

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 9, 2006**

Chair Freeman called the regular meeting of the Planning Board to order at 7:03 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Public Safety Complex, 250 – 5th Avenue North.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Janice Freeman, Chair
Jim Crim
Cary Guenther
Jim Young
Judith Works
Don Henderson

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Karin Noyes, Recorder

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

John Dewhirst, Vice Chair
Virginia Cassutt

Vice Chair Dewhirst and Board Member Cassutt were excused from the meeting.

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER WORKS MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JULY 12, 2006 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER YOUNG SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BOARD MEMBER CRIM MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JULY 26, 2006 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER WORKS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

No changes were made to the agenda.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Joan Archer advised that she owns a business on Main Street. She referred the Board to a letter that was submitted by a group of business owners located on the 500 block of Main Street asking that the City consider providing better lighting in front of their businesses for pedestrians. One of the City's goals is to encourage businesses to extend further along Main Street from the fountain, and there are definitely more businesses than there were three years ago. She said she recently contacted Noel Miller, Public Works Director, regarding the cost of additional lighting, and this information was included on the letter that was presented to the Board. She asked that the Board consider the merchant's proposal. She noted that lighting has been provided in all directions from the fountain except at 500 Main Street, and the merchants would like the City to correct this problem before the winter months.

PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED ZONING CHANGES FOR HIGHWAY 99, INCLUDING ESTABLISHMENT OF NEW BR AND BR2 ZONES AND CHANGES IN THE GENERAL COMMERCIAL (CG AND CG2) ZONING CLASSIFICATION (FILE NUMBER CDC-05-20)

Mr. Chave explained that the first proposal would modify the existing General Commercial zones (CG and CG2) to be more in keeping with the Highway 99 Task Force recommendations to clarify and improve permitted uses and standards while streamlining permitting for these high-intensity commercial areas. The second proposal would create new Business-Residential zones (BR and BR2) that could be applied in the Medical/Highway 99 mixed-use activity center. The new BR2 zoning could be used in transitional areas bordering high-intensity traffic corridors. Both of the proposals are intended to implement the current Comprehensive Plan. He displayed a map showing where the CG, CG2 and BR zones would likely be located, but he noted that a hearing on the proposed boundaries would be held at a later date. The current hearing is regarding the zoning language only.

Mr. Chave advised that the Highway 99 Task Force met for a few years to consider options for Highway 99 as well as the medical/hospital area. They recommended some changes to the existing CG and CG2 zoning language, as well as new BR and BR2 zoning designations that would accommodate mixed-use developments. He noted that the Planning Board held a public hearing several years ago regarding the concept of creating a mixed-use (BR) zoning designation, but they decided to table the issue pending the task force's review.

John Kolmer, Weber and Thompson Architects, said he was present to represent Stanley Real Estate, the owners of property located at 236th and 84th. He indicated that his client is in support of the proposed language, except for the proposed building height for the BR zone. He suggested that the 42-foot building height be increased to 44-feet. He explained that in mixed-use construction, a 44-foot height limit would make the residential units much more marketable and the commercial component more flexible, as well. Mr. Kolmer said he has designed many mixed-use buildings, mostly in Seattle. A 44-foot height limit would allow three stories of residential space that are 10 feet in height floor-to-floor and a minimum 13-foot high retail component, as well. Again, he said his client supports the proposed language for the BR zone, but with one slight amendment to the height limit.

Dale Behar advised that he currently owns the property at the corner of 220th Street and Aurora Avenue, and it is his intent to develop the site as an urban village, mixed use project. He said he recently reviewed the proposed CG and CG2 zoning language and found it to be generally acceptable to him. However, he expressed his concern that halfway houses and adult entertainment establishments would be allowed outright in the CG and CG2 zones. Having these uses in the area could make it very difficult for property owners to attract high end tenants and residents. Serious security issues would be a major concern.

Next, Mr. Behar pointed out that while the proposed language would allow residential development in the CG and CG2 zones, at least 50 percent of the development's overall floor area must be devoted to the commercial use. He expressed his concern that with larger mixed-use developments in the CG and CG2 zones, some of the ground floor space might not be conducive to either retail or commercial uses. He suggested that the Board consider changing the language to allow some residential uses on the ground floor, but only any areas where commercial or retail uses would not be viable. Mr. Behar also pointed out that the proposed language calls any non-residential use a commercial use and requires that the first two floors of a mixed-use development be commercial. He noted that it is important that mixed-use developments have retail space on the first floor, which is much different than commercial space since retail space generates sales tax revenue for the City. He suggested that the language specifically require retail space on the ground floor.

Mr. Behar pointed out that the proposed language identifies a maximum height limit of 60 feet for the CG zone and 75 feet for the CG2 zone. Buildings to these heights would be allowed without requiring Architectural Design Board (ADB) review. He suggested that the numbers to be changed to allow buildings up to 90 feet without requiring an ADB review. He noted that for projects where at least 50% of the parking is located below grade or under the building, the proposed language would allow modifications to above ground parking and landscape requirements. He suggested that providing at least 50% of the

parking underground would mitigate the City's concerns so that projects could be approved administratively without ADB review.

Mr. Behar referred to Section 16.30.030.D.1 and D.2, which talk about building design and massing. He suggested the requirements identified in these two sections could create hardships for property owners. He pointed out that good architecture could take care of the massing issue much more efficiently and attractively if more flexibility were allowed. He suggested that these two sections be eliminated. Next, Mr. Behar referred to Section 16.60.040.A which provides a list of uses that could occur outside of the enclosed building. He pointed out that outdoor dining was not included on the list. He suggested that outdoor dining also be called out as an allowed use in the CG and CG2 zones.

Jim Underhill advised that he participated on the Highway 99 Task Force from its inception. He said he is comfortable with the proposed language, with just a few exceptions. He referred to Section 16.60.005.F and reminded the Board of the City's strong emphasis on protecting residential areas as much as possible. To encourage this concept, he suggested that the word "should" be changed to "shall." This would ensure that site and building design be used to minimize adverse impacts on residentially-zoned properties.

Mr. Underhill referred to Section 16.60.030 and asked if the proposed language could be interpreted to mean that absolutely no notice would be provided to the public for projects that do not exceed the height limit. Mr. Chave explained that the Highway 99 Task Force recommended that projects that do not exceed the height limit be approved administratively. Mr. Underhill recalled that residential owners who participated on the task force expressed their concern about the impacts that could result from large projects being developed near the residential areas. Requiring some type of notice to the adjacent property owners would help alleviate some of the concern. He asked the Board to consider a requirement that the public be notified in some fashion before building plans get too far.

Mr. Underhill recalled that the Board first started considering the concept of creating the BR and BR2 zones about five years ago, and the citizens who attended these early meetings stressed that there are established neighborhoods with strong identities in the area. He asked the Board to keep in mind how the proposed changes would impact the residential property owners in the vicinity of Highway 99. He reminded the Board that the City recently conducted work sessions with the property owners in the Highway 99, Five Corners and Firdale Village Neighborhoods to consider some possible zoning changes, and these communities appreciated the opportunity to be part of the design and decisions. However, the City made no effort to hold neighborhood meetings for the property owners living in the areas proposed for BR and BR2 zoning. If the City values this process, they should consider replicating it for the neighborhoods that have been proposed for the new BR zone. This would allow the property owners an opportunity to buy into the new zoning concept.

Mr. Underhill referred to Item 16.52.006.G which indicates that the BR2 zone is intended to be applied as a transitional zone between residential and more intensive commercial areas. However, the map does not identify exactly where the BR2 zone would be applied. He asked that the staff identify where the BR2 zoning designation would be applied before the next hearing.

Mr. Underhill pointed out that Section 16.52.010.A.12 indicates that laboratories would be allowed as an outright use in the BR zone only, and Section 16.52.010.C.3 indicates that laboratories would be allowed in the BR2 zone as a conditional use. If the BR2 zone is intended to be a transition zone between residential and more intensive commercial uses, he suggested that laboratories should not be allowed at all.

Mr. Underhill referred to Footnote 1 in Section 16.52.020.A, which indicates that the setback for buildings and structures located at or above grade must be 15 feet from the lot line adjacent to all residential zoned properties. He pointed out that the setbacks would be minimal because the residentially zoned properties are not located adjacent to the proposed BR zones. However, the BR zones could abut properties that are currently developed as condominiums.

Mr. Underhill referred the Board to Section 16.52.030.B.1 and pointed out that the language is not consistent with the map. He advised that there are only a very few places where buildings in the BR zone would be allowed to exceed the 50-foot height limit. Mr. Chave clarified that the Comprehensive Plan identifies a high rise area along Highway 99, and only those

BR zoned properties that are located within the high-rise overlay area could have buildings that exceed the 50-foot height limit.

Mr. Underhill pointed out that the proposed BR zone would likely be applied to properties at the intersection of 212th Street and 76th Avenue. However, it is important to keep in mind that the infrastructure in this area is presently inadequate to support any increased density or traffic. Several of the business owners on this corner have indicated that their access points are difficult and sometimes impossible to use when the traffic that backs up from the intersection each way. Some traffic mitigation measures would be necessary to make any further growth work for the businesses that are already located in the area. There is a lot of pedestrian traffic at this intersection as a result of the high school and hospital campuses, yet the pedestrian pads at the corners of this intersection are small and inadequate. He encouraged the Board to consider the infrastructure of this intersection as part of a bigger picture to make sure safety issues are addressed adequately.

In conclusion, Mr. Underhill suggested that if the Board wants the BR and BR2 zoning proposal to be successful and supported by the community, they should consider holding a community meeting to solicit comments and suggestions early in the process.

Roger Hertrich said he was involved in the process that created the high-rise nodes on Highway 99 several years ago. Part of the intent was to design an area that would allow for higher buildings while taking into consideration the impacts that shadows, etc. would have on surrounding residential properties. The high rise concept was not effective because businesses were not ready to move forward.

Mr. Hertrich recalled Mr. Behar's suggestion that no ADB review be required unless a building was greater than 90 feet in height in the CG2 zone. However, he cautioned that this would not likely be acceptable to the citizens of Edmonds. He asked the Board to consider the reaction they would receive from citizens if they eliminated the ADB review requirement for these types of large development proposals. He expressed his belief that the ADB review requirement has resulted in the creation of quality development in Edmonds. Getting rid of the ADB review requirement would result in significant concern amongst the community. Mr. Hertrich pointed out that neighborhoods along Highway 99 such as Lake Ballinger and the unincorporated areas of Snohomish County should be invited to provide comments regarding the proposed new language.

Mr. Hertrich noted that the Board recently completed their work on the development standards for the downtown areas, and height was a significant issue. He emphasized that there is mutual agreement amongst most residents of the City that residential development above retail development is okay, but the degree of the residential development was never really agreed upon. The City's former Economic Development Director's program was confusing and people did not really understand what heights were being considered for the BR, BR2, CG and CG2 zones. He suggested that allowing buildings up to 60 and 80 feet high would be inappropriate since these buildings would have a significant impact on residential developments that are located just a half block away. He suggested that the Board consider a more moderate approach. Feelings about additional height in the downtown were severe. The general feeling of the community is that a little additional height in other areas outside of downtown would be fine, but the Board should not go too far.

Mr. Hertrich pointed out that the proposed language would require a 6-foot fence between the commercial and mixed use properties, but this fence would not effectively lessen the impact of a 60-foot high building. Residential properties that are adjacent to the proposed BR zone would likely be sold as rental units and the existing neighborhoods would decline. Again, he urged the Board to propose more moderate changes.

Mr. Hertrich asked how the City would protect the residential neighborhoods if the conditional use permit requirement were eliminated as suggested by Council Member Marin. He said he owns property on Beacon Hill in Seattle. Properties in this area were allowed to develop as residential in the back of the lot, using alleys for access. Then taller buildings with residential above were developed near the street. The character of this neighborhood has been lost.

Mr. Chave clarified that the adult entertainment provisions include many restrictions regarding where these types of businesses can be located. They must be a certain distance from residentially zoned properties, etc. He recalled that 220th Street was not one of the locations where adult entertainment businesses would be allowed to locate, but he agreed to email Mr. Behar a map showing how all of the setback requirements and other restrictions would be applied. He said similar

restrictions would apply to halfway houses. He emphasized that the City cannot prohibit either use, but there has not been a problem with these uses in Edmonds to date.

Mr. Chave referred to Mr. Hertrich's comments about the impacts of an 80-foot height limit. He pointed out that 80-foot high buildings would only be allowed on the BR zoned properties that are within the areas where the high rise node has historically been located. The height limit in all other areas of the BR zone would be 50 feet. He also pointed out that a 25-foot high building in the BR zone would be required to be set back 25 feet from any residentially zoned property line. He summarized that substantial setback requirements are already part of the zoning code.

Mr. Chave recalled Mr. Behar's concerns about the proposed requirement that 50% of a project must be utilized for commercial space. He suggested the Board consider this issue further and provide direction for staff to update the draft proposal prior to the next public hearing that is tentatively scheduled for September 13th.

Mr. Chave explained that while they have a good idea of where the BR zone would be located, its exact location is still open. The BR2 zone is intended to be located in areas where there is a high capacity transportation corridor and some fairly intensive uses. He recalled that Mr. Piha approached the Board on previous occasions regarding his property that is located on the southern end of the Highway 99 corridor. He was interested in a scaled down version of the BR zone that could serve as a transition between the commercial uses adjacent to the corridor and the residential uses further away. Mr. Chave pointed out that the BR and BR2 zones would be very similar except for the height limits. The BR2 zone would not give the option of additional height.

Mr. Chave suggested the Board think about other places in the City where the BR2 zone could be applied, such as the Edmonds Way Corridor. However, they should recognize that the BR2 zoning is really aimed at those portions of the Highway 99 Corridor where the BR height limits would not be appropriate. No properties were identified on the map as BR2 yet, but the BR2 zoning would be used in areas where less intense development would be more appropriate. In order to clarify where the BR2 zoning designation would be used, Mr. Chave suggested that the purpose section language could be more specific to make it clear that the BR2 zoning would only be allowed on the Highway 99 Corridor in areas where the CG, CG2 and BR zone are not appropriate. He advised that when the map is distributed for the September 13th hearing, the colors would be dropped so only the proposed CG, CG2 and BR zoned areas would be identified. A separate map would be provided to show the existing zoning of the properties.

Mr. Chave recommended the Board hold another hearing on the proposed language, but they should also advertise the proposed locations for the CG, CG2 and BR zones. He pointed out that, up to this point, the only zoning option for properties within the Highway 99 Corridor has been CG, BC or RM zoning. The BR and BR2 zoning designations would provide options that are more sensitive to the surrounding properties.

Board Member Crim expressed his belief that it would be appropriate to allow laboratories in the BR zone as a primary use and in the BR2 zone as a conditional use. The conditional use permit requirement would ensure adequate review of the associated impacts.

Board Member Young pointed out that there would be no properties where the high intensity uses would not be separated from residential areas by the regulatory functions that are already in place such as setback requirements. He reminded the Board that the City has decided they want to support economic development opportunities along the Highway 99 Corridor. Therefore, he suggested they leave the language related to Architectural Design Board review as currently proposed for the public hearing. The Board could then consider the public comments at their next discussion when the actual zoning boundaries are considered. The remainder of the Board concurred. Board Member Crim added that the concept of moving the ADB review to earlier in the project design phase matches well with proposed language for the CG, CG2, and BR zones. Talking about design early in the process would result in better projects.

Board Member Young pointed out that much compromise and sensitivity was built into the proposed language that is not apparent in the map that was provided. For example, the 80 foot height limit would only be allowed in isolated locations and separation requirements have been built into the language. In addition, an ADB or Hearing Examiner review would be required. He concluded that he is relatively confident with the level of compromise and sensitivity included in the proposed

language. He also reminded the Board of their decision to consider both the design guidelines and code amendments at the same time. Perhaps hearing more about how the two documents would work together would clarify issues of concern.

Chair Freeman requested staff to comment on the citizen concern about the public notice requirement. Mr. Chave pointed out that if a SEPA threshold is exceeded, a public notice would be required. He noted that SEPA thresholds are quite low already. He suggested that since notice requirements would be covered in other portions of the code for large buildings, the Board could drop the words “no notice required” from the second sentence of Section 16.60.030. The Board agreed that would be appropriate.

Board Member Young added that City and State requirements are already in place to limit the impacts associated with 80-foot high structures within the radius of the high rise nodes. Board Member Works suggested that perhaps these other requirements should be noted in a cover sheet that is attached to the proposed language to make it clear to the public that other requirements would apply. The remainder of the Board agreed.

Board Member Works recalled that she previously raised the issue about whether or not outdoor dining would be allowed in the BR, BR2, CG and CG2 zones. While staff indicated that this use would be allowed because it is covered in another section of the code, the issue is obviously not clear to the public. The Board agreed that the issue of outdoor dining should also be addressed in the cover sheet.

The Board considered Mr. Kolmer’s suggestion that the height limit in the BR2 zone be increased from 42 feet to 44 feet. Board Member Guenther said the 2-foot height increase would allow for better designed mixed-use developments. Board Member Young asked what a developer would be able to do with a 44-foot height limit that would not be possible with a 42-foot height limit. Mr. Kolmer provided a brief explanation of a typical floor assembly, which is between 16 and 18-inches thick. In addition, more height is needed for a roof assembly. He suggested that the components of streetscape would be more important to adjoining properties than the extra 2 feet of height. Therefore, the City should concentrate more on the streetscape than the building height. Board Member Young said he would support a 44-foot height limit in the BR2 zone because the additional impact would be minimal. The remainder of the Board agreed that the height in the BR2 zone should be changed to 44 feet.

Next, the Board discussed the issue raised by Mr. Behar regarding the proposed requirement of CG and CG2 zone that the first floor of a structure be devoted to commercial space, with only some options for residential (Section 16.60.020.B.1). He explained that in some situations, ground floor space might not be conducive to retail or commercial activities because it is not visible or easily assessable from the street. He suggested the language be changed to allow this space to be used for residential purposes. Board Member Guenther expressed concern that this change could end up allowing a developer to convert viable commercial space into residential space. Mr. Behar explained that commercial space is very different than residential space. Once a building has been designed, the boundaries for the commercial space would be set. Again, Mr. Behar pointed out that some areas on a large site might be too far back to work for commercial space but could work well for residential uses. For example, the space could be used to provide amenities for the residential units such as a game room or exercise room.

Board Member Young said he cannot see the purpose of compelling commercial space in areas where it would not be viable. However, the City should still require a developer to construct the most amount of commercial space possible on the first floor. Mr. Chave recalled that, historically, the City has been worried about duplicating situations where people have constructed commercial space and then converted it to residential units. The intent of this section was to give more flexibility for mixed-use developments, but the City cannot just open it up entirely since this would allow residential units to be constructed on prime commercial space.

Mr. Chave referred to Section 16.60.020.B.1.c and suggested that the word “adjoining” be replaced with “facing.” This would give more flexibility for the ground floor space on the back side of a building. The Board concurred. Next, Mr. Chave referred to Section 16.60.020.B.1.b and suggested that another option would be to require that the amount of commercial space be the equivalent of the first two stories of all buildings that are more than one story. The Board recognized Mr. Behar’s concerns with this requirement, but they noted the difficulty of coming up with language to address the situation while still protecting the City’s desire to have a minimum threshold for retail commercial uses. They agreed to

retain the language as proposed, but include Mr. Chave's additional option for the public to respond to at the September 13th hearing. They encouraged Mr. Behar to study the issue further, too, and prepare to make some additional comments and suggestions at the hearing.

The Board noted the following typographical errors in the proposed language:

- The first section on Page 1 of the proposed BR and BR2 language should be changed from "16.60" to "16.52."
- On Page 1 of the proposed CG and CG2 language "CC" should be changed to "CG."
- Delete the words "in multi-family and commercial zones" from Section 16.60.030.D.2.

Board Member Works referred to Section 16.60.040 and questioned if auto sales should be listed as an exception, as well. Mr. Chave pointed out that auto sales would be considered outdoor storage. The Board agreed to add "including outdoor storage of automobiles" to Section 16.60.040.A.7. The Board also agreed that wrecking yards should not be listed as an allowed use in the CG and CG2 zones.

Mr. Chave clarified Mr. Underhill's concern about the table in Section 16.52.020. He noted that when development in a BR zone is within 25 feet of a residentially zoned property, the maximum height allowed would be 25 feet. If a building is set back 25 feet, then the maximum height would be 50 feet.

Mr. Behar said his architect has requested an opportunity to work with the Planning Department staff to address some of their concerns with Sections 16.60.030.D.1 and D.2 before the language is adopted. Board Member Guenther explained that the design guidelines were included in the code language so that staff could use the document as a checklist when reviewing design proposals. However, he recognizes that this does not allow the flexibility that architects like to have. He said that since he has been on the Board, they have had several discussions about whether the code should be more flexible or more prescriptive. The Board has tried to reach an acceptable compromise. However, if the staff is making design decisions, they need specific guidelines. A more flexible code would require more ADB involvement. Mr. Chave encouraged Mr. Behar to forward his architect's suggestions to staff so they could be considered at the next public hearing.

The Board took a 10-minute break at 9:00 p.m. They reconvened the meeting at 9:10 p.m.

UPDATE AND DISCUSSION ON CODE UPDATES REQUIRED TO INTEGRATE DESIGN GUIDELINES AND REVISED DESIGN REVIEW PROCESS IN THE DEVELOPMENT CODE

Mr. Chave advised that staff is in the process of drafting code language to implement the proposed new design review process. He referred the Board to the draft design guidelines proposed by the Architectural Design Board (ADB), and explained that these guidelines would be used by the ADB in their "up front" review role. He also referred the Board to the attached summary of the proposed process. He explained that the intent is to apply more specific design standards throughout the City area-by-area, starting with Highway 99 and downtown Edmonds.

Board Member Young asked Mr. Chave to briefly review the proposed review process. Mr. Chave explained that the first thing the ADB would do is work with the applicant to identify the most important design considerations. The applicant would then come back with general forms and site plans to show how they would deal with the issues identified by the ADB. The ADB would establish some conditions that would figure into the staff's review of the project. The applicant would then work on a detailed submission, and staff would review it base on the design standards already in the code and the conditions identified by the ADB. He emphasized that conditions imposed by the ADB would be appealable and must come from code requirements, Comprehensive Plan policies, etc. He explained that the early design stage would involve a dialogue between the ADB and the applicant, and the public would be invited to provide input, as well. The big issues should be dealt with before the designs are solidified.

Board Member Young said he would like to know that at some point when a project is discussed in front of the public, the developer would be asked to go through each of the questions identified on the bulleted list on Page 2. Mr. Chave answered that the applicant would be asked to address those items that are applicable to their project. He summarized that the

APPROVED

proposed process would be easier to administer and the applicant would have more predictability. In addition, the City would be able to deal with the conceptual issues before the design is tied down.

Mr. Chave advised that the Board would discuss the design guidelines and process again on September 27th.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Chair Freeman recalled that the Board previously asked staff to provide a report regarding the impacts of proposed Property Rights Initiative 933. However, this item has not been scheduled on the extended agenda. Mr. Chave reported that the City Attorney has indicated it would be difficult to discuss the impacts without taking a position, and this would not be allowed. The staff obtained materials from the American Planning Association, which provide an analysis of the initiative. These materials would be forwarded to each of the Board Members.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Freeman requested the Board provide a response to the proposal that was submitted by the 500 Main Street Merchants. She suggested that the Board could offer their support to the group and encourage the City Council to include lighting as part of the Capital Improvement Program (CIP). Mr. Chave explained that there are actually two ways to get this item before the City Council. It could either be included in the CIP proposal or recommended for funding as part of the budget process. If approved in the budget process, it could be incorporated into the CIP.

The Board directed staff to forward a letter to the 500 Main Street Merchants informing them of the process for getting this item before the City Council. The letter should explain that the Board has already reviewed and forwarded a recommendation on the 2007 CIP. Therefore, the merchants could either wait for the next CIP process or approach the City Council with a request that it be funded as part of the 2007 budget. The letter should emphasize that the Board supports the proposal since it would be the first step in providing adequate lighting on Main Street all the way up to the Frances Anderson Center.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Crim announced that he recently notified the Mayor that he would resign his position immediately and this would be his last meeting. He said he has enjoyed participating on the Planning Board.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:29 p.m.

APPROVED