

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

January 24, 2001

Chair John Dewhirst called the regular meeting of the Planning Board to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Third Floor Meeting Room of City Hall located at 121 – 5th Avenue North.

PRESENT

John Dewhirst, Chair
Beverly Lindh, Vice Chair
Virginia Cassutt
Bruce Witenberg
Jim Crim
Joanne Langendorfer (arrived at 8:10)
Stan Monlux

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Duane Bowman, Development Services Dir.
Stephen Clifton, Community Services Dir.
Karin Noyes, Recorder

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION BY MR. WITENBERG, SECONDED BY MS CASSUTT, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 10, 2001 WITH THE FOLLOWING CORRECTION TO PAGE 2, LAST PARAGRAPH, FIRST LINE: CHANGE “PEHA’S” TO “PIHA’S.” MOTION CARRIED.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

There were no changes made to the proposed agenda.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Roger Hertrich, 1020 Puget Drive, said that the exterior of the new City Council chamber looks like one of the “Woodway oil tanks.” He inquired if the Board would consider recommending that some type of art be placed on the building to make it more attractive. He suggested that perhaps a mural describing the City’s history would be appropriate.

Mr. Hertrich also requested that the Board consider holding a public hearing on the design plans for the bulkhead and Olympic Beach Park. He noted that there are many citizens who have concerns about this project—particularly the width of the walkway and the use of upland property for something other than a green area.

Mr. Dewhirst advised that artwork for the new City building would likely fall under the purview of the Arts Commission. He inquired how someone would go about placing this issue before the Arts Commission. Mr. Chave suggested that a copy of the minutes, including Mr. Hertrich’s request, could be forwarded to the Arts Commission.

INTRODUCTION OF STEPHEN CLIFTON, COMMUNITY SERVICES DIRECTOR

Mr. Clifton introduced himself to the Board and described some of the responsibilities of his position, which include scheduling, organizing and planning major projects for the City. He said he works with the other directors to plan and organize projects, and also represents the Mayor, the City Council and the City as a whole on community groups. He is currently working on the Edmonds Crossing Project, which will include the relocation of the ferry terminal to Point Edwards. It will also include the relocation of SR-104 heading west at the Pine Street intersection. It will be designed to hold up to eight lanes of traffic, or two full boatloads, and will also include a multi-modal aspect that will connect the rail, bus, vehicular and pedestrian traffic. He noted that this is a ten to fifteen-year project, with Phase 1 being completed by 2008 and Phase 2 by 2015.

Mr. Clifton said he is also working with Sound Transit and the next technical advisory committee meeting should be about mid February. They are hoping to get the north line of the commuter rail line in place and functioning by early 2002, and it appears that a station will be located temporarily in downtown Edmonds. In addition, Mr. Clifton said that he is working with other City staff to review the issues related to the Endangered Species Act and issues related to watershed planning. He said the City has contributed over \$10,000 to participate in a group doing watershed planning in response to the Endangered Species Act. He is also working on the RFP for Fire Station 16 in the north part of Edmonds. They are hoping to gain occupancy of this facility by 2002.

Mr. Monlux inquired what elements of the Edmonds Crossing project have already been funded. Mr. Clifton answered that the City has been successful in acquiring about \$10.5 million in grant funds since 1993, and they have only spent about \$2 million thus far to prepare the environmental impact statement for the project. The final environmental impact statement will be issued in the near future. By 2001 the City would like to obtain a record of decision from the State Highway Department so that they can move on to acquisition and design.

Mr. Monlux inquired if the Endangered Species Act requirements could end up holding the project up. Mr. Clifton answered that the City is ahead of the environmental requirements with the hope that they can avoid future problems.

Mr. Dewhirst asked if Mr. Clifton is involved with maintenance of the existing facilities within the City. Mr. Clifton responded that the Parks Department and the Public Works Department are responsible for the maintenance function. He said staff is working on the capital-funding program for maintenance.

REVIEW OF DRAFT DESIGN GUIDELINES AND POTENTIAL CODE AMENDMENTS REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT THE DESIGN GUIDELINES

Mr. Chave recalled that the City Council recently accepted the consultant's report for the Design Guidelines and tasked the Board to hold public hearings and provide a recommended draft document to the Council for consideration. Since that time, staff has met with the Architectural Design Board (ADB), who came up with a list of fairly specific comments that they would like to incorporate into the document. These comments were provided to the Board at the last meeting. At the Board's request, staff divided the comments into three categories: simple formatting issues, issues requiring clarification, and policy issues that will need discussion and ultimately a decision. Staff has reviewed the issues that needed further clarification with the design consultant and cleaned up the confusing items. Staff attempted to make some of the formatting and clarification changes in the draft, but it is up to the Board to decide whether they should be incorporated into the document that will be used for the public hearing or not. Mr. Chave said that all of the ADB's comments are included in the current draft of the Design Guidelines as either underline/strikeout or in separate boxes.

Mr. Chave said that staff anticipates that at the next meeting, staff will have a fairly concise summary of code amendments related to the Design Guidelines. He recalled that the Board has discussed whether the Design Guidelines should be adopted as part of the Development Code or as part of the Comprehensive Plan. This decision will have an impact on the code amendments that are required to implement the Design Guidelines.

APPROVED

Mr. Dewhirst said his interpretation of the Council's approval is that they accepted the draft Design Guidelines as meeting the design consultant's contract. He did not feel that this approval would prohibit the Board from making changes to the document prior to the public hearing. Mr. Chave agreed, and added that the Council accepted the draft document as a complete document from the consultant, with the understanding that the Board would have the ability to change the document before sending it back to them for approval.

Mr. Witenberg said it was his understanding that the Council approved the draft document to be used for public hearing purposes without any changes being made prior to presenting it to the public. Mr. Chave answered that the staff requested Council approval that the consultant had done his job and that they were ready to start through the public hearing process. Staff did not ask the Council to approve the indelible draft to use for the public hearing. Ms. Cassutt recalled that at the last meeting, the Board requested the staff to clarify with the Council whether or not the document could be changed.

Mr. Bowman concurred with Mr. Chave's interpretation of the Council's approval. The document was presented to the Council as the draft report from the consultant, and the staff asked the Council to accept the report so that it could be moved to the public hearing process. There was nothing to restrict the Board from modifying the draft proposal before the public hearing. Mr. Chave said he would caution against the Board making changes that would alter the overall scope or intent of the document, but things that clarify and improve the consistency of the document could be made prior to the public hearing.

Mr. Witenberg inquired if the document distributed to the public prior to the hearing would have underlines and strikeouts showing the changes that were accepted by the Board. Mr. Chave suggested that it would be best to start with a clean draft for the public. After that point, any changes made during the hearing process could be identified in underline and strike out format. However, the Board should clearly identify that the draft was modified to clarify some sections, but no policy changes were made.

Mr. Chave said that whether the Design Guidelines are adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan or as part of the Development Code, code changes would be required to implement some sections. He said the City Attorney has recommended that the document be included as part of the Development Code. Mr. Witenberg requested clarification as to the advantages or disadvantages of both options. Mr. Chave answered that the Development Code is more adaptive to standards and is fairly specific in nature. The Comprehensive Plan is a policy document. The Development Code provides the specifics on how the Comprehensive Plan policies are carried out. The decision depends upon how the City wants to view the Design Guidelines. A lot of the language is not real specific and is intended to give guidance, while at the same time allow flexibility. However, there are parts of the Design Guidelines that are specific. The intent of the Design Guidelines is to lead developers down a certain path, but give them flexibility about what the actual result will be.

Mr. Monlux suggested that perhaps one approach would be to include the Design Guidelines as part of the Comprehensive Plan at least until after all of the code issues have been considered. Mr. Chave said that if the Board would like the guidelines to be more rigid, they should be included in the code. However, if they want to allow flexibility, they should be part of the Comprehensive Plan. The Board continued to discuss the pros and cons of each of the options.

Mr. Witenberg recalled that the Board requested that staff ask the City Attorney if the required code changes must be considered and approved simultaneously with the Design Guidelines. He said his impression is that the City Attorney feels it is most important to adopt the guidelines first. Once the guidelines are in place, the City would be at less risk of legal challenge. The Board could then begin their review of the required code amendments. Mr. Chave agreed. Mr. Witenberg suggested that the Board should start the process by reviewing the ADB's comments and determining what changes should be made to the draft document. Considering the guidelines and the code amendments at the same time will be too confusing.

Mr. Chave advised that it is important that the public have sufficient time to review the document before the public hearing. He suggested that the decision about whether the document should become part of the Development Code or the Comprehensive Plan could be decided at a later date. Mr. Dewhirst agreed that if the Board tries to figure out the content of the document, where it should be located, and the review process all at the same time, it would be too confusing. He proposed that the Board consider the content of the document first and remove the other issues from the table until after the draft is ready for circulation to the public. The Board agreed that they should start by reviewing the comments provided by the ADB and any comments that the Board members might have regarding the draft document.

APPROVED

Mr. Monlux emphasized that it is important that the public is aware that by adopting the Design Guidelines, the City would not be automatically adopting changes to the code. Each code change would require a public hearing process.

The Board reviewed the draft Design Guidelines dated December 6, 2000 and made the following comments and changes:

Page 1

The Board agreed that the first paragraph, fourth line, should be corrected by taking the comma at the end of the sentence out. In the middle paragraph, the words “are intended to” should be deleted.

Mr. Dewhirst recalled that the Board previously decided that the document should identify who must comply with the Design Guidelines at the beginning of the document. Mr. Chave said that this issue is clarified on Pages 35 and 43 of the document. However, the Board agreed that this information should be located at the beginning of the document, as well. The breakdown of small, medium and large projects should be identified up front. They directed staff to expand or rewrite this section so that the three categories are explained without going through the entire body of the document. The Board agreed that this would alert the public that there are different requirements, depending upon the size of the project.

Page 2

The Board discussed whether or not the drawings for large projects should require a stamp from an appropriate licensed professional. They decided not to consider any changes to this section until after the public hearing. Mr. Dewhirst suggested that the first bulleted item be changed by adding “driveways, sidewalks and bus stops” at the end. The Board agreed.

Page 3

The Board agreed that the second paragraph should be deleted as recommended by the ADB.

Page 4

In reference to Bullet A, the Board questioned how staff came up with the 50 percent figure as opposed to 10 percent. Mr. Dewhirst expressed his concern that 50 percent is too great of a number, especially since it would be applied across the board. He felt that 10 percent would be more appropriate. He said he understands that the intent is to balance out an encroachment into one setback in trade off for greater setbacks in other locations. However, this is a broad-based number and it would be applied to other areas in the guidelines, as well.

The Board discussed Bullet B, which would require mitigation. They noted that the definition is left to the discretion of the ADB. Mr. Chave clarified that the ADB wants to have Design Guidelines in place, but they want to have the ability to allow flexibility by require an exchange to mitigate the impacts.

The Board agreed that for public hearing purposes, the percentage number identified in Bullet A should remain as 10. They agreed that Bullet C should be deleted from the document.

Page 7

The Board agreed that the words “and are in good health,” should be added to the first line of Item 2.

Page 9

The Board agreed that the word “building” should be added before the word “setback.”

Page 10

APPROVED

The Board accepted the ADB's recommendation to add the words "commercial and multi-family" before the word "parking" in Item 5. They also agreed to replace the words "Use Type" with "Zone" in the first heading, and the words "Along Street Frontage" with "Parking Lots Abutting Streets" in the second heading.

Page 11

Mr. Dewhirst suggested, and the Board concurred, that the illustration that was provided on Page 11 be changed. He noted that to the right of Building C is a driveway with a crosswalk going into a dead end parking lot. He said putting a crosswalk in this location could create problems with pedestrian access. He said that if the crosswalk were moved to the north side of the driveway, the problem would be eliminated.

Page 12

The Board agreed that the drawing on Page 12 should also be changed as recommended on Page 11.

Page 13

The Board agreed that Objective D should be changed by adding the word "pedestrian" after the word "direct." Objective E should be changed to "Integrate pedestrian and vehicular access between adjacent developments." Standard 1 should be changed to indicate that the percentage for RM should be 10, and the reference to guest parking should be deleted.

Page 14

Mr. Dewhirst referred to Item 3 and inquired regarding the rationale for 4-foot sidewalks in the RM zone. Mr. Chave said RM zones have fairly constrained sites, similar to the downtown area. Mr. Dewhirst noted that a high percentage of elderly people live in the downtown area RM developments, and he inquired if a 4-foot wide sidewalk would meet the ADA requirements. Mr. Chave noted that the proposed standard for RM development is new and would meet the minimum ADA requirements. He suggested that raising the standard from zero to six feet is a substantial increase in the requirements for sidewalks in parking areas of RM developments. He noted that RM parking is generally located close to the units.

The Board agreed to accept the change to four-foot wide sidewalks for public hearing purposes.

Page 18

Mr. Dewhirst said that this page would be impacted by whatever the Board decides the percentage should be for Bullet A on Page 4. Mr. Chave said the ADB has indicated that they like the general standard that the garage entry on a frontage street be limited to 25 feet wide, but they would like the ability to vary this requirement on a case-by-case basis with mitigation. The Board agreed that the ADB should be allowed to vary the requirement up to ten percent on a case-by-case basis.

Page 19

Mr. Chave explained that the ADB expressed concern regarding Item 6. The way it is written, the entire building would have to be set back from the corner. The ADB would like to clarify that the first floor should be set back, but the second floor could have an overhang. Their intent was to adjust the language to allow this to occur. The Board agreed that the language should be clarified to better explain the intent. They recommended that the word "areas" be changed to "zones" and that a diagram should be provided to illustrate the intent.

Page 20

The Board agreed that all reference to the height limit should be deleted from the drawings. Mr. Witenberg inquired where the 25-foot height would be measured from. He suggested that there needs to be some type of standard identified for measuring height. Mr. Chave said the code clearly identifies that the height shall be measured from the original grade.

APPROVED

Page 21

The Board agreed that the frontyard setback distance for BC/CW zones should reference the illustration that would be provided on Page 19, which was previously discussed. They also agreed that the frontyard setback distance for RM zones adjacent to commercial zones should be changed by replacing the words “is already at 2.5 feet above grade” with “has already established a 4-foot setback,” and by adding the words “or 25 feet whichever is less,” after the word “high.”

The Board expressed their concern about the ADB’s request to delete the words “behind the sidewalk” from the middle heading of the chart. Mr. Dewhirst, in particular, expressed his concern about measuring all setbacks from behind the sidewalk.

THE BOARD TOOK A 10-MINUTE BREAK AT 8:30 P.M.

REVIEW OF PAST YEAR’S EXPERIENCE WITH ECDC AMENDMENTS TO ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT REGULATIONS

Luan Berisha, 19223 Olympic View Drive, said he has one-half acre of land on Olympic View Drive, and part of the property is located on a slope. He said he is interested in building a detached second unit that would have one bedroom. He said that right now, the regulations allow for a detached garage structure, but not a detached living structure. He noted that the Board and City Council considered this option when the accessory dwelling unit ordinance was passed, but it was not approved. He inquired if the Board would be considering this option again in the future.

Mr. Dewhirst explained that when the City Council adopted the accessory dwelling unit regulations, they asked that the Board review them after one year and provide a report to the Council. Based upon that report, the Board may consider a recommendation to the Council that the regulations be changed to allow detached accessory dwelling units. However, at this time, it is not clear whether this would be considered or not.

CONTINUED REVIEW OF DRAFT DESIGN GUIDELINES AND POTENTIAL CODE AMENDMENTS REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT THE DESIGN GUIDELINES

Page 21

Mr. Chave said that the ADB is recommending that in pedestrian oriented zones, the setback be measured from behind the sidewalk, regardless of the width of the sidewalk. The Board agreed that further clarification from the ADB is necessary before the Board can consider the proposed change. Mr. Dewhirst suggested that staff needs to come up with better language to indicate the ADB’s intent. Mr. Chave agreed, and said staff would present new language at the next meeting.

Page 22

The Board particularly discussed the ADB’s notes that were provided on this page. Mr. Dewhirst suggested that if the ADB does not feel this section is fair, the Board should be concerned, as well. He said it would behoove the staff to obtain further clarification from the ADB and provide draft language that would address their concerns. Mr. Chave cautioned against making significant changes to this section prior to the public hearing.

Mr. Dewhirst suggested that the diagrams do not demonstrate the intent of the section. He questioned how other jurisdictions handle their open space requirements. Mr. Chave clarified that the intent of this section is to go beyond the simple setback situations and move towards setbacks becoming usable open space. The ADB feels that the setback requirements, themselves, are sufficient. They felt that requiring more open space beyond the setback requirements in already tight building situations is inappropriate. The consultant has stated that this is a design issue that must be considered, and if worked carefully, much of the open space could be used.

The Board agreed that no changes should be made to this section prior to the public hearing. However, they would like more information regarding the ADB's concerns.

Mr. Witenberg asked that staff keep a list of those items which the Board decided not to address in the draft document prior to the public hearing. They should be noted as part of the public hearing so that the public can address each specifically.

Page 24

The Board agreed that the last sentence of Standard 1 should be deleted as recommended by the ADB.

Page 25

The Board accepted the ADB's recommendation to change "two" to "three" in Item 1 referencing multi-family buildings that fit into single-family neighborhoods.

Page 26

The Board agreed to accept the ADB's recommended change to Standard 3 changing "walkway" to "City sidewalks."

Page 30

Mr. Chave recalled the Board's recent work on the sign code and the recommendation that was made to the City Council. The graph on Page 30 was a result of the Board's discussion with the ADB regarding the sign code. Some of the items on the graph are not consistent with the code and amendments will be required.

The Board asked that "?" be replaced with "C" to indicate that a conditional use permit would be required.

Page 33

The Board discussed Requirement 1.a.i and agreed that an illustration would be appropriate to clarify the intent of a terraced roof. Otherwise, they accepted the ADB's recommended changes to read as follows: "Terraced with a minimum 18-inch change in height between each portion. Also, each terrace should be no more than 20 percent of the total roof square footage. The height change must be visible from the primary street, AND"

Mr. Witenberg said the document should clearly identify how the height of the roof would be measured. Mr. Monlux noted that Requirement 1.b.i on Page 34 indicates that the roof height would be measured from the eave line. Mr. Dewhirst said this section is not clear, and it would probably be one of the most debated at the public hearing.

The Board clarified that the height of a structure cannot ever be over 30 feet in height measured from the original grade. Mr. Chave said this is clearly defined and outlined in the code. Height is defined from original grade. Mr. Chave suggested that staff be allowed to come up with an illustration to further clarify the intent of this section. The consultant recommends that the Design Guidelines should limit the amount of roof area that can go beyond the 25-foot height limit. If the overall terracing were limited to 65 percent, the impacts of the additional five feet would be minimized. Mr. Dewhirst suggested that it would also help to clarify this section if a footnote were added explaining how height is measured from the original grade.

Page 34

The Board agreed to accept the ADB's proposed change to Item 1.b.i, adding the words "measured along the eave line." They also agreed to accept the change to Item 1, adding the word "zone" at the end of the last sentence.

Page 35

The Board accepted the recommended change to Item 1, adding the words “square footage calculation” at the end of the sentence.

Page 36

The Board agreed that the word “Subdividing” should be added to the title. They also agreed that the word “off-set” should be added at the beginning of Item 2, and that the words “building off-sets” should be added at the beginning of the second line of Item 3. Regarding the proposed changes to Item 1, the Board asked that staff request further information from the ADB.

Page 40

The Board agreed that the Roof Noise Section should be deleted from this page. The Board also discussed the ADB’s recommendation that the maximum length between modulation elements relates to each elevation and does not go around the corners. They requested that staff request further information from the ADB regarding this issue.

Page 44

The Board agreed that the first Item 2 be changed by replacing the word “three” with the word “two.”

Page 46

The Board questioned why the ADB is recommending that the “Restricted Materials” section be eliminated from the Design Guidelines. They agreed to leave this section in for public hearing purposes.

Definition Section

The Board agreed that if any Board member had a concern related to the definitions, they should contact staff by Friday, January 26.

The Board concluded that they would like to review the new draft document, with the comments incorporated, before it is distributed to the public for the public hearing. Mr. Chave said staff would incorporate the changes that were agreed upon by the Board and indicate in underline/strike out format the changes that still need to be considered by the Board at their next meeting.

CONTINUED REVIEW OF PAST YEAR’S EXPERIENCE WITH ECDC AMENDMENTS TO ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT REGULATIONS

Mr. Chave briefly reviewed the accessory dwelling unit activity that occurred last year. He said that of the 24 applications that were received by the City, only one was not approved. Twenty-three of the applications were for accessory dwelling units that already exist. He said that most of the comments received by the staff throughout the past year were related to detached accessory dwelling units, which are not allowed. Other comments were related to the 800-square foot requirement. Some people want to exceed this amount. Mr. Chave concluded that he does not foresee a problem with allowing detached accessory dwelling units as long as the property is owner occupied.

Mr. Chave said that if the Board would like to pursue the option of allowing detached accessory dwelling units, staff could report this to the City Council and determine if they would like the Board to consider the option further. Mr. Witenberg noted that accessory dwelling units are one way for the City to meet their affordable housing requirements. He suggested that this be stated in the report to the Council. The Board concurred that this option should be considered further.

DISCUSSION AND OVERVIEW OF OPTIONS AVAILABLE FOR DESIGN REVIEW PROCESS

This issue was continued to the next meeting. Mr. Chave distributed a flow chart that was prepared by staff to illustrate options for the design review process.

REVIEW OF 2001 PLANNING DIVISION WORK PROGRAM

Mr. Chave said that staff would like to work with the chair to schedule out a year of extended agenda to include the major items that are listed on the memorandum from staff. He asked that the Board identify any additional topics they would like to consider this year, as well.

Mr. Dewhirst inquired regarding the Port Master Plan. Mr. Chave answered that the Port Master Plan could be considered as part of the Comprehensive Plan (Number 6 on the list). If this master plan were adopted into the Comprehensive Plan document, a public hearing would be required similar to what was required for the High School and Stevens Hospital Master Plans.

Mr. Dewhirst suggested that the Board consider options for Highway 99 revitalization. Mr. Bowman said the Chamber's Economic Development Council is working actively to connect the downtown area to the Highway 99 area to get the Highway 99 business owners more involved with the Chamber activities. Mr. Dewhirst noted that the City of Shoreline is going all out on their portion of the Highway 99 corridor. If they are successful, they will capture a lot of the business opportunities in this area. He said it would behoove the City to consider how they can get more revenue from Highway 99. He suggested that the Board encourage the Council to pursue this option further.

Mr. Monlux inquired if the Shoreline Master Program is on a timeline. Mr. Chave answered that this program would be a two-year process, with a background study and periodical reports being completed this year. The Comprehensive Plan will be updated to transition from a general Comprehensive Plan Map to a more specific one that is consistent with zoning. It will include a report on buildable land status and census and housing requirements.

Mr. Witenberg recalled that the Board wanted to make sure that they compare the school district's capital facilities plan to the final community facilities ordinance that will be adopted by the Council to make sure the two documents are consistent. He noted that the Board's hearing date for the capital facilities plan is February 28, a week after the public hearing before the Council regarding the community facilities ordinance. Mr. Chave said he did not think there was anything in the proposed community facilities ordinance that would steer the district's capital facilities plan in a different direction.

Mr. Monlux suggested that the Board discuss what they can do to encourage positive transportation opportunities. One option would be to allow bus turn outs as part of development mitigation—especially in planning for the multi-modal facility that is coming to the downtown area. Mr. Chave felt this issue should be discussed as part of the update to the transportation element of the Comprehensive Plan which will start in the fall.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Mr. Dewhirst announced that his employer, Snohomish County, has informed the Port that he would not be participating in their planning process, as was requested. Another County employee was substituted to represent the County.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Mr. Crim reported that the TAC Committee for Sound Transit has had no activity for several months. Mr. Dewhirst said he talked with the new Sound Transit project manager for the north corridor and asked why nothing has been happening. One reason is that the railroads are holding the north corridor hostage in an attempt to get more from the south corridor. Sound

APPROVED

Transit has not been given permission to start the preliminary engineering process, which was supposed to have been done by now.

Mr. Witenberg said the City Council will have a hearing on January 30, 2001 to decide whether or not the housing authority can operate a 120-unit apartment complex at 223rd and Edmonds Way for the purpose of providing 12 transitional apartment units for families from the Pathways for Women Program. Fifty-four units will be used for low to moderate income housing and the remaining 54 will be available to anyone.

Mr. Chave noted that the City Council has placed the animal ordinance on their January 30, 2001 consent agenda for approval.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 10:00 P.M.

APPROVED