, Mr. Hertrich said that signs have a great effect on the environment of the City. There are some cities that restrict the signs to very small sizes, without massing them along the roadway. The reason that Edmonds has done a better job with their signs, is that in a lot of cases the public has been involved. The ADB is aware of how the public feels about signs, and that helps them make their decision a little more critically. Bigger isn't better when it comes to signs, and neon is not better than a front lit sign. There are a lot of examples in the design guidelines that deal with signs, but there is no guarantee that the public's concerns related to signs will be addressed if no notice or public

hearing is required. He suggested that the public needs to be involved in this process rather than allowing the staff to make the decisions on their own. He said that anything that reduces the ability for the public to be involved, also reduces the possibility that the town will resemble what the people feel it should be. The City has gone a long ways over the past few years with some major changes to benefit developers and property investors, but the citizens are beginning to react to these significant changes.

Rob Michel, 7907 – 212<sup>th</sup> Street Southwest, said he is confused because the packet he was sent over the weekend does not include the new process. All it includes is the changes to the design guidelines. He didn't know they were discussing the process today until he picked up the packet at the meeting. He said he is in favor of some of the changes that are being proposed, but he is a little concerned about the threshold. He said that he liked the option of the ADB being allowed to pull a minor project off of the consent agenda if they had a particularly concern that they wanted to have addressed by the Board. He noted that as indicated in the buildable lands study, there is not a lot of buildable land left in Edmonds. Much of it consists of just two City lots. Therefore, they will likely see more minor projects being built than major projects.

Mr. Michel said he is also concerned that the new design guidelines consider a small building to be a 10,000 square foot footprint or less, which is a fairly large sized building. For instance, the project on 5<sup>th</sup> and Walnut is just a little bit over 10,000 square feet. All of the buildings up Bell Street are less than 10,000 square feet, and they have very little design guidelines as far as what the building looks like. The chance for the public or the ADB to comment on any building design is slowly slipping away. He said he believes that the current staff would do a good job in reviewing these projects, but the they will not be with the City indefinitely. New staff members may not have as clear of an understanding of the history. Therefore, he is concerned about giving so much power to the staff to determine what buildings will look like.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Mr. Chave clarified that there are provisions that enable the staff to refer signs to the ADB. He also clarified that at this time, sign designs do not generally require ADB review. The proposed language states that the Planning Manager or designee may refer design review applications to the ADB, and then it lists several types of signs for which this would apply (Section 20.60.015).

In reference to the comment regarding small buildings, Mr. Chave clarified that even though buildings are defined as small in the guidelines, they would still go the ADB as a major project if they are over 4,000 square feet or four or more units. Only very small projects that are underneath the SEPA Threshold would become staff decisions. The hope is that this would cover the projects that will have an impact. When the Board last discussed the design review process, they spoke about how most of the frustration with the design review comes from people experiencing their first contact with the ADB, and that is typically for a sign review. Business owners do not generally understand what the City's processes are, and it is extremely frustrating for them to have to go through the public hearing process for small projects. He said the Board is hoping that the revised process will allow minor projects to go before the ADB if there is a concern about the guidelines or potential impacts. But for most items, they are trying to cut down on the process and not require more than is really necessary.

Mr. Chave recalled that during the Board's last discussion the point was made that the Board, in conjunction with the ADB, would like to see how the Design Guidelines and the Design Review Process work over a period of time. They discussed the option of incorporating into their recommendation to the City Council the suggestion that there be a series of milestones for review. The Board, along with the ADB, will be carefully monitoring how the Design Guidelines and Design Review Process will work. The expectation is that there will have to be changes in the future.

Mr. Dewhirst inquired how the Board feels about having a mandatory pre-application conference requirement for all major projects. He said this seems to be one of the significant issues of concern. Ms. Cassutt noted that some builders find the pre-application meeting to be necessary and some do not. Mr. Chave recalled that during previous hearings the Board has heard how pre-application meetings have certainly been a benefit. Staff's experience has been that while not every developer necessarily needs to go through the pre-application meeting, if it is not a mandatory requirement, the City will run into problems when a developer who really does need it chooses not to do so.

Mr. Dewhirst expressed his opinion that having a major project coming through the new process will require a period of re-education. It may be that the pre-application meeting will be necessary early on, but perhaps not later. He suggested that one of the points where staff will hear more about the Design Guidelines and how they are applied will be at the pre-application conferences. Mr. Chave suggested that the most workable solution would be to have a mandatory staff pre-application meeting. From staff's experience they could identify those things the ADB will be looking for and also identify the code problems early. There could still be the option for a developer to go before the ADB for a preliminary review, as well.

Mr. Crim inquired if preliminary meetings are held at the staff level now. Mr. Chave said there is a provision for a preliminary review before the ADB now, but the pre-application meetings that people are most familiar with are with staff. The nice thing about a pre-application meeting is that the fee gets applied to the permit fee later on. Mr. Crim said he would be in favor of a mandatory pre-application meeting with staff. Ms. Cassutt concurred.

Mr. Guenther recalled that there was some concern about scheduling the pre-application meetings. He inquired if staff plans to hold these meetings once a week. Mr. Bullock said that at this time, pre-application meetings are scheduled every Wednesday. The pre-application application must come in at least a week before the Wednesday meeting. It usually takes two weeks from the time the application is submitted for the pre-application meeting to take place.

Mr. Chave explained that if a project requires design review, a pre-application meeting would be required before a project could go to the public hearing before the ADB. Pre-application meetings on building permits, etc. would not require design review. But if a project requires design review, the proposed process would require a pre-application meeting for major projects only. Mr. Guenther concluded that for major projects, only one pre-application meeting would be required.

Mr. Young said he agrees with the testimony stating that it is not that onerous on the ADB to have something that might be construed as a minor project on the consent agenda. The ADB receives information on these projects, and there are times when they feel it was not appropriate to approve the project on the consent agenda. These projects are then removed from the consent agenda so that the ADB can discuss them in more detail. Once a project is beyond a SEPA threshold, minor is "in the eye of the beholder" and a sign, no matter how small, might have some justification to be discussed by the ADB. He said when he was on the ADB, he did not find it to be onerous to have sign designs placed on the consent agenda. It was also helpful to the staff to have the ADB make the determination as to whether or not a smaller project should go through the ADB review process. The record could then be established by the ADB. He said he doesn't have a problem with staff review, but Mr. Michel's point is well taken that he trusts the staff people who would be doing the reviews now. However, the current staff will not be with the City forever. The ADB could be the advocate or final arbitrator of an issue, no matter how minor it might seem to the staff.

Mr. Young said he thought the Board decided to table any further discussion of the process until they completed the guidelines. He inquired if they are under any mandate to consider changes to the process now. Mr. Dewhirst answered affirmatively.

Ms. Noel inquired about Mr. Michel's comments related to the size of small buildings. Mr. Young said the technical thresholds are whatever is written in the City Code or the WAC's, and he feels that these projects at least deserve a spot on the consent agenda. Historically, the ADB has had the professionalism to pull projects and deliberate on matters that need to be covered more thoroughly in a public hearing. Regardless of the size of a project, it deserves at least the current level of scrutiny or opportunity for public input.

Mr. Dewhirst said that one problem that has started to come up that is not handled well in either the design review process or the Design Guidelines is how the threshold is defined. The document says what a small building is and what design guidelines would apply, but it doesn't really state what the threshold is. Mr. Chave said it refers to the SEPA threshold, and that gets echoed in public handouts, as well. However, they try to avoid repeating standards in different parts of the code because when you change it in one place you inevitably forget about somewhere else where it is also mentioned. Mr. Dewhirst noted that three people tonight have been confused over this issue. Because this is a significant issue, it needs to be addressed in the proposed design review process document. Mr. Chave suggested that they can make this plain in the introductory materials to the Council and in the public handouts, but he cautioned them against putting it into the code again.

The more times it is in the code, the more opportunities there are for conflicts when one section is changed and another is not.

Mr. Bullock recalled some of the older ADB meetings where signs got pulled off the consent agenda quite frequently. At that time, the code that was in place had very little direction about what signs should look like. That was one reason why the ADB took an active role in what they should look like and often pulled these projects off of the consent agenda. In document 7a, Page 18, there is actually a matrix of sign types listed by neighborhood and district. This is something that the ADB and the Planning Board sat down and discussed about a year ago. They identified the different types of signs they would find acceptable or unacceptable in different districts in the City. This table addresses some of the reasons the ADB used to pull items out of the consent agenda. The table gives direction to both the applicant and the staff about what is permitted. If staff is faced with an application that they find questionable, they could still forward it to the ADB for review.

Ms. Cassutt said that, being a person who had to work with the ADB several years ago on a plain little sign, it was not a pleasant experience. She supports the proposal that signs be reviewed by the staff instead of the ADB. The atmosphere for business in the downtown area is becoming more difficult. The City needs to make it easier for people to start businesses and stay in business. She did not feel that regular signs that meet the design guideline requirements, need to go before the ADB for review.

Mr. Young said that while he respects Ms. Cassutt's position, he has never been convinced that ADB review has an impact on the relative health of a business. Ms. Cassutt said that is all the business community 20 years ago talked about. The ADB review had a lot to do with the businesses, and people were very upset with the ADB. There are still many of these people still in business in the downtown area. But only after much thought and expense was put into getting their viewpoint across to the City to enable them to place signage on their businesses that was visible to people driving along the street.

In terms of signs and design review, Mr. Chave said the biggest confusion for the typical applicant is to try and understand why they need a building permit for a sign in addition to a design review. They tend to confuse the two frequently. Even though all the literature says you need to have both, there are still people who come to the City for sign approval and then find out that it has to go through design review. There is some uncertainty about exactly what the process is based on the type of sign project. If all sign proposals that meet the guidelines become staff decisions, the design review decision could be done at the same time as the building permit. This would provide a significant benefit. If the Board is considering the option of requiring some signs to go through the ADB review process, they should specifically identify these types. That way, it would be clear for staff to determine what type of review process is required for each type of sign. If staff is uncomfortable with a sign proposal, they could always send it to the Board for review.

Ms. Freeman said she has heard that anything that will streamline the process will benefit the developers. On the other hand, there is a need for public input on some projects. They need to come up with some way to combine both of these concerns and please both sides.

Ms. Noel said she is more concerned about discussing the thresholds a little bit more to make sure that projects that are sizeable or have a greater impact will go through the correct design review process.

Ms. Cassutt said she would like to leave the design review for signs as currently proposed. If they send the proposal on to the Council for consideration, they will ask that there be periodic review periods. This could be something that comes up as part of the review, and they could make necessary changes at that time. Mr. Crim agreed. He did not feel they should go back and revisit the sign issue at this time.

Mr. Guenther said that when he told his neighbors he was going to join the Planning Board and discuss the Design Guidelines, they informed him that one of their biggest issues was the ADB's review of signs. They expressed that rather than dealing with the type or size of signs and how they are attached to buildings, the ADB dealt with colors, etc. Maybe the present ADB is different. As he understands it, they have a better code to define what kind of signs can go where. If staff follows the code, they should be able to make these decisions. If an applicant wants to deviate from the code requirements, the project could go before the ADB for additional review. He said he would like to leave the proposal as it currently exists and not make any changes related to signs.

**APPROVED**

Mr. Zhan said that, recognizing that everything is subject to future changes and improvements and that reviews will be held in the future, perhaps they should be more specific about future reviews to pay particular concern to those areas that have been identified. He said he supports the proposed design review process in addition to a periodic review.

Mr. Young agreed that the sign code is a lot better than what the ADB had to work with even as recently as 1997. He just never found it that onerous for the ADB to review sign proposals on their consent agenda. He said he does like the certain element of public review. He said he would support the proposed design review process on a trial basis.

Mr. Dewhirst summarized that the Board's consensus is to leave the design review process for small projects the way it is currently proposed.

Mr. Dewhirst referred to Sections 20.10.030.A and 20.10.030.B.4 and noted that both talk about public workshops. He suggested this needs to be cleaned up since no public workshops will be held. Next he referred to Section 20.10.080.B and noted that this states that all decisions from the ADB are final and appealable only to Superior Court. Mr. Chave said that what the Board had talked about previously was that ADB decisions should be appealable to the Hearing Examiner and from there to the Court. The Board agreed that this section should be changed to reflect the Board's intent to send appeals to the Hearing Examiner rather than the City Council before going to the Supreme Court.

Mr. Chave said that staff has the ability to refer certain sign proposals to the ADB for review. However, the proposed language does not have anything similar for small projects. If the Board wants to preserve the staff's ability to send minor projects to the ADB for review when they are concerned about the impacts, they should include a provision stating that staff has the ability to refer minor projects to the ADB if they have concerns about them meeting the guidelines. The Board agreed that staff should have this option, and they directed staff to add this provision.

Mr. Crim suggested that the Board talk more specifically about the review proposal outlined in Mr. Dewhirst's document of June 23, 2002. Mr. Dewhirst explained that this document was provided to the Board at their last meeting during his absence. He said that as the Board has talked about the design review process, they all recognize that things are going to be missed. He suggested that in the motion to send the design review process and Design Guidelines on to Council that they include the four paragraphs he has proposed to establish a one-year special review period on both the design review process and the Design Guidelines from the date of Council adoption. Secondly, it would grant the Planning staff latitude to problem solve with both the Design Guidelines and review process, and then report these issues to both the Planning Board and the ADB every two months. Every four months the issues could be bundled, along with interpretations and solutions, and presented to the Board as draft code corrections or amendments.

Mr. Crim recommended modifying the fourth paragraph in Mr. Dewhirst's review list to read "Planning Department staff will bundle such issues, interpretations, problems and ADB comments, along with draft corrections/amendments..." The paragraph would end at "...recommendations to the City Council," with the words "after receiving input from the ADB" being struck. Mr. Crim felt this would clarify that the ADB's comments should be considered "up front" instead of after the Planning Board's review was complete. The Board concurred with this change.

**MOTION BY MR. CRIM, SECONDED BY MS. CASSUTT, TO FORWARD THE PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENTS ADOPTING THE NEW DESIGN REVIEW PROCESS TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

### **CONTINUED REVIEW OF PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENTS ADOPTING NEW DESIGN GUIDELINES**

Mr. Bullock said that staff made the changes to the Design Guidelines as directed by the Board at their last meeting. He said that one of the major issues is related to the lot coverage requirements for parking garages. He said his understanding is that the Board wanted to eliminate parking garages from the lot coverage limitation, and otherwise leave the lot coverage the same for the building above that. He said there are likely some people in the audience who would like to address the Board regarding this issue, as well as the incentives for encouraging parking garages underground and whether or not they should

be given some bonuses for placing the parking underground other than just allowing the parking garage to expand beyond the footprint of the building.

Mr. Bullock said another significant issue is found on Pages 14 and 15 and is related to weather protection. Staff has moved the table addressing weather protection and the types of weather protections that are going to be required in the various zones up to Section B.1 under "General." The description indicates that the required amount of weather protection will be determined by the type of building and the zone for which it is located. Staff took some of the information from the building massing section and placed it in Section C because it dealt with weather protection, awnings, the definition of permanent weather provisions, and what types of incentives will be granted to those who choose to do weather protection along 100 percent of their street frontage. All of this is now located in the same section.

Mr. Bullock said that the last section that had significant changes was on Page 21 and 22. They made the change for medium and large sized buildings in the BC zone by adding an additional footnote to the table. The double star in that footnote states that in the BC zone, medium buildings will be treated as small buildings and large buildings will be treated as medium buildings for the massing requirements. That should completely address the concerns raised regarding these provisions. Further down in this section, there was some confusion as to the different ways that a developer could meet the massing requirement. The staff has tried to group these so that the illustrations and photographs are tied directly to the descriptions of the different massing options.

Mr. Bullock said that all of the other changes were already discussed at the previous meeting.

Mr. Crim referred to the top of Page 16, which makes reference to incentives to developers who provide weather protection on the north facing façade of their structures. He inquired why this only refers to north facing facades. Mr. Bullock said the idea is that weather protection along a north facing façade is likely to be very dark if it is solid and does not have some type of transparency. As you continue reading through section, it talks about weather protection that has the ability for light to filter through somehow, and developers would be given a bonus for doing this on north facing facades.

Mr. Dewhirst referred to Page 19, Section A.1 which states "preserve views to the Mountains and Puget Sound from public places." He suggested that there are all kinds of definitions for "public places." Some people think any place the public gathers is a public place. Because he anticipates that this will be confusing and controversial, the intent should be clearly stated by changing the term to "public owned places." They could also include the phrase "excluding streets." Mr. Bullock said he does not have a problem with changing the term in this section to "publicly owned places" if that is the Board's desire. He said he would also support a change to "publicly owned places, excluding streets." Mr. Crim suggested that perhaps rights-of-way should also be excluded. Mr. Dewhirst cautioned that there are dead end public rights-of-way that have been converted to little mini parks. These are rights-of-way and not streets, and views from these should perhaps be protected. The Board agreed with Mr. Dewhirst's recommended change.

Mr. Dewhirst referred to the chart at the bottom of Page 10. He noted that the third box in the middle makes reference to needing further clarification. Mr. Bullock explained his concern by pointing out a parking lot that is located behind Beck's Funeral Home that the Becks own, but is actually zoned multi-family. If someone were to purchase this property to develop a multi-family project and make use of this provision, they could bring the front of their building to within four feet of the property line as opposed to the typically required fifteen, as long as the first floor was 2½ feet above the base elevation. He said the problem is that Alder Street, at this point, goes up at a pretty good grade. There may be one spot where the floor is 2½ feet above grade, but unless that floor does a whole bunch of stair steps, it is not going to stay at 2½ feet above grade. It will very quickly be at grade and then below grade. He said he is not sure how to deal with this, but it is something that was proposed by the consultant in one of the first drafts of the Design Guidelines. He noted that he has not heard any testimony either in opposition or support of this provision from either the general public or the development community. He suggested that perhaps this is something that is so difficult to understand and apply that it should be removed from the document. Mr. Dewhirst noted that if this section is eliminated, the picture should be eliminated too. The Board agreed that this section should be eliminated.

Mr. Zhan said that when he read the section related to buffer zones and setbacks, he was thinking about areas such as creeks, water bodies, steep slopes and other critical areas. He questioned if the City allows any development within the critical areas

at all. Mr. Bullock answered that the critical areas and buffers required by the critical areas ordinance are found in a completely separate section of the code. Those buffers would still be required over and above any of the stuff that is talked about in the Design Guidelines. Unless special critical areas variances or reasonable use exceptions are granted, the critical areas requirements would have to be maintained. Mr. Bullock further explained that the buffers talked about in the Design Guidelines are crafted to try to protect different disparate uses, such as a commercial use next to a residential use.

Mr. Zhan said he assumes that the City has a map showing the critical areas. Mr. Bullock answered affirmatively, and added that the staff also does a site specific critical areas review of each property as developers come in for permits. Mr. Zhan said his assumption is that not much could be done in the critical areas, and the entire site design section (Section 20.11) is assuming that development would not occur in any critical area at all. Mr. Bullock answered affirmatively.

Mr. Guenther referred to Item 8 on Page 8 which states that “for buildings with more than four units and commercial projects with a footprint of over 10,000 or 7,000 square feet.” He asked which of the numbers would be correct. Mr. Bullock said the number is supposed to be 10,000.

Mr. Dewhirst summarized that only two changes to the Design Guidelines have been agreed to by the Board (Section 20.11.080 and Section 20.12.010). With those changes, Mr. Dewhirst inquired if the Board is comfortable sending the document on to the City Council.

**MOTION BY MR. CRIM, SECONDED BY MS. NOEL, TO FORWARD THE PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENTS ADOPTING THE NEW DESIGN GUIDELINES TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

THE BOARD TOOK A FIVE-MINUTE BREAK AT THIS POINT.

### **BUILDABLE LANDS REPORT**

Mr. Chave reviewed the current progress of the buildable lands report and what the Board can expect to see in the near future. He reported that the staff has been working with Snohomish County, who is in the process of obtaining information from the County Assessor’s Office, as well as information from staff at other cities regarding what the current development patterns and capacities are. The County is in the process of getting all of this information together. A few weeks ago the City staff met with the County staff to review the maps and make corrections. A new draft will be available from the County within the next few weeks. It is anticipated that new numbers will be attached to identify how much additional capacity could be accommodated under the existing zoning. Once the staff has had a chance to review the new draft, they will bring it to the Board for review. Then the Board can get into more of the heart of the discussion about where the City is at in terms of capacity relative to the population projections. They can also start considering the laundry list of measures local jurisdictions can consider to try and achieve their projections.

Mr. Chave said depending upon the shape of the information provided by the County, the most reasonable date at which the Board will receive the information would be the first meeting in August. It will take the staff a little bit of time to review the document and put it into a format the Board can use for their review. He noted that the information that was provided is background information on terms that will be used in the County’s document. He suggested that the Board members review the terms that are being used by the County in preparation for their review.

Mr. Chave reported that the City currently has two interns who are working to update the City’s current land use inventory and other kinds of mapping and GIS work.

### **CONSTRUCTION SITE SIGNS**

**APPROVED**

Mr. Dewhirst said he received a call from the City Council President asking that the Board quickly take care of a problem within the sign code. The issue will be introduced to the Board at this meeting and scheduled as a public hearing at the first meeting in August.

Mr. Bullock explained that when the Planning Board reviewed some changes to the sign code about two years ago, they were primarily concerned with making some changes to the temporary sign section. He recalled that there was a significant concern about sandwich board signs, etc. Under the previous code, there was a section dealing with temporary signs, and there was a list of about eight different specific kinds of temporary signs such as political signs, going out of business signs, real estate signs, construction signs, etc. Each one of the different temporary signs had its own standard for how large the sign could be and also its own limitation on how long it could be on the site. In the interest of making the sign code easier to apply without so many different standards and regulations, the new sign code tried to simplify the code by dealing with temporary signs by zone. In addition, there was a blanket time limit of sixty days per year.

Mr. Bullock advised that the old standard was 32 square feet for a construction sign, which is the size of a sheet of plywood, and it was allowed to be up for the entire length of construction. Now, if the construction is happening in a multi-family zone, it is only allowed to be six square feet in size. It is also allowed to only be up for 60 days. Mr. Bullock said this is a fairly significant change, and the City is starting to receive comments that this is really not adequate for construction signage.

Mr. Chave added that there might actually be some requirements in the building industry that adequate signage for the projects be provided to indicate such things as who the contractor is. Staff will be researching these requirements, as well.

Mr. Dewhirst inquired if the staff would be able to do some research and present a draft for the Board's consideration on July 24, 2002. This would allow them to schedule the hearing for the first meeting in August. Mr. Chave said that it is the staff's desire to move the issue forward as quickly as possible.

### **REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA**

Mr. Dewhirst said that the Board will need to place the PRD issue on the extended agenda. He asked staff to provide an update. Mr. Chave reported that, ultimately, the Council will forward a request to the Board for further review of the PRD ordinance. He said there appears to be a lot of confusion amongst the public between the old ordinance versus the new ordinance. The City has not even had a project run through the new ordinance from start to finish. Mr. Chave said within the near future, the Council will forward a request for further review to the Board, and he anticipates that they will also indicate what priority the issue should take on the Board's agenda.

### **PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS**

Mr. Dewhirst announced that on September 22-24 there will be a planning conference at the Airport Hilton. On Sunday afternoon there will be a planning commissioners workshop that is free. However, interested Board members need to register to attend this event. He said he has received a preliminary program for the entire planning conference. He reminded the Board members that the City will pay for their registration if they want to attend. He suggested that this would be a good opportunity to obtain planning information.

Mr. Dewhirst reported that a few weeks ago in the newspaper there was an interesting article by Neal Pierce about what is going to happen to cities in the future. He had a different take than he has ever seen before, and it is, of course, controversial.

### **PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

There were no Planning Board member comments.

**APPROVED**

Mr. Chave advised that at the Board's request, the traffic engineer has reproduced the large boards he displayed during his update. One is available to each of the Board members.

Mr. Chave reported that the City Council did approve the MP zones for inclusion in the code as recommended by the Board. They also verbally approved, without formally adopting the ordinance, the request to rezone the UNOCAL property to MP1 and MP2 with the master plan.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:55 P.M.

**APPROVED**