

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

July 9, 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 – 5th Avenue North.

PRESENT

Jim Crim, Chair
James Young, Vice Chair
Virginia Cassutt
Janice Freeman
John Dewhirst
Cary Guenther
Ronald Hopkins
Judith Works

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Steve Bullock, Senior Planner
Arvilla Ohlde, Parks and Recreation Director
Karin Noyes, Recorder

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER FREEMAN MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JUNE 25, 2003 AS CORRECTED. BOARD MEMBER HOPKINS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

Mr. Chave suggested that, later in the meeting, the Board should discuss a schedule for reviewing the amendment to the ECDC making the decision of the Hearing Examiner on permit applications final and clarifying the rules of reconsideration of hearing decisions (File Number CDC-03-60). The Board agreed.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

There was no one in the audience who expressed a desire to address the Board during this portion of the hearing.

PARKS AND RECREATION QUARTERLY REPORT

Ms. Ohlde distributed copies of a brochure that was put together by the Parks and Recreation Staff. This brochure was distributed to the public to help them understand the Mid-Waterfront Bulkhead and Walkway Project and what they can expect. It answers many of the questions that typically arise on a project of this type. In addition, staff has met with neighbors and businesses in the area to let them know what they can expect.

Ms. Ohlde reported that the contract for the **Mid-Waterfront Bulkhead and Walkway Project** was awarded to BOSS Construction with a low-bid amount of \$1.3 million, which was \$300,000 under the engineer's estimate. The project began on May 1st and is progressing steadily. However, it is very difficult to maneuver due to the tight working conditions. Staff has been working with the neighbors that are impacted by the project, and they have received wonderful cooperation from

everyone. She recalled that the City received matching grant funds for the project from the Department of Economic Development in the amount of \$300,000. It was anticipated that the main bulkhead would have been completed by the first of September. However, because of the change order that was necessary to include the 144 Railroad Tidelands Upland Path Project, the completion date was pushed back to October 1st. She noted that the designs have been completed for the **144 Railroad Tidelands Upland Path Project**, which will construct the final pathways along the Edmonds waterfront. Staff is currently securing bids for the project, which is anticipated for completion in September.

Ms. Ohlde reported that the **Edmonds Center for the Arts**, located at the purchased Puget Sound Christian College, is moving through the design stage. The renovation will preserve a historical and substantial community facility for the benefit of the performing arts. The City of Edmonds provided \$2 million through the 1st quarter real estate excise tax to support the purchase and realize the goals of the Edmonds Comprehensive Cultural Arts Plan. It is anticipated that the building will not only serve the arts, but will become an economic driver for the community. She noted that the 2003 Legislature provided \$500,000 in capital funding under the Community, Trade and Economic Development Funding Program for the project, and the Public Facilities District is currently starting their private fundraising campaign to secure private donations for the construction. In addition, Congressional leaders have indicated that they support \$2.5 million in Federal appropriations for the capital project through the 2004 Federal funding which is currently in progress.

Ms. Ohlde advised that the **Edmonds Interurban Trail Project** was ranked 13th for funding from the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation (IAC). With the State's capital budget complete, it appears that funds may be available for funding the Edmonds Project as it now ranks as the next alternate project on the list. Traffic Engineer, Darrell Smith has opened conversations with the Snohomish County PUD to discuss the start of the project, and the City has secured grand funds from the Puget Sound Regional Council for the on-street portions of the project. The IAC would fund 50 percent of the recreational off-street portions, which will be matched with local REET funds.

Ms. Ohlde reported that the **SR 104 Mini Park Improvement Project** is currently out to bid. This area is located adjacent to the Edmonds Ferry holding lanes, and has been in need of improvement for many years. The landscaping and interior sidewalk improvements will provide for an upgrade for recreational users and will also serve as the temporary site for the Sound Transit Gerry Tsutakawa "Standing Wave" sculpture. She noted that Sound Transit provides 1 percent for the arts to provide an art element for capital projects. With recent delays, the art piece progressed ahead of the completion of transportation improvements.

Ms. Ohlde advised that the City Council recently approved bonds to fund the completion of the electrical, plumbing and seismic **Upgrades at the Frances Anderson Center**. She noted that work has been in progress since the first of the year. The electrical upgrade was a major project that will protect the recreational center for future years. In addition, the bond funds will provide for the renovation of the Plaza Room above the Edmonds Library. Sno-Isle Library is providing matching capital funds for the roof repair.

Ms. Ohlde reported that over the past year, the Parks Department has worked to upgrade and replace existing playground toys throughout the park system. In addition, they have worked in partnership with the Edmonds School District to complete playground improvements on school grounds to meet the need for neighborhood playground sites as identified in the Comprehensive Park Plan. To publicize the new installations and familiarize families with the location of community-wide playgrounds, the Parks Department worked with graphic art student, Kate Gebert, to complete the **Explore the Edmonds Playground Brochure**.

Ms. Ohlde explained that the adopted Edmonds Walkway Plan defines a neighborhood connector between Elm and Fir Streets at 7th Avenue. To provide for the completion of the connection, the City has purchased an off-site constructed bridge that will serve as the **7th and Elm Neighborhood Pathway Connection** by providing access across Shellabarger Creek. Now that the bridge is in place, the soft surface pathway will be completed early in the fall.

Board Member Hopkins noted that the map of the Mid-Waterfront Bulkhead and Walkway Project shows a gap in the pathway in front of the Ebb Tide Condominiums. Ms. Ohlde explained that this indicates a gap for barrier free access only. The City was able to secure a ten-foot public access from the Ebb Tide Condominium owners, which lies ten-feet out from the bulkhead. When the project was started four years ago, there was an extensive public process. The project was

advertised as one complete barrier-free access along the waterfront. But there were conditions placed on the easement access that was granted by the Ebb Tide Condominium owners. One of the conditions, that no structure can be greater than 17 feet in height, was intended to protect the condominium owners' views. Because of this condition, the City was required to come up with a lower design that would also meet the requirements of the Department of Fish and Wildlife. The engineer determined that because of the wave velocity against the lower elevation, a bridge would not be possible unless it was built at a height of at least 18 feet. Because staff did not want to encumber the bulkhead replacement project while the engineering problems were being worked out, they decided to move ahead with the rest of the project. If the engineer can come up with a design that will meet the height condition, this portion of the walkway can be considered at a future date.

Board Member Young questioned about the long-term prognosis for the City's park maintenance capacity. Ms. Ohlde answered that she has always balanced the capital improvements with the resources available to maintain them. The bulkhead project will significantly diminish the operations and maintenance expenses. In addition, the other capital projects and improvements that have been completed have decreased the amount necessary for maintenance and operations. However, she said she has never seen the financial situation quite so bleak. Governments will be run completely different in the future. Just last year, the City cut 12 percent from their general operating budget. She explained that the Parks Department generates revenue from fees. However, if the funding is reduced too much, it will impact their ability to bring in fees and the situation could get worse. She concluded that the capital projects that are planned for the near future would not put a greater strain on the operating and maintenance budget.

Board Member Young said the operation of such an excellent parks system is not just a matter of civic pride. He said his son works as a general maintenance worker, and he is making less this year than he made last year. Instead of ten maintenance employees for the summer, they only have three. If this continues, the buildings will begin to show a certain level of shabbiness at a time when the usage is actually increasing. He said that if the economic situation does not turn around, and even if it does, he would like the staff to start looking at a stable funding source for the parks system. He asked that Ms. Ohlde provide anecdotal evidence each quarter regarding the operations and maintenance situation so that the public can become informed.

Board Member Dewhirst recalled that last time Ms. Ohlde came before the Board to provide a quarterly report, there was a proposal in Olympia that would have allowed cities to use funds with less strings attached. Ms. Ohlde reported that these six measures never received a hearing. However, another attempt will be made next year.

CONTINUED DELIBERATIONS ON REGULATIONS CONCERNING AMATEUR RADIO ANTENNAS (FILE NO. CDC-03-4)

Mr. Chave provided each of the Board members with a copy of the letter that was received by the City on July 8, 2003 from Elizabeth Snyder. In addition, he referred the Board to the draft ordinance that was put together by the City Attorney. He emphasized that the document should be considered a first draft. The staff report also includes a letter from Sylvia and Sam Hochman and the Snyders, both commenting on the draft ordinance. He asked that the board review the information, provide direction for any ordinance revisions, and set a hearing date to consider the new draft ordinance.

Mr. Chave referred to the draft ordinance and noted that the City Attorney attempted to clear up the entire section addressing both radio and television antennas. He also provided new language for the section related to technological impracticality. The Board took five minutes to review the letter they had just received from Elizabeth Snyder.

Board Member Crim recalled that the Board had previously agreed that the ordinance should differentiate between an antenna on a mast and a ground mounted antenna. However, the draft ordinance does not make this distinction. Mr. Chave agreed that there is no specific distinction. However, he noted that Item E.3 on Page 3 refers to smaller antennas. Whether an antenna was an array or a dish, they would be treated the same. If a proposed antenna could meet all of the criteria set forth, it would be allowed outright regardless of the type. If a proposed antenna would exceed the criteria set forth in the ordinance, it would require a staff review and decision and a notice would be sent to the surrounding property owners. If there were an issue of technological impracticality that requires an antenna to be placed at a height greater than 65 feet, a Hearing Examiner review would be required. He noted that Page 6 of the draft ordinance describes this review process. The

APPROVED

Hearing Examiner would attempt to craft conditions to place the minimum burden on adjacent property owners while still permitting the holder of the license to operate. He noted that no fee is being proposed for the Hearing Examiner review.

Board Member Dewhirst questioned why the City Attorney is recommending that there be no fee for a Hearing Examiner review. Mr. Chave said the City Attorney was trying to follow an approach that would create the least amount of burden on the radio operator. However, he agreed that it would be reasonable to charge a minimal fee for the review. Board Member Dewhirst expressed his concern that if there is no fee for the review, the taxpayers would end up paying for an expense that is associated with only one individual.

Board Member Works inquired if the Hearing Examiner's decision would be appealable to the City Council. Mr. Chave said he would have to refer this question to the City Attorney. However, he would presume that if the staff were to issue a decision, the decision would be appealable to the Hearing Examiner and that would be the end of it. While, generally, the code allows appeals of Hearing Examiner decisions to the City Council, this is a unique situation and he is not sure what the City Attorney's intent would be. Since the Hearing Examiner review would be an interactive process, it does not really lend itself to an appeal.

Board Member Crim referred to Question I on Ms. Snyder's letter. He said it was his understanding that the ordinance would distinguish between a dish and an array. While the reality is that a 1½-inch post would not support a dish that is more than one meter in size, the ordinance should make it clear that amateur radio antennas would be arrays and satellite television receivers would be dishes. If this differentiation is made, then an array could still be allowed up to 1.1 meter in diameter, which seems to be the general size. He noted that the satellite television dishes that are used most today are probably only about 12 to 15 inches in diameter. Board Member Freeman said it has been previously noted that a dish of 1-foot in diameter would be adequate for television reception.

Mr. Chave referred to Item E on Page 3. He explained that since it does not distinguish between an array or a dish, it would apply to both. If the Board wishes to have a smaller threshold for dish size, this section would need to be changed. Board Member Freeman suggested that the size threshold be limited to the minimum size that will meet the technological needs. Rather than using the term "diameter" for the maximum size of an amateur radio antenna, they should use the term "spread." These types of antennas should also be called "arrays."

Board Member Crim referred to Question II on Ms. Snyder's letter. He recalled that the Board never agreed that a dish could be mounted on a 12-foot high pole. They agreed that dishes must be mounted at roof level or below the 25-foot height limit.

Board Member Dewhirst referred to Ms. Snyder's statement that based on the proposed changes, unless the amateur radio antenna is licensed by the FCC, it is not subject to the conditional use permit process. She noted that the FCC does not license antennas, it licenses operators of antenna. The Board agreed that Item E.1 should be changed by replacing the words "is licensed" to "whose use is licensed."

Regarding Ms. Snyder's Question IV, Board Member Crim recalled that the Board previously agreed that telescoping antennas must be ground mounted. Mr. Chave referred to Item E.4 at the bottom of Page 3 of the draft ordinance. He explained that while the base height is described elsewhere, this section indicates that the device could telescope up to 65 feet in height. Mr. Chave clarified that an accessory structure on the ground is allowed to be 15 feet in height. This would allow for a tower of up to 15-feet, with a telescoping device of up to 50 feet for a total of 65 feet in height if ground mounted. If a telescoping antenna were to be placed on a roof, the base would be allowed to extend up to 12 feet, and then telescope up to 65 feet above the ground level. He emphasized that the 65-foot height limit is measured from the ground level and not from where the device is mounted.

Board Member Crim said he does not recall the Board discussing the option of allowing extendable antennas to be mounted on rooftops. He thought that roof mounted antennas were limited to fixed arrays on fixed masts. Board Member Cassutt agreed and added that the Board only discussed telescoping antennas that were ground mounted structures.

Board Member Young suggested that all telescoping antennas should be ground mounted since they require some sort of a base structure. The issue of concern is not so much the antenna, itself, but the base structure that would be located on the

roof top and visible to the people who live behind. He said that if the City allows telescoping antennas up to 65 feet in height, they should be ground mounted and have separate standards.

Board Member Hopkins disagreed. He said he could conceive of a circumstance where an antenna could be mounted on a lower roof, but still extend to 65 feet. He felt requiring all antennas that have an adjustable height to be ground mounted seems to be arbitrary. Mr. Chave suggested that another option would be to require a Hearing Examiner review for all telescoping antennas that are mounted on the roof.

Board Member Crim recalled that the Board's previous discussion was to allow array antennas that are similar to television antennas. However, if a proposed antenna is greater in height or size than the identified criteria, more review should be required. He suggested that the draft ordinance needs further work to make this concept clear and to separate the amateur radio transmitting antenna from the satellite television dishes. He said the ordinance tries to treat both the same. Mr. Chave pointed out that Item E is only related to radio antenna. The only time the ordinance talks about both radio antennas and satellite dishes is on Page 5 in the section related to technological impracticality, which still provides some distinction between the two.

Board Member Hopkins questioned if the FCC requirements would prevent the City from charging a fee for a Hearing Examiner review in situations where technological impracticality exists. Mr. Chave answered that the FCC regulations would not prevent the City from charging a fee, but the fee must be reasonable and not an obstructive burden. Board Member Hopkins agreed that if there were no fee, then the taxpayers would end up paying for the cost of the Hearing Examiner review. Board Member Freeman recalled that the City Council just created a fee structure that matches the staff costs associated with administering a service. She suggested that the same concept be applied to the fee for the Hearing Examiner's review of situations where technological impracticality exists. Mr. Chave said the problem is that if the fee is half the cost of the staff's administrative costs, it could become unreasonable.

Board Member Young asked that staff identify exactly what the City must do in order to meet the FCC rules for accommodating amateur radio antennas. He noted that there are different requirements for transmitting antennas than there are for receiving antennas. There is also a distinction between the operators of antennas. He said he would like to be assured that what they allow is required by the FCC law. From his experience on the ADB in requiring developers to screen roof mounted utilities, it seems the City will be opening the doors to accommodate only a specific group of people. He said he does not have a problem with doing this if there is a review process such as the Hearing Examiner or the Architectural Design Board. This would allow those who will be impacted to participate in the process. He suggested that the same standards that apply to other roof mounted structures should apply to antennas, as well. He said that antennas can be designed so that they have a relatively small impact to adjacent property owners.

Board Member Cassutt reminded the Board that they received a copy of the FCC regulations as part of their background materials. Mr. Chave said that Page 4 of the draft ordinance specifically talks about staff review and lists the criteria that can be applied by staff to those antennas that are not allowed outright.

Board Member Freeman inquired if there is a limit to the number of antennas that can be placed on one parcel of property or rooftop. Mr. Chave said there are implied limits, but they are not specifically called out in the ordinance. Board Member Freeman said this must be made clear. Board Member Crim said the proposed ordinance specifically states that only one television antenna or satellite dish is allowed per home. He questioned if the Board feels the same limits should apply to radio antennas, as well. Board Members Works and Freeman felt that radio antennas should be limited to one per house. Board Member Guenther clarified that they are talking about one mast and not just one antenna because more than one antenna can be mounted on a single mast. Board Member Dewhirst clarified that each home should be allowed to have one dish for a television, one radio antenna for receiving and one for transmitting.

The Board agreed that telescoping antennas should only be allowed if ground mounted. If mounted on a rooftop, only a 12-foot mast on a 25-foot rooftop would be allowed. Mr. Chave questioned about placing an antenna on a garage that is only 15-feet in height. If the Board were to limit the mast to 12 feet in height, people would be discouraged from placing a structure on the garage because it could only be 27 feet instead of 37 feet in height. In some situations, a telescoping device that is mounted on the garage rooftop might be preferable and have less impact than a 12-foot mast mounted on the rooftop

APPROVED

of the home. Mr. Chave said there might be unique situations that can be considered by the Hearing Examiner to provide the best situation for all parties. It is important to allow enough flexibility for the Hearing Examiner to come up with a possible solution.

Board Member Crim suggested that fixed masts under 12-feet in height should be allowed outright, but telescoping antennas that are mounted on the roof should require a Hearing Examiner's review. Mr. Chave clarified the Board's intent that anything that is in a fixed state (a mast) that is no greater than 12 feet above the roofline should be allowed outright. But any structure that telescopes above the 25-foot height limit should require a review by the Hearing Examiner.

Board Member Dewhirst suggested that staff take the comments provided by the Board back to the City Attorney to rewrite the draft ordinance for future Board review. Mr. Chave agreed. The Board provided the following additional comments regarding the draft ordinance:

Page 3 -- Board Member Freeman referred to the last sentence of item E.1 and requested clarification. Mr. Chave clarified that the guy wires for amateur radio antennas would not be allowed within the setback areas.

Page 5 -- Board Member Freeman suggested that the term "adjacent" should be used rather than the word "abutting."

Page 6 -- Board Member Freeman noted that the word "sight" in Item 5 should be changed to "site."

Board Member Dewhirst suggested that the format and numbering of the document needs to be corrected.

Board Member Freeman inquired if the final draft could be reviewed by an outside disinterested person to make sure that the technology, etc. is correct and meets the minimum requirements of the FCC. Mr. Chave said the document could be forwarded to the FCC for review, but he is not confident that the Board would receive comments back anytime soon.

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS FOR 2003 (FILE NO. CDC-03-7)

Mr. Chave advised that staff is in the process of moving the Comprehensive Plan Map amendments towards conclusion. The Board Members received both electronic and paper maps. The staff has been comparing the zoning maps to the Comprehensive Plan Map designations to identify areas of inconsistency. They have found very few places where problems exist, one being the Highway 99 area.

Mr. Chave said the maps that were provided to the Board show a direct conversion of the Comprehensive Plan Map based on the existing zoning. The map that was distributed most recently illustrates the Comprehensive Plan Map being converted to property specific locations. The main difference between the two maps is that the earlier map identified multi-family and other specific land use designations, and the new map identifies primarily mixed-use classifications. He noted that the areas identified in red indicate mixed-use designations. He said one of the main questions that must be answered by the Board is how far eastward the mixed-use area should be. He pointed out the location of the hospital and high school properties, and noted that the general commercial zone runs up and down Highway 99.

Mr. Chave referred to the mixed-use areas that were identified in red and described the various uses that currently exist. He noted that the current uses follow the land use designations on the Comprehensive Plan Map fairly closely. He emphasized that a mixed-use zoning designation would not rule out intense commercial development, but there must be a mixture of uses.

Mr. Chave advised that the legislature recently passed a "sleeper law" that is targeted at jurisdictions with infill priorities. It allows a city to steer their SEPA thresholds and exemptions if they have a valid Comprehensive Plan and Environmental Impact Statement and they are targeting the new SEPA threshold categorical exemptions as mixed uses or residential development. In the City's two activity centers (the hospital/medical use area and the downtown area) the City is able to allow all projects that are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan to be exempt from SEPA. This is significant because SEPA is potentially a time-consuming and expensive process to go through. If the City has a Comprehensive Plan with a

completed SEPA process, all SEPA issues should already have been addressed. In addition, the Critical Areas Ordinance should handle all critical areas issues. He said that, typically, SEPA review in these areas deals with traffic mitigation, and the City's traffic engineer is in the process of preparing a traffic mitigation ordinance to handle these situations. Once the traffic mitigation ordinance is in place, it might be possible to exempt all mixed-use and multi-family development in the two activity centers from SEPA review. This would remove a significant obstacle for future development.

Mr. Chave said the boundary for the mixed-use development could also be important. Right now, the zoning in the hospital/medical use area that is identified on the Comprehensive Plan Map as mixed use is zoned multi-family residential. All of the medical offices that currently exist have been permitted uses in the multi-family residential zones.

Mr. Chave said that the new legislation could be a significant economic development tool for the City. He recalled that the City was considering the option of doing a planned action for the Highway 99 Corridor, and this would have been time consuming. If the same type of thing can be accomplished by doing a combination of categorical exemptions under SEPA and adopting a traffic mitigation ordinance, the intent can be accomplished much quicker and it would be less costly for the City.

Mr. Chave emphasized that when translating or creating a new Comprehensive Plan Map, the staff can go with very specific land use designations that match closely with zoning. However, staff would like to stay as close as possible to the Comprehensive Plan Map land use designations using mixed uses rather than calling out specific zoning designations such as multi-family. Staff could use the translation table to identify the zoning that is consistent parcel-by-parcel with the land use designations.

Mr. Chave said another issue that must be considered by the Board is the RM-2.4 zoning classification, which is the middle multi-family density classification. He noted that the Comprehensive Plan lumps the RM-2.4 zoning into one of two categories, either high-density or low-density multi-family residential. He said that, in general, the Comprehensive Plan Map is quite clear as to where the RM-2.4 areas are located with one exception. He recalled the Fiorno Rezone Application, and noted that the Comprehensive Plan Map identifies the area as high-density multi-family residential, but the lighter areas are actually zoned RM-3, which is a low density, multi-family residential classification. These properties were likely intended to be a transition area, but staff will have to do more research into the Comprehensive Plan policies to see if this transition is allowed. He said staff is not planning to show this area as medium density multi-family residential at this time.

Board Member Dewhirst recalled that the Board previously recommended that the Fiorno Rezone Application be denied and the City Council supported the Board's recommendation. He further recalled that the rationale was that the subject properties provided for a gradation in density between the high-density multi-family residential and the single-family residential zones. Mr. Chave agreed that was the intent of the Board's recommendation. He noted that in most of the other similar situations, such as the east side of Highway 99, there are some lower density multi-family residential areas located between the single-family residential and commercial zones. These multi-family residential zones serve as a transition area between the high and low density uses. The Comprehensive Plan policies allow for this type of transition zoning to within the Highway 99 corridor.

Board Member Dewhirst said that designating properties that are zoned as low-density multi-family residential as high-density multi-family residential on the Comprehensive Plan could set the City up for future rezone applications to change the zoning on the properties to a higher use. Mr. Chave said the question that must be answered is where the transition line should fall—within the higher density or lower density zoning designations. Board Member Dewhirst questioned why the land use designation should be changed. Mr. Chave answered that in some situations, there is a conflict between the actual zoning and what the Comprehensive Plan designation would be when applied. Again, Board Member Dewhirst expressed his concern that changing the medium density multi-family residential land use to a high density multi-family residential land use could set the City up for rezone applications.

Board Member Crim noted that the Fiorno property currently has two different land use designations—high density and medium density multi-family residential. Mr. Chave agreed and explained that the current bubble map shows the area as high density multi-family residential with single-family residential located next to it. The map does not hint that the zoning

should be something else. Although the City's policies and rezone actions indicate there is some sort of transition, putting a new designation on the property, other than what is shown in the original Comprehensive Plan, makes him uncomfortable.

Given that rezone actions have supported transition for that area, Board Member Dewhirst questioned why it would not be possible to be parcel specific and identify the high, medium and low density zones rather than just high and low density zones. He recalled that when discussing the concept of mixed-use zoning in the past, several property owners in the light industrial areas indicated that they would have some problems. These properties were located on the north side of 212th Street. He said that since Edmonds does not have a lot of employment opportunities to begin with, they should be encouraging those that currently exist to remain. He asked the staff to review the past minutes when the mixed-use concept was discussed to identify the specific concerns that were voiced by these property owners.

In regards to school sites, Mr. Chave said that a number of sites are shown as "public" on the draft map which are actually schools. The Board has at least a couple of options for these sites.

- Designate these sites as schools but state that the compatible zoning is residential. Schools would be permitted, but would not be zoned "public."
- Designate the sites as single-family and allow the zoning ordinance to control where and how schools are located.
- Leave the public designation alone but otherwise limit the use to schools as opposed to all the other public uses allowed in the "P" zone.

Mr. Chave said the last option is probably the least acceptable, given the lengthy discussion by the City Council when the current regulations governing schools and community facilities were adopted.

Board Member Crim pointed out that there are specific requirements associated with high school sites but elementary sites are permitted out right. Mr. Chave said one of the worries for the existing Edmonds/Woodway High School on 76th Avenue and 212th Street is that they went through a substantial approval process, and they do not want to make this facility non-conforming.

Board Member Crim inquired about the old Woodway High School site. Mr. Chave said the underlying zoning for this site is single-family. The zoning map identifies the high school site, but keeping it as a single-family zone makes perfect sense.

Board Member Dewhirst asked that staff review the process that will be used to change the Comprehensive Plan map. Mr. Chave answered that City staff will attempt to generate a final version for the Board's review. The next step would be to set a public hearing. Board Member Crim inquired if they need to identify all of the small areas where decisions need to be made. He said it is important that areas being considered for change are identified to the public. In addition, some explanation for the changes should be provided. Board Member Dewhirst said the public hearing should be specific on the changes being made. He questioned whether property owners should be allowed to request changes, themselves. Mr. Chave said that if a property owner requests something that would result in a zoning change, the issue would be taken to a whole different level. The Board could review their request, but these changes would require amendments to both the Comprehensive Plan and the zoning map. The Comprehensive Plan Map should not be changed to be inconsistent with the zoning map.

Board Member Dewhirst suggested that prior to the public hearing, a map should be provided to clearly identify the changes being proposed. In addition, the ground rules should be made clear as to what changes can be requested. Mr. Chave said that at the August 13th meeting, staff would provide a new map plus accompanying materials. The public hearing could potentially be advertised for the first meeting in September.

CONTINUED DELIBERATION ON AMENDMENTS TO THE EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE MAKING THE DECISION OF THE HEARING EXAMINER ON PERMIT APPLICATIONS FINAL AND CLARIFYING THE RULES OF RECONSIDERATION OF HEARING EXAMINER DECISIONS (FILE NUMBER CDC-03-60)

Mr. Chave suggested that since the Board is considering amendments to the Hearing Examiner review process, a number of parts of the code that are related to the hearing examiner process would have to be changed. Also on the staff's work plan is reorganizing and reformatting the process section of the code (Chapter 20). Staff suggests that there is a great opportunity to do both projects at the same time. While this would require substantial changes, they could end up with a better document that has been reformatted and corrected. He said that if the Board would be willing, staff would like to take the time to reformat the entire section. While this would take more time, staff believes it would be worthwhile. The Board agreed that this would be appropriate.

Mr. Chave said the staff could put all of the processes into a cross table format. The Board would then be able to identify the process, appeal period, etc. for each action. This would eliminate the need to go back and forth to identify the process.

Mr. Dewhirst asked about the time frame for this review process. Mr. Chave said he is doubtful that staff can be prepared for a future discussion before September. At that time, staff could at least have a good working layout but not a draft ordinance. Board Member Crim said that, in the meantime, the Board could categorize the items that should go to the Hearing Examiner for a final decision and those that should go to the City Council.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Mr. Chave reminded the Board that the August 13th meeting would be scheduled as a work session on the Comprehensive Plan. On July 23rd they could bring back the amateur radio ordinance for further work, but this would probably be the only item on the agenda. Board Member Crim suggested that they could also talk about the decision process and categorize various actions into groups. Mr. Chave said that would be helpful. He said staff could list various types of decisions that are under various types of agencies now. The Board could then place these actions into three categories: those that are appealable to the courts, those that are appealable to the City Council, and those that are neither.

Mr. Chave reported that the City Council approved design guidelines related to signs that will be effective August 1. Another hearing on the PRD ordinance is scheduled for August 5th. He also announced that there would be an hour-long presentation by the Public Facilities District on July 15, 2003 regarding the Edmonds Center for the Performing Arts starting at 7:00 p.m.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

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

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Guenther advised that he would be absent from the next meeting.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:00 P.M.

APPROVED