

APPROVED JULY 10TH

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

June 26, 2013

Chair Reed called the meeting of the Edmonds Planning Board to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Public Safety Complex, 250 – 5th Avenue North.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

John Reed, Chair
Valerie Stewart, Vice Chair
Todd Cloutier
Ian Duncan
Bill Ellis
Philip Lovell
Neil Tibbott

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Development Services Director
Carrie Hite, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director
Mike Delilla, Utilities Engineer
Renée McRae, Recreation Manager
Karin Noyes, Recorder

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Kevin Clarke (excused)

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER TIBBOTT MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JUNE 12, 2013 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER CLOUTIER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

No one in the audience indicated a desire to address the Board during this portion of the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING ON 2013 SANITARY SEWER COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (FILE NUMBER AMD20130006)

Mr. Delilla said he was present to present the Sanitary Sewer Comprehensive Plan Update and solicit feedback from both the Board and the public in preparation for a public hearing before the City Council. He explained that the Sanitary Sewer Comprehensive Plan is an element of the City's Comprehensive Plan. It guides the operation of the City's Sewer Utility by identifying and proposing solutions to known conveyance, maintenance and other problems; detailing the actions necessary to ensure compliance with applicable Federal State and local requirements; and presenting an operation and maintenance plan, capital improvement plan, and financial plan.

Mr. Delilla explained that because Edmonds is primarily a built-out City, most of the identified Sanitary Sewer issues are a result of aging infrastructure, current size of infrastructure in relation to current and future population, root intrusion, and infiltration and inflow. He noted that most of the pipes date back to the 1950's and before, with some as old as the 1920s.

He advised that the Sanitary Sewer Comprehensive Plan was last updated in 2006. The purpose of the update is to reprioritize capital projects, reflect the actual changes in population growth that have occurred, accommodate future population growth projections based on data from the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) and the Planning Department, incorporate the wastewater treatment plant plan, and improve record tracing methods.

Mr. Delilla pointed out that in addition to treating flows from properties in Edmonds, the City's treatment plant also treats effluent from the Ronald Wastewater District, the Olympic View Sewer District, and nearly all of the effluent from Mountlake Terrace. The City has agreements with each of these entities to pay for their respective portions of the facility.

Mr. Delilla reported that since 2006, the City has significantly improved their tracking methods to identify current and potential issues in the pipe system. Every three years, the City sends a camera device into each pipe reach to record the existing conditions and provide visual data to identify potential problems. In addition, they now have the entire sanitary sewer system on a GIS Map. This enables them to tie the entire facility into real world coordinates to provide a good feel for the slope of the pipe in relationship to other pipes in the area. They also collect meter data from various locations in the City, and this allows them to bill other entities fairly for the service.

Mr. Delilla advised that the City's current system has 10 flow meters, 3,200 manholes, and 679,227 miles of sanitary sewer pipe main. They have 14 lift stations and 1 wastewater treatment plant with 3 primary clarifiers, 3 aeration basins, 3 secondary clarifiers and 1 incinerator. He reviewed that the proposed plan update identifies the following capital projects:

- **Conveyance Projects.** The goal of the plan is to provide a basic or essential level of service for the sanitary sewer utility. The City is currently working to complete citywide pipe replacement and restoration projects to correct issues related to excessive root intrusion, conveyance problems and old/damaged pipes.
- **Wastewater Treatment Plant.** The plan calls for replacement of the emergency power switchgear system, which is used in the event of a power failure. The plan also identifies changes that are necessary to ensure the incinerator meets the regulatory requirements and recoating the clarifiers.

Mr. Delilla advised that 100% of the Sanitary Sewer Utility is rate funded. Fees collected for the utility have been used for an increased number of items. Projects are driven by aging infrastructure that requires more maintenance as time goes by and as population and development increases. Any utility rate adjustment would require approval by the Edmonds City Council.

Board Member Lovell asked if the update takes into account potential development that might occur on Highway 99, the hospital district, Harbor Square and the waterfront to ensure there is adequate capacity within the existing piping system. Mr. Delilla answered that the update incorporates the population growth data provided by the PSRC. In addition, he met with the Planning Manager to coordinate where the growth is anticipated to occur. A growth model was prepared, assigning an effluent factor to each of the areas where population is expected to grow significantly. The proposed plan addresses future capacity up to the years 2019, 2033 and ultimate build out of the City. Board Member Lovell asked if the proposed plan would provide sufficient capacity to accommodate a substantial amount of multi-family development in any of the areas mentioned above. Mr. Delilla answered affirmatively and noted that the treatment plant is currently under capacity.

Board Member Lovell referred to the two cost studies that were done for treatment and conveyance and maintenance and operations. He said it appears that the treatment and conveyance costs could be covered by increased rates, but the total package would require some subsidy. Mr. Delilla answered that the intent is for all costs associated with the Sanitary Sewer Utility to be funded by rate payers, and increases may be required. At this time, the City pays for about 50% of the costs of maintenance and operation, and the other entities share the remaining costs.

Board Member Lovell observed that the plan does not appear to implement any infrastructure that would allow the City to reclaim and reuse the treated water. Mr. Delilla said he does not anticipate the City will implement a reclamation program within the six-year timeframe of the proposed plan. He pointed out that there are stringent regulatory requirements associated with reclaimed water. In addition, the treatment plant is site constrained and there is little room for the added infrastructure. He summarized that a study would be necessary to determine the feasibility of water reclamation, and this goes beyond the scope of the current update. Vice Chair Stewart said she is aware of a model program that has been implemented in both Portland and IslandWood where a trademark system has been developed for reclaiming water. She suggested that perhaps this same type of system could be implemented at Harbor Square.

Vice Chair Stewart observed that there is a worldwide trend to use alternative materials to get away from Polyvinyl Chloride (PVC) because of the environmental impacts that occur in the production of PVC. She said she hopes the City will consider using an alternative material. She noted that several studies have been done on the various types of materials, and she agreed to forward the information she collected to staff. She said it does not appear that Acrylonitrile Butadiene Styrene (ABS) would cost significantly more than PVC, and it is more environmentally friendly.

Board Member Ellis said it appears from the report that all of the treated water is currently discharged into Puget Sound. He asked if it would be possible for this water to be utilized for secondary uses. Mr. Delilla agreed that would be possible, but it would require a second level of infrastructure for storage and conveyance and space at the current treatment plan for additional infrastructure is limited. Board Member Ellis pointed out the water reclamation would also be seasonal in Edmonds.

Board Member Lovell asked how the projects in the Capital Improvement Plan were prioritized. Mr. Delilla answered that cameras are placed inside the pipes to ascertain their condition and identify potential problems in each of the pipes. Each problem is given a score, and the projects with the worst scores are given a higher priority in the Capital Improvement Plan. He said that projects that address conveyance problems are typically given priority.

Board Member Lovell commented on the good plan prepared by staff and said it is great to see a plan that can actually be funded and implemented.

Chair Reed pointed out that the draft plan provided in the Staff Report did not include Section 10 (Operations and Maintenance Program) and Section 11 (Wastewater Treatment Facility Financial Plan). However, Mr. Delilla did provide a summary of each of the sections, and the actual documents will be included in the draft plan that is presented to the City Council for approval.

Vice Chair Stewart asked which pipes typically require the most repair and maintenance. Mr. Delilla said root intrusion is a serious problem and is more difficult to address. Many of the pipes are old, and people have planted trees on top or nearby. As the tree roots grow, they often find their way into the pipes, eventually blocking the flow. There are also areas in the City where soils are poor and can expand and contract based on moisture. This can complicate the construction and reconstruction of the pipe, as well.

Vice Chair Stewart asked if broken pipes are removed and recycled. Mr. Delilla answered that the majority of the City's pipes are concrete, which is recyclable. Again, he summarized that the current conveyance system is old, and the City is working to address the problems and be more proactive in the future.

No one in the audience indicated a desire to participate in the public hearing, and the hearing was closed.

BOARD MEMBER LOVELL MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD THE 2013 SANITARY SEWER COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE (FILE NUMBER AMD20130006) TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL. VICE CHAIR STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED REZONE OF PARCELS LOCATED AT 403 AND 405 – 3RD AVENUE NORTH (FILE NUMBER PLN20130030)

Chair Reed reminded the Board that the rezone application is a quasi-judicial matter. He invited Board Members to disclose any communications that might have had regarding the subject of the hearing outside of the hearing. None of the Board Members indicated an ex parte communication.

Mr. Clugston advised that a site-specific rezone is a Type IV-B application. Staff makes a recommendation to the Planning Board, and the Planning Board conducts a public hearing and forwards a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council holds a closed-record review of the project and makes the final decision. After conducting a public hearing and reviewing the Staff Report, the Board can vote to adopt the findings in the Staff Report or modify the findings as appropriate.

APPROVED

Mr. Clugston advised that the property is located at 403 and 405 – 3rd Avenue North and is currently developed with two single-family residential homes. The parcel is zoned Multi-Family Residential (RM) 3.0 with a contract that was established in 1999. Prior to 1999, the parcel was zoned Single-Family Residential (RS) 6. The Edmonds Center for the Arts is located to the east of the subject property, and the downtown business (BD) zones are located to the south. The RS-6 zones to the east, west and north are primarily developed with single-family residences, while the RM and BD-zoned parcels to the south are developed with a mixture of residential and commercial uses. The property immediately to the south is zoned RM-1.5 and is currently developed as an 8-unit condominium. The Comprehensive Plan identifies the subject site as Multi-Family Medium Density, with Multi-Family High Density to the south.

Board Member Lovell asked about the vehicular access for the two homes on the subject property. Mr. Clugston answered that one home is accessible from the street, and the other from an alleyway.

Mr. Clugston referred to Attachment 13, which is an oblique aerial photograph of the subject property. He explained that the 1999 contract rezone limited development on the site to two, single-family units, and that is how the site is currently developed. The first home was constructed prior to the 1999 rezone, but was remodeled in 2007 to add a second story. The second structure was built after the rezone. Both the second structure and the addition on the first structure met the zoning code that was in place at the time of construction.

Mr. Clugston explained that the applicant is requesting that the property be rezoned from RM-3 with a contract to RM-2.4 with no contract, and the stated intent of the rezone is to allow for an additional dwelling unit at 403 – 3rd Avenue North. He reviewed the six criteria that must be considered when reviewing rezone applications as follows:

- A. ***Whether the proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.*** Mr. Clugston explained that the Comprehensive Plan designation for the parcel is Multi Family-Medium Density, and compatible zoning classifications for this designation include both RM-3.0 and RM-2.4. Therefore, the proposed RM-2.4 zoning would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
- B. ***Whether the Proposal is consistent with the purposes of the zoning ordinance, and whether the proposal is consistent with the purposes of the proposed zone district.*** Mr. Clugston said the Board should keep in mind that, if approved, the rezone would eliminate the restrictions placed on development of the parcel in 1999, which specifically prohibits some RM-zone uses such as community facilities, boarding and rooming houses, bus stops and shelters. While these uses could be established if the subject property is rezoned, the applicant has indicated the intent now is to simply establish another dwelling unit within 403 – 3rd Avenue North. However, in the absence of a contract, there is nothing to prohibit the complete redevelopment of the site to RM-2.4 standards or the establishment of any of the permitted or conditionally-permitted uses allowed in the RM-2.4 zone. The purpose of the 1999 contract rezone was to create a “transition” or buffer between the RS-6 properties to the north and the RM-1.5 zoned property to the south. The Planning Board and City Council found this transition to be compatible with the zoning ordinance at the time. If the rezone is approved, the applicant could redevelop the property into a residential triplex or some type of office building, both of which are allowed in the RM-2.4 zone, and the buffer for single-family residential properties would be lost.
- C. ***The relationship of the proposed zoning change to the existing land uses and zoning of surrounding or nearby property.*** Once again, Mr. Clugston said the applicant has indicated that the intent of the rezone is to create an additional dwelling unit within the 403 – 3rd Avenue North structure without altering the external appearance of the building and site. While this action would likely result in little change and fit fairly well with surrounding development, the rezone could alter the relationship of the subject site with respect to the surrounding area since the current or future owners could redevelop the site more fully in accordance with the standards from the RM-2.4 zone.
- D. ***Whether there has been sufficient change in the character of the immediate or surrounding area or in city policy to justify the rezone.*** Mr. Clugston pointed out that with the exception of the remodel that was done on the 403 house and the addition of the 405 house, the character of the immediate and surrounding area has remained unchanged since the 8-unit condominium was constructed in 1995 and the contract rezone was approved in 1999. There has not been significant change in City policy or the Comprehensive Plan as it relates to the vicinity in the last

20 years, either. The 4th Avenue Cultural Corridor concept was developed in 2003-2005 and was subsequently included as an element of the Comprehensive Plan in 2006, but it applies to the parcels on 4th Avenue, south of the Edmonds Center for the Arts and not on 3rd Avenue. The Downtown Business (BD) zones were created in 2007 to simply replace the Community Business (BC) classification on the zoning map. Board Member Ellis pointed out that although the property to the south is zoned RM-1.5, many of the lots are still developed with single-family homes. Mr. Clugston noted that some of the single-family homes have been remodeled to accommodate uses other than residential.

- E. *Whether the property is economically and physically suitable for the uses allowed under the existing zoning, and under the proposed zoning. One factor could be the length of time the property has remained undeveloped compared to the surrounding area, and parcels elsewhere with the same zoning.*** Mr. Clugston said it does not appear the property would be suitable under the proposed RM-2.4 zoning. RM-2.4 zoning would increase the required setback from 5 to 10 feet, making the north and south portions of the existing building nonconforming. In addition, it does not appear that adequate off-street parking can be obtained as the structures are currently configured. As per code, no parking spaces may be located within the street setback. The structure currently has a two-car garage that provides the required off-street parking spaces for the single-family dwelling unit. If a duplex was allowed through approval of the rezone, additional off-street spaces would be required. Based on the length of the driveway and the required size of off-street parking spaces, there is currently not enough room on the driveway to establish the additional required spaces and significant changes to the structure would have to be made.
- F. *The relative gain to the public health, safety and welfare compared to the potential increase or decrease in value to the property owners.*** The property owner would realize increased value and income if the 403 unit were altered to be used as a duplex as envisioned by the proposed rezone. There would also be a small gain in tax valuation if the duplex use was established.

Chair Reed recalled that the current contract restricts the uses on the site. He asked if staff discussed with the applicant the option of placing similar restriction on the proposed new zone. Mr. Clugston said the issue may have been briefly discussed at the counter, but when the application was submitted, it was for a straight RM-2.4 zone. Even if approved with contract restrictions, parking would still be a problem and the setbacks would be nonconforming. Because the front unit was recently remodeled and the back unit was constructed in 2002, he does not anticipate the applicant will want to redevelop the site to accommodate new uses. Chair Reed noted that the subject property is 8,621 square feet in size.

Board Member Lovell referred to the existing site plan for the subject property (Attachment 10) and pointed out that the side setbacks for the existing buildings appear to be out of compliance with the setback table in Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC) 16.30.030. As per the table, an RM-3 zone requires a side setback of 15 feet. Mr. Clugston advised that there is a caveat in the RM development standards that allows a developer to apply the RS setbacks to RS development in an RM-zone if the lot is less than 10,000 square feet. The side setback for RS zones is 5 feet. Board Member Ellis observed that the side setback would be nonconforming if the site is rezoned and the front unit is converted into a duplex because the property owner would no longer be able to apply the RS setback standards.

Board Member Lovell said that, in a recent visit to the subject property, he found that the front unit appears to have been remodeled within the past year. Mr. Clugston said the remodel work was completed in 2008. A second story was added to transition the unit from a ramble to a two-story dwelling. Board Member Tibbott inquired about the size of the two structures. Mr. Clugston answered that the front unit is about 2,230 square feet, and the back unit is about 2,000 square feet. Board Member Tibbott asked how the size of the two structures compares with surrounding development. Mr. Clugston said the surrounding single-family homes are primarily rambles that are between 1,400 and 1,600 square feet.

Board Member Duncan pointed out that the subject property is shown in the Comprehensive Plan as being a single transition lot between RM-1.5 and RS-6 zones. He asked how this lot came to be designated as a transition lot. Mr. Chave explained that when the 1999 rezone was approved, the Comprehensive Plan was more general. It was later updated to be more parcel specific. It is likely the Comprehensive Plan was drawn to conform to the 1999 rezone decision. Since no other applicants had asked for a similar transition, the zoning remained the way it is. Board Member Duncan asked if neighboring property owners would be allowed to rezone properties to become transition zones. Mr. Clugston explained that the Comprehensive Plan would have to be amended in order to rezone an RS-6 lot because the current land use is low-density residential.

Board Member Ellis asked if the height limit for the subject property would change as a result of the proposed rezone. Mr. Clugston answered that the height limit would remain the same. Board Member Ellis summarized that, if the rezone is granted, the applicant plans to convert the front unit to a duplex. However, an RM-2.4 zoning designation would also allow three single-family units or a triplex on the site. The side setbacks would remain in conformance if the site were redeveloped into three separate residential units, but the existing structures would be nonconforming if a duplex or triplex were constructed on the site.

Steve Cohn, Applicant's Representative, said he has been a city planner for about 33 years, mostly working in King County suburban cities. He is semi-retired and has recently been doing consulting work for Sound Transit. He has known the applicant, Helena Parker, for 25 years, and agreed to help her with the rezone proposal. He focused his presentation on the six criteria that must be satisfied in order for the City Council to approve a rezone. He reviewed how the proposal is consistent with each of the criteria as follows:

- A. ***Whether the proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.*** Mr. Cohn said the site is designated Multi Family-Medium Density in the Comprehensive Plan, and this designation permits both RM-3.0 and RM-2.4 zoning classifications. In addition, the proposal is consistent with a number of goals in the Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan:
- Goal H calls for providing a variety of housing for all segments of the city that is consistent and compatible with the established character of the community.
 - Goal I calls for providing housing opportunities within activity centers consistent with the land use, transportation and economic goals of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Cohn summarized that the proposal will provide a choice for potential residents who want to live close to the downtown but do not want to be in a single-family home or in a three-story apartment or condominium.

- B. ***Whether the Proposal is consistent with the purposes of the zoning ordinance, and whether the proposal is consistent with the purposes of the proposed zone district.*** Mr. Cohn explained that the first listed purpose of the RM zone is to reserve and regulate areas for a variety of housing types and a range of greater densities than are available in the single-family residential zone, while still maintaining a residential environment. As noted in the Staff Report, the site is a transition zone. The question before the Board is whether or not there will be any real difference in impacts between development of the site under the existing RM-3.0 zone versus the proposed RM-2.4 zone. He noted that the RM-2.4 zone would permit one additional unit. He expressed his belief that if parking can be sited according to the regulations, if other code requirements can be met, and if there will be no exterior changes to the structure, then the impacts would be negligible.
- C. ***The relationship of the proposed zoning change to the existing land uses and zoning of surrounding or nearby property.*** Mr. Cohn explained that the intent of the rezone is to permit one additional dwelling unit on the property. As the Staff Report states, this would result in little impact to the surrounding area. He expressed his belief that it is extremely unlikely that the property will be used for another use because the size and configuration of the existing front structure does not lend itself to another use and consolidation of the two structures would be difficult and expensive given they are under separate ownership. In the unlikely event that a future owner decides to develop another use in the existing structure, the impacts would be minimal because the structure is relatively small.
- D. ***Whether there has been sufficient change in the character of the immediate or surrounding area or in city policy to justify the rezone.*** Mr. Cohn said the applicant agrees that there have been no physical changes in the surrounding area for many years, but there have been a number of use changes. In the last 10 years, both the hair salon and a computer repair store opened in vacant buildings near the subject property. Of equal importance are the changes that have occurred in City policy since the property was rezoned in 1999. For example, at the time of the rezone, the property was designated as Single Family Residential according to the rezone hearing record. Since then, it has been changed to Multi Family-Medium Density, which allows both the existing and the proposed zoning designations. The Comprehensive Plan does not provide any direction as to whether RM-3.0 or RM-2.4 zoning would be most appropriate for the site. The designation for the arts corridor was also changed. The edge of the

corridor district is less than a block away from the subject property. The purpose of the district is to support a vibrant downtown and art uses in particular. The intent is to intensify the uses in the district that currently are largely residential. Lastly, the downtown was designated as an activity area, which is important because Housing Goals I and I.1 encourage development in activity areas. The subject property is located within walking distance of the activity area.

E. *Whether the property is economically and physically suitable for the uses allowed under the existing zoning, and under the proposed zoning. One factor could be the length of time the property has remained undeveloped compared to the surrounding area, and parcels elsewhere with the same zoning.* Mr. Cohn said the main question raised in the Staff Report is whether the required parking could be situated on site given the street setback requirements. The applicant believes that it is possible to configure the parking to meet the requirements, but it will be tight. He agreed with staff that the side setbacks of the existing structures would become non-conforming if the property is rezoned to RM-2.4. The applicant would have to work with staff to modify the setback requirement or wait until the City changes its codes to allow a reduced setback. Another option would be to expand the multi-family zone further to the north. In any case, the applicant would be required to meet all of the City's current zoning requirements in order to create a third unit on the site.

F. *The relative gain to the public health, safety and welfare compared to the potential increase or decrease in value to the property owners.* Mr. Cohn expressed his belief that there would be a gain to the applicant and to the taxing districts if the rezone occurs and the property is used as a duplex. Other than that, there would be no appreciable impacts to the public.

Helene Parker, Applicant, Edmonds, said she owns the property and building at 403 – 3rd Avenue North, but not the property and building at 405 – 3rd Avenue North. When she purchased her unit, it was listed in Snohomish County records as a condominium.

Once again, Board Member Lovell referred to the site plan (Attachment 10), as well as a photograph taken in front of the building. He observed that if the front building is converted to two units, a total of four off-street parking spaces would be required, and they cannot be located within the street setback. Mr. Clugston clarified that the size of the units would indicate the number of parking spaces required, but it would likely be four. Board Member Lovell said it appears that only two vehicles can be accommodated in the current site configuration. Mr. Cohn explained that when the application was submitted, he did not realize that tandem parking would not be allowed. There are currently only two parking spaces on the site. He noted that the RM zone requires a 15-foot street setback, and the applicant could conceivably get two additional parking spaces in front of the unit. He acknowledged that parking would have to be addressed before the second unit would be allowed. Board Member Lovell expressed concern that there would be insufficient space to locate parking in front of the unit.

Board Member Cloutier reminded the Board that the purpose of the hearing is to consider the proposed rezone application and not focus on the specific layout of the site. Mr. Chave agreed that the purpose of the hearing is for the Board to consider whether or not the proposed rezone is consistent with land use patterns in the area. While suitability of the site is important, there may be multiple ways to address potential development other than keeping the property configured the way it is.

Board Member Ellis expressed concern that changing the zoning would cause the existing structure to be nonconforming by way of setbacks. Mr. Cohn emphasized that the additional unit would only be allowed if the setback and parking requirements can be met. The applicant is asking for an opportunity to see if it can be done. Board Member Ellis summarized that changing the zoning would not make the building nonconforming. The structure would only be made nonconforming if it is converted into a duplex.

Chair Reed recalled staff's earlier comment that if the zoning is changed as proposed, any of the primary and secondary uses allowed in RM zones would be allowed on the subject property with no restrictions. He asked if the applicant considered placing similar restrictions on the proposed rezone so the property would remain residential. Mr. Cohn said the applicant did not consider this option. As a long-time planner, he expressed his view that the unit is so small that most of the things that are allowed in the current RM zone could not be accommodated on the site; and if the use were to change, the impact would be very small. Again, he reminded the Board that any change in use would require the applicant to meet all the requirements

of the zoning code. He expressed his belief that zoning requirements would significantly limit the uses that could occur on the site.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Chair Reed pointed out that staff is recommending denial of the application. If the Board disagrees, they will need to modify the six findings contained in the Staff Report to support their recommendation.

Board Member Lovell observed that changing the zoning to RM-2.4 does not appear to do any damage. Staff's findings indicate that the site could be redeveloped in accordance with RM-2.4 zoning, but the existing structures would have to be eliminated. Mr. Clugston said it is difficult to make this determination based on the current layout. It may be possible for the applicant to find adequate space to meet the parking requirement. Mr. Chave clarified that, at this time, the City does not know what the ultimate design proposal will be for the site.

Vice Chair Stewart expressed concern about the conceivable uses that would be allowed on the subject property if it is rezoned to RM-2.4 with no restrictions. The property seems like an appropriate location for a transition between single-family and multi-family zones. She asked if the applicant has considered converting the top floor of her unit to an accessory dwelling unit. Mr. Clugston pointed out that accessory dwelling units are not allowed in multi-family zones.

Board Member Ellis clarified that approval of the rezone would not actually create another dwelling unit on the property. The applicant would have to submit a development application to the City that complies with all of the setback, parking and other code requirements before a permit would be granted. He said that staff's recommendation of denial appears to be based mainly on the lack of apparent feasible on-site parking. Mr. Clugston agreed that is part of the reason for the recommendation for denial. But the recommendation is also based on the fact that there has not been a lot of change in surrounding area or in the Comprehensive Plan to warrant the rezone. With the exception of a few buildings that might have changed uses, there has not been a lot of new construction and no changes in zoning. The only change in the Comprehensive Plan was the development of the arts corridor a few blocks away from the subject property. The arts corridor is a site specific area that does not necessarily impact the subject property.

Board Member Cloutier asked what transition an RM-3 zone would offer the surrounding properties that an RM-2.4 would not. Mr. Clugston pointed out that either zone would be compatible with the Comprehensive Plan designation. Board Member Tibbott asked if an RM-3 zone would have more restrictions on use. Mr. Clugston answered that the uses allowed in either zone are the same. However, the property is currently zoned RM-3 with a contract that further limits the uses. Board Member Cloutier pointed out that the Comprehensive Plan does not identify the need to restrict the uses as outlined in the 1999 contract rezone.

Chair Reed asked if the upper level of the front unit could be occupied by another family if the rezone is approved as presented. Board Member Cloutier advised that the applicant would be required to submit an application to establish the additional dwelling unit, and all the current code requirements would apply. The rezone, itself, will not establish another dwelling unit; all of the setback and parking requirements must be met. If the rezone is approved, the property owner would have the flexibility to make a proposal to adjust the use of the land.

Although he concurred with some of staff's points, Board Member Cloutier said he did not feel it would be appropriate to deny the application simply because there has not significant change in the area to warrant the rezone (Criteria D). Board Members Tibbott and Ellis concurred. Board Member Tibbott expressed his belief that changing the zoning from RM-3 to RM-2.4 would be a minor change. The applicant is not proposing to change the Comprehensive Plan or the uses allowed. He said he supports the proposed rezone. Board Member Ellis said that when he first read staff's recommendation, he was convinced that the rezone should be denied because he was concerned about creating nonconforming buildings and the problems associated with parking. However, the conversation has convinced him that it is not the Board's charge to resolve these points. The rezone would not create a nonconforming property, but it would allow the property owners to talk about changes in the future. He agreed with Board Member Tibbott that the proposed rezone represents a minor change. Instead of a transition from eight units to two and then one, the transition would be from eight units to three and then to one. He expressed his belief that giving the property owner more flexibility is appropriate. Vice Chair Stewart concurred.

Board Member Tibbott said he is still concerned that the rezone would allow for office uses, which is very different than the uses on the multi-family zone to the south. While this change is not likely, it would be possible, and nothing would prevent the property owners to the north, west and east from proposing to do the same thing. Introducing a new zone could result in a number of different uses that could spread to other lots. From his perspective there has not been a lot of change in the neighborhood to warrant a rezone of the subject property and it could set the tone for a different type of development in the future.

CHAIR REED MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD FILE NUMBER AMD20130006 (REZONE OF PARCELS LOCATED AT 403 AND 405 3RD AVENUE NORTH) TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL BASED ON THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

- A. *Whether the proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.* The proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan since the RM-2.4 zoning classification is one of the possible implementing zones for the Multi Family – Medium Density designations.
- B. *Whether the Proposal is consistent with the purposes of the zoning ordinance, and whether the proposal is consistent with the purposes of the proposed zone district.* The proposal to rezone the parcel RM-2.4 in order to establish one additional dwelling unit within “Unit A” at 403 – 3rd Avenue North is consistent with the purposes of the zoning ordinances and the zoning district.
- C. *The relationship of the proposed zoning change to the existing land uses and zoning of surrounding or nearby property.* The proposal would be appropriate in relation to the surrounding area.
- D. *Whether there has been sufficient change in the character of the immediate or surrounding area or in city policy to justify the rezone.* There has been sufficient change in the City’s policy to justify the rezone.
- E. *Whether the property is economically and physically suitable for the uses allowed under the existing zoning, and under the proposed zoning. One factor could be the length of time the property has remained undeveloped compared to the surrounding area, and parcels elsewhere with the same zoning.* The site is currently suitable for the inclusion of an additional dwelling unit within the confines of Unit A at 403 – 34d Avenue North.
- F. *The relative gain to the public health, safety and welfare compared to the potential increase or decrease in value to the property owners.* There is a gain in public health/safety/welfare compared to the potential increase in value to the property owners.

BOARD MEMBER CLOUTIER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Board Member Ellis noted that Criteria E should be included in the motion as written by staff since it points out that further process is necessary before the project envisioned by the applicant could actually occur.

BOARD MEMBER ELLIS MOVED THAT THE MOTION BE AMENDED TO REPLACE CRITERIA E WITH THE FOLLOWING:

- E. *Whether the property is economically and physically suitable for the uses allowed under the existing zoning, and under the proposed zoning. One factor could be the length of time the property has remained undeveloped compared to the surrounding area, and parcels elsewhere with the same zoning.* The site is not currently suitable for the inclusion of an additional dwelling unit within the confines of Unit A at 403 – 34d Avenue North. Significant alternations would need to occur to Unit A in order to provide the required off-street parking a duplex in that location would require. If the entire site were to be redeveloped, it would be physically suitable for it since the property is flat and located on an arterial.

BOARD MEMBER CLOUTIER SECONDED THE MOTION TO AMEND. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

APPROVED

THE MAIN MOTION, AS AMENDED, CARRIED 5-2, WITH BOARD MEMBERS DUNCAN AND TIBBOTT VOTING IN OPPOSITION.

Mr. Chave advised that the Board's recommendation would be forwarded to the City Council for review and a public hearing. The applicant and other parties of record will be notified of the hearing date.

PUBLIC HEARING ON PLANNING BOARD'S PROCESS AND NAMING RECOMMENDATION FOR THE SR-104 MINI PARK (FILE NUMBER AMD20130007)

Ms. Hite advised that the SR-104 Mini Park is located adjacent to the ferry holding lanes in downtown Edmonds. It is owned and operated by the City and has a variety of amenities, including a restroom, picnic tables and benches, and vending machines. It is heavily used during the peak season by people waiting in line for the ferry and by pedestrians enjoying a walk in the downtown area. At the request of the Planning Board, the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services staff solicited naming proposals from the community, and 104 recommendations were received. The Planning Board formed a subcommittee to review the proposed names and present a recommendation to the Board. She referred to the complete list of proposed names, which was attached to the Staff Report. The purpose of tonight's discussion is to review the subcommittee's recommendation and solicit public feedback. Following the public hearing, the Board will make a recommendation to the City Council for final approval.

Chair Reed referred to the City's Park Naming Policy, which was adopted approximately three years ago. He noted that staff has followed the policy procedures, as written. It is now up to the Board to review the recommendations, conduct a public hearing, and forward a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council will take final action.

Ron Clyborne, Edmonds, said that, out of respect for the Planning Board's time and energy, he was speaking on behalf of all of those present (fellow veterans, their wives and children). He was also present to speak on behalf of the Edmonds Rotary Day Breakers, the Edmonds Chamber, Veterans of Foreign Wars, American Legion and many citizens of Edmonds. He pointed out that there are over 40,000 residents in Edmonds. Most communities of this size across the United States have some type of memorial honoring veterans, but the City of Edmonds does not. They feel it is time that the City honor all those who have served in the armed forces. On behalf of over 1,000 members of the organizations he just outlined, they would like to thank the Planning Board for the opportunity to suggest a name for the SR-104 Mini Park located at 131 Sunset Avenue. He urged the Board to recommend naming the park "Veterans Memorial Park."

Mr. Clyborne shared a quote from his commander as follows, "It is our sacred obligation to honor and memorialize all our veterans who sacrificed so much in the defense of liberty, freedom, and the American way. In light of the willingness of these men and women to sacrifice so much in the discharge of their duties, the dedication of Veterans Memorial Park would serve as a symbol of the community's lasting gratitude. For those they honor, their duties are now done, and it is our responsibility to memorialize their commitment and sacrifice to our great nation."

Mr. Clyborne said that, in the event the Board looks favorably upon the suggested, the Veterans of Foreign Wars (VFW) and the American Legion are prepared to work with the City to create a suitable commemorative memorial. He said he recently learned that the Edmonds Museum is planning to relocate the few memorials that are presently located in front of the museum in the near future. The VFW and American Legion have had discussions with the Museum to relocate the three items, including the stone that lists the names of all the Edmonds veterans that died in combat in the past. It is their intent to relocate the memorials to the Veterans Memorial Park. In addition, they would like to add an education component at the park. If the proposed name is approved and the City embraces the idea of a veterans memorial, the VFW and American Legion is planning to establish an interactive monument in the park that would educate thousands of Edmonds and Woodway youth, as well as those waiting for the ferry, about the history of the country and the important roll service men and women play in preserving the American way of life. He respectfully requested that the Planning Board enthusiastically recommend to the City Council the name Veterans Memorial Park.

Michelle Clyborne, Edmonds, said she was present to read the following letter from Maria A. Montalvo, Executive Director, Our Family Foundation, into the record:

APPROVED

“Edmonds offers great parks for a great many lucky citizens and visitors. We benefit from the joy and play that we receive from the variety of offerings in our City and County parks. Having a park named for something or someone is a further gift to those who visit it because we can take a moment to learn more about things outside of ourselves. We all likely remember visiting a park in another town or country and reading about who it is named after and what historic event. Our SR-104 Mini Park is the perfect opportunity for Edmonds to embrace an opportunity to allow us to remember important moments in our history, and the people who lived them: Veterans Memorial Park.

We all know of the impact that veterans have on the American way of life. The men and women who serve in these wars have been remembered not only for what they were fighting for but for the sacrifices they and their families made. This small park is well-located to show our city’s commitment to this important part of our population and make sure we never forget.

Edmonds has a number of parents and grandparents of service members. Edmonds Community College is serving a growing number of veteran students (more than 350 and growing), so much so that they are initiating several new programs and campaigns for these veterans. Many of us are lucky enough to be able to work to support veterans and their families every day, as I am.

I’d like to share a story about a man, a Soldier, who represents why I am speaking in support of naming SR-104 Mini Park the Veterans Memorial Park. Brian is just like many other 35-year-old men—a father of three, a husband, a hard worker trying to support his family, and a big sports lover, especially of baseball and football. However, Brian has been deployed in a war zone on and off for several years, and as he prepared to return recently, he lost several of his closest fellow Soldiers. He is coming home to live his life and care for his family, but he will think about those men and women often. He will remember when they were lost and how important each was to their own mother, father, husband, wife, brother, sister, friend. This small park gives Edmonds a chance to show that it remembers them, as well.”

Board Member Tibbott reported that the subcommittee considered a number of factors when reviewing the list of proposed names for the SR-104 Mini Park. They noted that the benefit of that particular location is it draws tourists and those passing through the City out of their cars, and the park offers a great opportunity to educate them about other aspects of Edmonds such as the arts and their parks and recreational opportunities. He said the subcommittee is recommending the park be renamed Anway Park to memorialize a man who was well respected by law enforcement and served the community in a variety of ways. It is a compelling choice to immortalize a public servant by naming a park after him. He said the subcommittee did consider naming the park Veterans Memorial Park because there is not a specific park for veterans. While the subcommittee had not heard that the Museum was going to relocate their veteran memorials, there is also a plaque to memorialize veterans in the public plaza by the public safety building. He said the subcommittee also considered the appropriateness of naming the park Veterans Memorial Park given that it is located in traffic and is not a particularly meditative or recreational place. They felt there are or will be better locations in the City for a veterans’ memorial park. Again, he said the subcommittee is recommending the name Anway Park to identify with a person who would be known by those who work and use the transportation system. They also expressed a desire to consider ways to improve the park as an educational and informational zone for the rest of Edmonds.

Board Member Cloutier clarified that no disrespect to veterans was intended or implied by the subcommittee, as he is also a veteran. He said he supports the name Anway Park because the site is not frequented by Edmonds residents. It is also loud and is used as a place for people waiting for the ferry to let their animals relieve themselves. It is not a place to relax and think about history or to take your kids to play. Mr. Anway served the City for over 30 years in that location as a volunteer. His exemplifies the small town character of Edmonds. Veterans should be memorialized, but he does not think this park is the right location. He suggested there are other locations coming forward that would be more suitable for a veterans memorial.

Board Member Lovell suggested that the park be named Richard Anway Memorial Park rather than simply Anway Park. He felt that Anway was too close to Amway, which might confuse the public. He asked if the City has a plan for the future of the park. Ms. Hite answered that there is no master plan for the park, but it offers several park amenities such as a restroom, walking path, vending machines, picnic tables, and a place for concession stands. The park is small and highly utilized by ferry traffic.

Board Member Lovell asked if there is adequate space at the park to accommodate memorial events and/or celebrations associated with a memorial park for veterans. He said it does not appear that the site is suitable for this type of use from a size and location standpoint. Ms. Hite pointed out that there is no designated parking for the park, and it is not a destination park. It would not be possible to host events in that location, and it does not have the capacity for large gatherings. The park is too closed off by the ferry holding lanes. She summarized that there is no vehicular access to the park except for those waiting for the ferry.

Board Member Lovell recalled that a few months ago, Mayor Earling presented a possible plan to address ferry traffic and the railroad crossing. He provided a rough schematic prepared by David Evans Associates for providing below-grade crossing. This would be a major infrastructure project that will need to be addressed at some point. If the plan is implemented, the park would no longer be heavily used by ferry traffic.

Chair Reed said he is also a veteran and he respects the service rendered by the service men and women and what they have done for the entire country. He expressed concern that the veterans' memorials that are currently located at the Museum will be relocated or put in storage. They need to find a new location for these three pieces. He said he also supports the name Anway Park as Mr. Anway did a lot to serve the Edmonds community. He said that if he had to choose, he is leaning towards Veterans Memorial Park.

Vice Chair Stewart asked where the memorial plaza referenced earlier by Board Member Tibbott is located. Ms. Hite answered that it is located between the Public Safety Building and the Edmonds Museum. It was sponsored by the Sister City Commission, and it does have memorial plaques. Vice Chair Stewart asked if this would be a more suitable place for a veterans memorial plaza. Ms. Hite agreed that this would be a good location for a veterans memorial plaza, but there are likely other places in existing or future City parks that might be appropriate, as well. She agreed to work with the Veterans to look for a more suitable location for a memorial park.

Vice Chair Stewart noted that some cities provide a wall that is inscribed with veterans' names. She suggested that a wall would not occupy a lot of space, but it would provide a way to memorialize those who have served our country. She said it is imperative that the City find a suitable location for a memorial to honor veterans.

For the Board's information, Ms. Hite provided a photograph showing a front view of the SR-104 Mini Park. She also provided an aerial photograph of the park.

Board Member Ellis said he is also a veteran. He acknowledged that numerous people have indicated support for the name Veterans Memorial Park, and he believes the name would be suitable, as well. He commended the veterans for their enthusiasm to make the park better, but he felt a veterans' memorial park deserved a grander location than the SR-104 mini park. A veterans memorial park should be more accessible to people who want to visit and commemorate those who have served. He questioned if it would be possible to capture the veterans' enthusiasm to help the City find a better location. Ms. Hite made a commitment to work with the community to try and figure out a more grand and suitable location and bring a recommendation back to the Board.

Board Member Ellis requested more information about the Museum's decision to relocate the three veterans' memorials in front of their building. Mr. Clyborne explained that the Museum is interested in restoring the exterior of the building to its original architectural integrity in an effort to obtain national historic recognition. The bell will be given to a school, and the three veterans' memorial will be stored until a new location can be found.

Board Member Ellis asked if those who nominated the name Veterans Memorial Park considered the characteristics of the park and the fact that it is not accessible to Edmonds Residents. While it would be great to show those who are passing through Edmonds the great esteem the City has for its veterans, it would not be a great place for Edmonds residents to visit. Mr. Clyborne said they did not consider this viewpoint. He said the veterans generally support a proposal to acquire a better location that is grander and more accessible to residents of the City, but their thinking at the time was that the City currently has nothing to memorialize veterans and the SR-104 Mini Park was an opportunity to remedy the deficiency. They wanted to take advantage of the opportunity. Their original thinking was simplistic, and their goal was to honor all veterans, past, present and future. They considered the installation of flag poles with flags from all branches of the service, and they have

already raised some money to fund the project. If they can raise enough money, they would like to provide interactive sculptures for the children visiting the park to play on. He observed that the best way to honor veterans is for children to come out of their cars and play on the sculptures.

Mr. Clyborne said he has chaired the 4th of July event for the Chamber for the past 12 years, and he had the opportunity to work with Dick Anway. He said he is happy to hear that Dick Anway will be honored. Perhaps with the Board and staff's support, they can find another location that is more suitable for a veteran' memorial park.

BOARD MEMBER TIBBOTT MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL THAT THE SR-104 MINI PARK BE RENAMED ANWAY PARK. BOARD MEMBER CLOUTIER SECONDED THE MOTION.

Chair Reed agreed with Board Member Lovell's previous comment that the park should be named Richard F. Anway Park rather than just Anway Park.

BOARD MEMBER TIBBOTT MOVED TO AMEND HIS MOTION BY CHANGING THE RECOMMENDED NAME OF THE PARK TO RICHARD F. ANWAY PARK AND ADDING THE RECOMMENDATION THAT, IN ADDITION TO RENAMING THE PARK, THE CITY SHOULD INSTALL AN APPROPRIATE PLAQUE TO GIVE CONTEXT AND HISTORY ABOUT MR. ANWAY'S SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY. BOARD MEMBER CLOUTIER, THE SECONDER OF THE MOTION, ACCEPTED THE AMENDMENT. THE MOTION, AS AMENDED, CARRIED 5-1-1 WITH BOARD MEMBER LOVELL ABSTAINING AND BOARD MEMBER REED VOTING IN OPPOSITION.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Chair Reed reviewed the Board's updated extended agenda. He specifically noted that a public hearing regarding changes to the RM-EW and BC-EW zoning standards is scheduled for July 10th. Also on July 10th, the Board will discuss implementation of the Strategic Plan. He advised that he has reviewed the Strategic Plan and identified the action items that fall within the purview of the Planning Board and/or the Planning Division. He agreed to have a list available for the Board's review on July 10th.

Chair Reed advised that the Board is tentatively scheduled to continue their work on the Westgate and Five Corners Plans on July 24th. He noted that construction of the Five Corners Roundabout is scheduled to begin in 2014. He said the Board will also discuss potential code amendments regarding the wireless communications regulations on July 24th.

Mr. Chave announced that the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Manager has indicated that the Quarterly Parks Report will be postponed UNTIL September 11th. That leaves an open agenda on August 14th. Chair Reed suggested that perhaps it would be appropriate to continue their work on the Five Corners Plan on August 14th.

Chair Reed reviewed the pending items on the Board's extended agenda, which includes Community Development Code re-organization, Five Corners and Westgate Neighborhood Plans, further Highway 99 implementation, potential updates to the Economic Development Plan to implement the Strategic Plan, and exploration of incentive zoning and incentives for sustainable development.

Chair Reed announced that the Board would cancel their second meeting in November, which is scheduled the night before Thanksgiving, and their second meeting in December, which is scheduled for Christmas Day.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Reed thanked Vice Chair Stewart for preparing and presenting the Board's quarterly report to the City Council. He also thanked the Park Naming Subcommittee for their hard work reviewing the proposals for the SR-104 Mini Park. He said he hopes the City can find another suitable location for a memorial to recognize veterans.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Ellis thanked the Park Naming Subcommittee, as well. He said the effort was much harder than he anticipated it would be.

Board Member Lovell reported on his attendance at the June 19th Economic Development Commission (EDC) meeting where it was announced that the EDC has prepared a draft ordinance to limit the amount of office space allowed in the Downtown Business (BD) 1 zone. They voted to forward the ordinance to the Planning Board for action. Board Member Lovell advised that each of the items in the Strategic Plan that the EDC believes it is responsible for have been assigned to one of the four subcommittees (land use, tourism, technology, and communications). The EDC Chair asked each of the subcommittees to report back with a plan for implementing their assigned action items.

Board Member Lovell advised that the EDC's Land Use Subcommittee discussed the concept of potentially designating an area within the City as a planned development area. In conjunction with this effort, the City could undertake a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review that could be used as a governing document when future development proposals are proposed in the planned area. The idea is it would save developers both time and money to have a predetermination made of the environmental impacts. The costs associated with the study would be allocated to developers when projects move forward. He noted that this process has been utilized by the City of Mountlake Terrace. He said he forwarded information from Mountlake Terrace to the EDC, and he would send the information to Planning Division staff, as well.

Vice Chair Stewart reported on her attendance at the City Council's Mini Retreat where a portion of the agenda was dedicated to a presentation from the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) regarding their responsibility for certain roadways located in Edmonds. There were a number of questions pertaining to the Westgate Plan, but it did not appear that many were addressed. The consultant from the University of Washington team was prepared to present, but she decided to hold her comments for another opportunity. She did, however, answer some questions about the Westgate Plan as it relates to SR-104. A representative from WSDOT mentioned there is a policy that enables them to serve as consultant to towns to help them plan areas such as Westgate. They are willing to put on a workshop for the Planning Board and City Council members to discuss this particular site and forecast what might be the issues and some solutions.

Vice Chair Stewart also reported that at the mini retreat, the City Engineer provided a PowerPoint presentation to demonstrate some opportunities for bicycle and pedestrian improvements such as raised crossings, high-intensity cross walks, and bike boxes that allow bicyclists to be ahead of traffic when waiting at intersections. The engineer provided visuals that got those in attendance thinking that there is hope for the intersection to move bicycles, pedestrians and cars. She said it was mentioned that, in general, vehicle miles traveled has plateaued or declined in recent years. The prediction is that the level of service on 100th Avenue will not change significantly, depending on how the intersection at 100th Avenue and SR-104 is set up. The engineer was optimistic that things could be worked out.

Vice Chair Stewart advised that no action or direction was given by the City Council about whether or not the Board should continue their work on the Westgate Plan. However, there was a favorable response to perhaps having a workshop about the intersection at SR-104 and 100th Avenue to discuss ideas for moving people and traffic in a safe manner. It was emphasized that in terms of grant funding, including plans to improve walkability is a significant plus.

Vice Chair Stewart said she recently attended her daughter's 20-year high school reunion where one of her daughter's classmates who lives in Woodway commented that Edmonds is "getting really cool." She mentioned that there was a lot more to do downtown, and there is so much more life. However, she also commented that it is difficult to get a taxi to take you home in the evening.

Chair Reed announced that a presentation regarding the Westgate Plan will be made to the City Council on July 23rd.

Board Member Tibbott commented said he recently walked through the SR-104 Mini Park, which did not take long. He was struck by the overwhelming sound from the ferry traffic and the aroma that permeates the area that will not go away. He said the subcommittee agreed that the City could find a better location for a veterans memorial, and he encouraged the Board to carefully consider upcoming opportunities that would be more suitable than the SR-104 mini park.

APPROVED

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

APPROVED