

## PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

January 8, 2003

---

---

Chair 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

Jim Crim, Chair  
James Young, Vice Chair  
Virginia Cassutt  
Janice Freeman  
John Dewhirst  
Wayne Zhan  
Ronald Hopkins

### ABSENT

Cary Guenther

### STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager  
Steve Bullock, Senior Planner  
Karin Noyes, Recorder

Mr. Guenther was excused from the meeting.

### READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER YOUNG MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 20 AND DECEMBER 11, 2002 AS CORRECTED. BOARD MEMBER ZHAN SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, WITH BOARD MEMBER CASSUTT ABSTAINING.

### ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

There were no changes made to the proposed agenda.

### REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Earl Lavery, 556 Holly Drive, said he was present to express his concern about lot size rounding. He said he started to attend Planning Board meetings in November to get a feel for the issue, and the Holly Drive residents have sent two letters to the Planning Board members voicing their opposition. He noted that the last letter contained signatures of almost everyone living on Holly Drive, with the exception of those who were out of town.

Mr. Lavery said his main concern is related to Ron Gard's request that the City allow lot size rounding to enable him to place two homes on a single-family lot located at the top of Holly Drive. He said he lives right next to this property. Mr. Lavery noted that at a previous meeting Board Member Dewhirst mentioned that traffic flow onto Mr. Gard's property might be a problem, and Board Member Crim mentioned that maybe the entrance could be from Holly Drive. He pointed out that Holly Drive is very narrow, and in the vicinity of Mr. Gard's property it is only 15-feet wide. It is difficult for more than one car at a time to pass through this street—especially since there are often cars parked along the street. In the past, the neighbors

have lost fences as a result of people backing off of Holly Drive. They have had 2-foot high planters overturned by cars, as well.

Mr. Lavery said that when Mr. Gard made a previous request to rezone his property, he proposed that the entrance be from Holly Drive. However, the City Engineering Department denied the proposal because of the width of the street. The only entrance to the Gard Property would be from 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, which is only 17-feet across. Traffic flow is already a big problem on both Holly Drive and 17<sup>th</sup> Avenue South.

Mr. Lavery emphasized that Mr. Gard's property was designated some time back as single-family residential, and this was done for a reason. Now Mr. Gard wants to cram two houses onto his property, and this would have a negative impact on the surrounding property owners. He said he has not heard any of the Planning Board members mention the negative impacts that would result from allowing lot size rounding. There are single-family houses to the east and west of the Gard property, as well as across Holly Drive. Edmonds has always prided itself in preserving the integrity of the single-family properties, but that does not appear to be the case now.

Mr. Lavery recalled that Board Member Cassutt mentioned that a person could walk up Fifth Avenue and look at the changes going on. However, he noted that these properties are designated as such. But it is difficult to grasp the situation for the Holly Drive residents unless you live within the bowl on Holly Drive. The single-family property owners in this area are "scared to death." They are being crowded out. He referred to a letter John Pruitt wrote to the City Council a few years ago regarding the concerns of the residents on Homeland Road. He mentioned that people living along Holman Road used to have a view, but now the view has been obstructed by condominiums.

Mr. Lavery concluded by stating that the Board has a difficult job to do, and the public must rely upon them to act as a spring board, and he hoped the Board would let the City Council know of the concerns expressed by the Holly Drive residents.

Board Member Crim advised that the Board Members have all received copies of the two letters submitted by Mr. Lavery on behalf of the residents living on Holly Drive.

### **REVIEW OF DRAFT AMENDMENT TO THE EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE CONCERNING PRDs**

Mr. Chave referred the Board to the draft PRD Ordinance (ECDC 20.35) that was prepared by the City Attorney, Scott Snyder as a follow up to the meeting the Board had in Mid November. One draft identifies the changes that were made using underline and strike out format. The other is a clean copy of what the document would look like if all of the changes were made. He reminded the Board that they advertised the document for a public hearing on January 22. Staff recommends that the Board review the document and agree upon a draft they feel comfortable with as the subject of the hearing.

Mr. Chave advised that as a companion to the changes to ECDC 20.35, ECDC 16.20 must also be amended to show what the maximum density permitted in each single-family zone is. He explained that the maximum density of each zone would control the number of lots allowed, rather than the minimum lot size which has previously been the guide. Once a maximum density has been established for each zone, the PRD provisions would simply form an alternative development approach for each zone and would not be considered a rezone of property.

Mr. Chave further explained that maximum density is already defined in the City's multi-family and commercial/mixed-use zones, and staff recommends that it is important to do so for the single-family zones, as well, to help make it clear that PRDs would not be granted special density privileges above that allowed for a standard subdivision. In order to establish a maximum density figure for the single-family zones, the Board must decide on a couple of issues. First, they must decide what the "density number" for each single-family zone should be. He referred the Board to the table that was provided as an example. He explained that the table divides the minimum lot sizes into an acre to arrive at a gross density number for each single-family zone. An RS-6 zone would allow 7.3 dwelling units per acre, an RS-8 would allow 5.5, an RS-12 would allow 3.7, and an RS-20 would allow 2.2.

**APPROVED**

Mr. Chave said the second issue the Board must consider is whether or not the density number for each zone is equivalent to what one could expect to obtain under the “minimum lot size” approach that has been used up until this time. He explained that the difference is that when developing property using a “minimum lot size” approach, roads and access easements are not counted as part of the resultant lots. For example, the actual density on a parcel of land is actually a net density, which results after subtracting the area devoted to roads and access easements.

Mr. Chave advised that if the Board wishes to equate the maximum density allowed in each zone to the net density figure that would have resulted from the minimum lot size approach, there are at least two ways to accomplish this. One is to clarify that the maximum density established for each single-family zone is a net density. The second is to attempt to reduce the density number by a factor to compensate for typical roads and easements that would normally be subtracted from the acreage available for actual lots. He concluded by stating that the first method has the advantage of clearly translating lot sizes to equivalent densities for each zone. However, it has the disadvantage of encouraging manipulation of road and access systems to maximize the number of resultant lots. For example, minimizing road area may be the goal of the development rather than creating the best design.

When asked by the Board to identify the method that would be the easiest for staff to administer, Mr. Chave answered that the simplest method would be to divide the lot area of the zone into the total land area available, and not subtract the road and access areas at all. If this option were used, the table that was provided in his memorandum would be incorporated into the ECDC as written. However, it would be very difficult for a standard subdivision to achieve the amount of density identified in the memorandum because the road and access easement areas must be subtracted.

Board Member Freeman reminded the Board that one of their main goals in reviewing the PRD ordinance is to make sure that that PRD’s do not qualify as rezones. She questioned what option would be the best to prevent future legal challenge of the PRD ordinance. Mr. Chave suggested that the Board establish a density for each single-family residential zone. The method of calculation would be built into the zoning code, itself, and would be the same for every zone. The PRD Ordinance would offer an alternative form of development, but it would not change the zoning. He advised that there are many different ways to calculate density, and as long as it is done consistently for all development in single-family residential zones, there should not be an issue of a PRD being allowed a greater density than a standard subdivision.

Board Member Dewhirst inquired which option would be easiest for the staff to administer. Mr. Chave answered that a simple number that is divided into the lot area would be the simplest to administer. The most time consuming option would be to calculate the road area and then apply the density because during a typical course of development, the road area changes many times and it is difficult to track exactly how much of the property would be used for roads and easements. In addition, developers would try to be as creative as possible in differentiating between driveways, easements and roads with the idea of maximizing the lot area available. Mr. Chave suggested that the concept of subtracting a uniform factor for the roads would be a good compromise between the two.

Mr. Bullock pointed out that, typically, the amount of land given to roads and access easements ranges between 10 and 30 percent, depending upon the character of the property in question. There is no hard and fast percentage number identified, but staff has suggested that 15 percent would be fairly typical.

Board Member Hopkins expressed his concern that the actual adjustment required would vary between one situation and another depending on the topography and the size of the development. Perhaps a better solution would be to identify a minimum adjustment, but then allow a developer to exceed this number if special circumstances can justify the request.

Board Member Dewhirst expressed his opinion that 15 percent seems too low. He suggested that a standard percentage for subdivisions should be 25 percent. Mr. Chave noted that utility easements are not subtracted from the lot area in Edmonds. In addition, the Edmonds street pattern is pretty much set and, and, typically, new subdivisions in Edmonds only need to provide streets into the property. The amount of area needed for roads and easements is generally lower in Edmonds than in the less developed areas.

Board Member Zhan inquired if the population growth targets would have any impact on the maximum density numbers. Mr. Chave answered that the table that was provided merely translates lot sizes into density without making any judgments or adjustments based on the growth targets.

Board Member Crim said it seems the proposed PRD ordinance attempts to provide an alternative approach for development while allowing flexibility. He suggested that the simplest approach of taking the gross land available for development and dividing it by a factor to determine the density would be consistent with the how the density is calculated for a standard subdivision now. Mr. Chave agreed that this would remove the potential of a PRD being able to get more units than a standard subdivision would be allowed.

Board Member Zhan inquired what would happen if a PRD was divided by two different zones. Mr. Bullock answered that this type of situation has occurred in the past, and the staff calculated the density for the area of lots in each of the two zones separately, and then the two densities were added together to identify the maximum number of units allowed on the entire parcel.

Board Member Crim referred to the written comments that were provided by Board Member Guenther regarding the draft PRD Ordinance. Mr. Chave said he read through Mr. Guenther's comments, but did not compare them to the draft document.

The Board discussed the following sections:

- **Sections 20.35.030.A.1.c and A.1.d:** Board Member Dewhirst suggested that language be placed in these two sections to indicate that there is no limit for either lot width or lot coverage. The Board concurred.
- **Section 20.35.030.1.f:** Board Member Dewhirst inquired what the term "enhanced design standards" means. Mr. Bullock suggested that this section references the design criteria in **Section 60**. Board Member Dewhirst suggested that this be made more clear. The Board concurred.
- **Section 20.35.040.A:** Board Member Dewhirst questioned how providing more landscaping and safe and efficient site access is related to compatibility. He suggested that this section be reworded to clearly indicate that these are the elements the City is looking for in order for a PRD to be compatible. The Board concurred.
- **Section 20.35.050.C:** Board Member Dewhirst suggested that this language should be included in **Section 20.35.040.A**. The Board concurred.
- **Section 20.35.060:** Board Member Dewhirst suggested that the term "reasonable" is vague and should either be defined or taken out of the draft document.

Mr. Bullock said he recently met with an applicant who has a PRD application in right now. The staff and applicant have been wrestling with the idea of making the PRD compatible with the neighborhood it is going into. The existing neighborhood was not developed using the same design criteria as is found in the PRD ordinance. The question is do they want to require the PRD developer to meet the design criteria in the PRD ordinance or do they want them to build to be compatible with the surrounding development. There is definitely a contradiction between the two requirements. Mr. Bullock said staff would like a PRD developer to design a project that fits into the community in an attractive way, but requiring them to be compatible with the neighborhood is not entirely what they are looking for.

Board Member Freeman agreed that the City should be careful about requiring a PRD to be consistent with neighborhood character because some neighborhoods were built many years ago and are undergoing change.

Board Member Crim suggested that the second sentence in the first paragraph of **Section 20.35.060** be changed to read, "It is acknowledged that the criteria listed here are not necessarily consistent with every design characteristic of every single-family neighborhood in the City of Edmonds." This would eliminate Board Member Dewhirst's concern

regarding the word “reasonable” as well as address the concern expressed by Mr. Bullock and Board Member Freeman. The remainder of the Board concurred with the recommended change.

- **Sections 20.35.060.A.1.c, 20.35.060.A.2.c, and 20.35.060.A.4.b:** Because attached units are not allowed in single-family zones in Edmonds, Board Member Dewhirst suggested that these three sections need to be changed or deleted accordingly.
- **Section 20.35.080.A.2:** Mr. Dewhirst suggested that this section needs to be changed to reflect the Board’s decision that neighborhood meetings should be mandatory. The Board concurred.
- **Section 20.35.050:** Board Member Freeman recalled previous Board discussion that it is important to define what the clear public benefits of a PRD are up front, but this was not done. Mr. Chave explained that the intent of the proposed language is that if a PRD application meets the criteria that follows in this section, the application would have met the public benefit test. Board Member Freeman said the intent is not clear as written.

Board Member Crim suggested that all three sentences in the paragraph need to be taken in context together. The section states that alternative bulk standards would only be allowed if one of the listed public benefits could be met.

Board Member Freeman noted that the Board has not identified exactly who the public is. Board Member Cassutt recalled that the Board agreed that public benefit would be related to the community as a whole and to the people living in the PRD development—not the surrounding property owners.

Board Member Young recalled that the Board discussed that open space and infill development has an intrinsic value to the community as a whole. A developer who provides more open space, even if it is not available to the general public, provides a value to the community at large. However, he agreed that it is difficult to quantify the value. He said he would be in support of recommending that the City Council view open space as a community value.

To address Board Member Freeman’s concern, Mr. Chave recommended that the second sentence of this section be changed to read, “To meet this test and to insure that there will be a benefit to the public, a PRD which seeks alternative bulk standards shall be approved, or approved with conditions, only if the proposal meets the following criteria.” The Board concurred.

- **Section 20.35.010.G:** Board Member Freeman asked that the term “affordable” be deleted from this section. The Board concurred.
- **Section 20.35.010.H:** Board Member Freeman suggested that views be added as a natural site amenity that should be protected. The Board disagreed. Board Member Freeman expressed her concern that **Section 20.35.060.B.7.b** requires each of the residential lots in a PRD to have at least one street tree planted in the parking strip if present or in the front yard if not. These trees could grow to a height that would eventually obstruct the view of the resident.

Mr. Chave referred to **Section 20.35.060.B.7.a**, which does not require a street tree on each of the residential lots. He suggested that **Section 20.35.060.B.7.b** could be deleted. The Board agreed.

- **Section 20.35.060.B.5.a:** Board Member Freeman said she does not feel the paragraph at the top of **Page 8** is necessary since it is a value judgment. Mr. Bullock explained that this paragraph is a caption to a picture that has not been provided yet. Board Member Freeman expressed her concern that she still feels the document gets too much into the design details. The Board agreed that no changes should be made to this section.
- **Section 20.35.090.D.1.c:** Board Member Freeman inquired if the City has the ability to require a developer to dedicate open space for the general public’s use. Mr. Bullock answered that any public open space dedication would have to be approved and accepted by the City Council.

- **Section 20.35.110.A.4:** Board Member Freeman referred to the second sentence and inquired if a developer would have the ability to make changes after the development has been approved, such as to the design of the homes. Mr. Bullock answered that staff has talked about this issue at length. The applicants have expressed concern about committing to a specific house plan for each lot. The staff's position is that they are not approving a specific housing plan for each lot, but a conceptual housing plan to be used throughout the PRD. An applicant can commit to a specific house plan for each site, but it is not required by the ordinance. If an applicant does make a commitment, he would have to request a modification in order to change the design and staff would consider the request based on the criteria. These changes could be approved as minor changes.

Board Member Freeman noted that this section requires that the changes only be approved if they are shown to be in the best long-term interest of the residents of the PRD and do not impact the surrounding neighborhoods. Mr. Bullock said that staff would have to review the request based on their judgment of the criteria.

- **Section 20.35.030:** Board Member Zhan pointed out that the title of this section and the table of contents are not consistent. The Board agreed that this should be corrected.
- **Section 20.35.090:** Board Member Zhan pointed out that the number identifying this section was not placed in the document. The Board agreed that this should be added to the document before Item A on Page 11
- **Section 20.35.040:** Board Member Zhan pointed out that the title of this section and the table of contents are not consistent. The Board agreed that this should be changed.

Board Member Young expressed his concern that the draft language in the document is not what they should hold a public hearing on. The hearing will be well attended. While he does not have any problem with what is being said in the document, he has a problem with the fact that this document tries to do too much in one chapter of the development code. It is really an alternative form of subdividing, and if they want to promote this option, it must be as attractive and low impact as possible. Board Member Young suggested that they should promote concepts such as neighborhood protection, the ADB review process and the fact that the external setbacks are equal to or greater than those required for a standard subdivision. They should then let the public comment on whether or not they believe PRDs are appropriate forms of subdivision for the City of Edmonds.

Board Member Young said that while the proposed language could be presented to the public at the hearing, he is more interested in comments that focus on issues related to PRDs in general and whether they are good or bad and not just to a specific piece of property. The issue before them is whether or not a more flexible form of subdivision is appropriate for Edmonds, and if so, under what circumstances.

Board Member Young said he likes the concept of PRDs, but the Board has tweaked the ordinance so much to make it "warm and fuzzy" that they have diluted it to the point that it does not really accomplish anything at all. He suggested they forward the draft document to the City Council as a discussion draft and then take public testimony. They could then lump the issues together and address the concerns raised by the public. He would like to wait and hear from the public before deciding to go forward with the document the way it is written.

Board Member Crim said one of the Board's purposes in reviewing the document was to create a level playing field between the standard subdivision requirements and the requirements of a PRD. He said he is not sure they have accomplished this. However, he inquired if the Board feels comfortable enough with the draft document to send it forward to a public hearing.

Board Member Hopkins said he approves of the document as drafted. But as a non-developer, he felt it would be helpful to provide a definition of a PRD in the ordinance. It is important that neighborhoods that could be impacted have a clear understanding of the types of advantages and challenges the PRD ordinance could provide. Perhaps some examples could be provided, as well.

Board Member Young agreed that the purposes of the PRD ordinance are left hanging because there is not really a definition of a PRD included. He agreed that a definition needs to be provided. He suggested that it would be appropriate for staff to carefully explain what the PRD concept is at the public hearing, as well.

The Board agreed that the draft language would provide a good basis for soliciting further testimony with the changes as discussed. Board Member Dewhirst reminded the Board that their charge from the City Council was to give their best effort in reviewing the document, hold a public hearing and make a recommendation to the City Council.

The Board briefly discussed options for incorporating the density definition and numbers into the ordinance. Mr. Bullock suggested that the Board recommend the City Council also consider amending the single-family residential standards table to include the residential density numbers as discussed.

Board Member Crim suggested that the advertisement for the public hearing indicate both the new and old table for the public's information. Board Member Dewhirst felt that before making a decision on the method of calculating the density, the Board should take public testimony. The Board agreed that the options should be outlined for the public, but that no decision should be made by the Board until after the hearing.

THE BOARD TOOK A TEN-MINUTE BREAK AT 8:20 P.M. THEY RECONVENED AT 8:30 P.M.

### POTENTIAL COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS AND WORK PLAN FOR 2003. INCLUDES GIS DEMONSTRATION

Mr. Chave clarified that the brief presentation that he and Mr. Bullock would provide is a representation of the GIS system and not the software, itself. He explained that, using the GIS software, staff created a number of maps to illustrate the types of information that can be obtained. He explained that the basic premise of the GIS system is that there are layers of information, such as parcels, soils, slopes, etc. and each can interact with the other. The GIS system is the same as that used by the County.

He reviewed the following maps that were provided as examples of the type of information that can be obtained from the GIS system:

- A **Land Use Inventory Map** identifies the various land use categories. Each individual lot is coded with a specific land use that can either be grouped or looked at as specific types.
- A **Critical Areas Map** identifies lots that are located near streams or slopes, and can be sorted for various zones.
- A **Simplified Zoning Map** groups the single-family, multi-family and commercial zones. The City can match this map to the land use designation map to identify areas where the uses and zoning do not match.
- A **Map Identifying Parcels that are Vacant or Undeveloped** shows where the density of the underlying zoning is not being achieved and identifies where there is potential for additional residential units.
- A **Non-Conforming Lots Map** displays lots that are non-conforming in the single-family residential zones.
- A map was created to illustrate the **Range of Lot Sizes for the R-12 Zoned Property**. This map identifies areas that need to be reviewed for possible zoning changes.

Board Member Zhan inquired regarding the accuracy of the GIS system. Mr. Bullock answered that the City staff worked with the County Staff using the Snohomish County Assessor's Maps to recreate all of the subdivisions in the file based on the control points that were created. The system is actually pretty accurate. Mr. Chave added that the GIS system is the best mapping system available at this time. However, the Assessor's records are incomplete in some situations and sometimes they are not completely accurate as far as details of access, square footage, etc. But in terms of uses, zoning and parcel information it is fairly accurate.

Board Member Crim asked the staff to explain what they envision the Board achieving with the Comprehensive Plan Map review in 2003. Mr. Chave replied that this year the staff would like to work with the Board to complete the transition process from the bubble map to the parcel based map and then start to have discussions about growth targets and what the

City's approach and policy direction will be. Staff anticipates that there will be some public workshops this year to set the stage for doing the whole Comprehensive Plan evaluation and update in 2004.

Mr. Chave reminded the Board that they have already started discussions related to the growth targets, etc. Staff understands there will be a process to agree on growth targets for the jurisdictions within the County through Snohomish County Tomorrow, but the initial targets will be set fairly soon this year and the discussions will come before the Board soon. Once the initial targets are set, there will be a high and low range established for each jurisdiction to plan for. The City will have to review their plan to see whether or not they can fall within the range. Hopefully, jurisdictions will be within their respective ranges for planning. Next, Snohomish County Tomorrow will be looking at each jurisdiction's local plans and growth targets to try to reconcile Countywide.

Mr. Chave said staff has consistently been telling the County not to set a low threshold for the City's growth target that is higher than the existing capacity. The low end of the target range should not be higher than what they know they can do with existing capacity. The upper number can be set higher and the City could consider it when looking at planning along Highway 99 and other areas where additional growth might occur.

### **REVIEW OF LETTER TO THE CITY COUNCIL REGARDING REASONABLE MEASURES**

Board Member Crim referred the Board to the revised letter to the City Council regarding reasonable measures. Board members should read through the document carefully and provide their comments to the staff as soon as possible.

Mr. Chave noted that the changes were fairly minor and he tried to highlight them for the Board's information. If the Board members have concerns about the document or additional comments they would like to incorporate, they should contact staff by January 10 at noon. Otherwise, staff will assume that the document can be copied and forwarded to the Council Members in their packets on Friday afternoon. The Board agreed.

### **REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA**

Mr. Chave reviewed the extended agenda as follows:

- **January 22, 2003**
  - Public hearing on proposed amendments to ECDC 20.35 pertaining to planned residential developments and ECDC 16.20 pertaining to single-family residential zoning classifications.
  - Overview of Stormwater Comprehensive Plan by the Engineering Department.
- **February 12, 2003**
  - Public hearing on request for rezone of property at 410 – 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue North (Library Building) from Public to RM-1.5. The applicant is the Edmonds Public Facilities District.
  - Public hearing on request for rezone of property at 8505 Bowdoin Way (Old Fire Station) from public to RM-2.4. The applicant is the City of Edmonds.
  - Public hearing on the Stormwater Comprehensive Plan.
- **February 26, 2003**
  - Review of Council request to consider amendments to the ECDC regarding the regulation of hedges. (Tentative)
  - Review of Council request to review regulations concerning amateur radio antennae. (Tentative)
  - Review of Council request to review regulations concerning neighborhood day care facilities. (Tentative)
  - Annual report on Adult Entertainment zoning.
- **Pending 2<sup>nd</sup> Quarter Topics**

**APPROVED**

- Comprehensive Plan Amendments for 2003.
- Parking Study, pending the consultant's report.
- Highway 99 Task Force. Mr. Bowman will highlight the potential of the Highway 99 Task Force at the City Council retreat in an attempt to get a commitment to proceed.
- ECDC Re-write Work Sessions. The City needs to significantly re-write the ECDC to provide better organization and resolve inconsistencies. They will begin the process by focusing on the process and procedures chapter. There was no money identified in the budget for consultant work on this project.

Mr. Chave said that if this schedule seems reasonable, he would like to work with the Chair and Vice Chair to creating a more specific agenda.

Board Member Dewhirst inquired if the Board is going to hold a retreat this spring. Board Member Crim answered that when they get into the Comprehensive Plan Map project, a retreat might be appropriate.

Mr. Chave said the Board should start thinking about specific questions they would like to have answered using the GIS Mapping system. Staff will try to provide information on the transition areas, but the Board members should think about other areas they would like to have further analysis on.

Board Member Dewhirst asked about the process for doing the mapping project. Mr. Chave answered that the next time staff presents information to the Board, they will try to highlight all of the areas on the site specific map where there are problems or questions and the Board can prioritize the areas they would like to discuss first. This will probably take place at the first meeting in March, and staff will provide the map ahead of time. Board Member Dewhirst agreed that maps would be helpful to identify the problem areas.

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

Board Member Crim provided no comments during this portion of the meeting.

#### **PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

None of the Board Members provided comments during this portion of the meeting.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:00 P.M.

**APPROVED**