

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

April 11, 2001

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

PRESENT

John Dewhirst, Chair
Beverly Lindh, Vice Chair
Virginia Cassutt
Bruce Witenberg
Jim Crim
Joanne Langendorfer (arrived at 7:10)
Stan Monlux
Cary Guenther

ABSENT

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Duane Bowman, Development Services Dir.
Steve Bullock, Senior Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION BY MR. WITENBERG, SECONDED BY MR. CRIM, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 28, 2001 WITH THE FOLLOWING CORRECTION TO PAGE TWO, END OF SECOND LINE FROM THE BOTTOM, CHANGE “CONSIDERING” TO “CONSIDER.” MOTION CARRIED.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

Item 7b (continued Board deliberations concerning parking ratios for single family and multi family development) was switched with Item 7a (continued review of the design guidelines).

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Roger Hertrich, 1020 Puget Drive, said that he attended a recent City Council meeting in which the parking issue was discussed. At no time was there any discussion regarding the parking ratio for multi-family development. However, he spoke with a business owner after the meeting who expressed his concern regarding the issue in the downtown area. This person indicated that any time the parking ratios are reduced, parking is pushed out to the streets and there is less parking available for businesses. Mr. Hertrich encouraged the Board to strongly consider the possibility of leaving the 2:1 parking ratio in place for multi-family developments with two or more bedrooms. He also encouraged them to consider some type of guest parking requirement, as well.

Mr. Hertrich said he is also surprised to see that the staff has, basically, rewritten the entire PRD ordinance. He expressed his opinion that the entire existing ordinance was not insufficient. He specifically asked that the Board carefully review the

portion of the proposed PRD ordinance related to zero lot lines. They should also consider whether or not the entire ordinance needs to be redone.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING FOR BOARD DELIBERATION OF PROPOSED ORDINANCE PERTAINING TO PARKING RATIOS FOR SINGLE-FAMILY AND MULTI-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT (FILE NO. CDC-2000-144)

Mr. Dewhirst opened the Board deliberation portion of the public hearing and asked staff to provide their comments regarding the issue.

Mr. Chave recalled that at the public hearing on March 28, some members of the public voiced their support of the proposed ordinance, while others wanted to have either greater or lesser standards. However, staff feels that the data that was collected and presented to the Commission supports the proposed ordinance. The Board must now determine if it is a reasonable proposal in light of the public testimony and other information that they received.

Ms. Cassutt inquired if it would be possible to have different parking regulations for different sections of the City. She agreed with the public comments stating that there is a parking problem in the downtown area and that the parking requirements should be greater than what is necessary for other areas of the City. It is important that multi-family development in the downtown area provide sufficient on-site parking so that the parking does not spill out onto the limited street parking.

Mr. Chave answered that the City will be conducting a study of the downtown parking situation soon. However, until the study is completed, there is nothing to support the statement that there is a parking problem in the downtown. Some people have expressed that there is a problem, but others have disagreed. He explained that the code identifies parking requirements for multi-family, commercial and mixed uses. Each of these requirements were based on objective information when they were established. He suggested that some of the parking problems in the downtown are historic based on parking ratios that were different when the buildings were developed. He emphasized that all new development is required to comply with the parking standards in the Code, and available data and survey information indicates that the proposed ratios are adequate to meet the demand.

Mr. Chave said that it is possible to have different parking ratio requirements for different sections of the City, but there must be information to support this decision. Right now, the City's parking ratios are opposite of what the national data indicates they should be. The City requires only one parking space per unit for single-family development and two parking spaces per unit for multi-family development. The national data strongly suggests that the single-family parking ratios should be greater than the multi-family ratios—especially since many of the multi-family developments are located close to transit facilities.

Mr. Bowman said the City will start working on the downtown parking study this year. Mr. Witenberg suggested that perhaps it would be more appropriate to wait to make any parking ratio changes for the downtown area until after the study is completed. Mr. Chave agreed that the Board could wait until the parking study is available, but information that has already been collected supports the proposed ratio changes for the remainder of the City. He suggested that the Board consider approving the ordinance for all other areas.

Mr. Monlux inquired if there is flexibility in the requirements for situations such as low-income senior development located near transit facilities where a lower parking ratio would be appropriate. Mr. Chave answered that he does not recall anything in the code that would allow the parking ratios to be modified for these types of situations, but this idea does have merit for further consideration. He indicated that staff would check the Code for any reference to low-income senior housing.

Mr. Chave said that since it is the City's intent to start the downtown parking study this year, the Board could hold back on the parking standards as they relate to the BC zones until after the study has been completed. However, since there are no plans for a broader parking study for the other areas of the City, staff would feel comfortable recommending that the Board go forward with the proposed ordinance for all areas except the BC zone.

APPROVED

Mr. Monlux said he feels that the proposed changes are an improvement over the existing parking standards. He felt there is no reason to postpone approval of the ordinance to apply to all areas of the City, including the BC zone. When the downtown parking study is completed, appropriate changes could be made to the parking standards again.

MOTION BY MR. MONLUX, SECONDED BY MR. CRIM, TO FORWARD THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ECDC 17.50.020 CONCERNING PARKING RATIOS FOR SINGLE-FAMILY AND MULTI-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL AS SUBMITTED.

Mr. Witenberg said that given the concerns that have been raised about the parking situation in the downtown area, he is not sure that the proposed ordinance would be an improvement. If the City were to reduce the amount of parking required, new development would provide fewer parking spaces. If it is determined later that more parking should have been required, it will be too late to correct the problem. He said he could not support the motion as set forth, but could support it if the BC zone is left out until after the parking study has been completed.

MOTION BY MR. WITENBERG, SECONDED BY MS. CASSUTT, TO AMEND THE MAIN MOTION TO EXEMPT THE BC ZONE FROM THE ORDINANCE AND CONSIDER THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE BC ZONE AFTER THE PARKING STUDY IS COMPLETED. MOTION CARRIED.

Mr. Chave noted that the area that would be exempted from the ordinance would be identified as the downtown business district instead of the BC zone.

THE MAIN MOTION CARRIED, WITH MR. DEWHIRST VOTING IN OPPOSITION.

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

Mr. Dewhirst opened the continued Board deliberation portion of the public hearing. He suggested that it is unlikely that the Board would make a recommendation on the design guidelines at this meeting, but he said he would like to work through enough of the issues to give staff direction to enable them to provide specific language for consideration as soon as possible. He said he would also like to discuss how the Board could obtain input from the ADB before sending a recommendation to the Council. He inquired if staff forwarded the public hearing comments to the ADB. Mr. Bullock said the ADB has not received the actual comments provided by the stakeholders group, but several members of the ADB were present at the public hearing. Staff has informed the ADB that they would try to provide a consensus of the Boards' direction at their next meeting so that they can prepare an appropriate response. Mr. Chave added that all of the materials that have been provided to the Board thus far regarding this issue would also be provided to the ADB.

The Board determined that it would be appropriate for at least one Board member to attend the next ADB meeting as a Planning Board representative. Ms. Lindh indicated that she would attend the ADB meeting on behalf of the Board.

Mr. Chave said the staff reviewed the public comments, the stakeholders' comments and the Board's comments from the last meeting. Mr. Schmidt of Cascade Design also reviewed the comments and provided input, as well. He referred the Board to the two documents provided—one from the consultant and one from the staff.

Staff Reference #1 (Page 4)

Mr. Chave referred to the first item on the staff's submittal, which references Page 4. He said staff agrees with the stakeholders' comment that the guidelines should have built-in flexibility. However, they do not feel that a numerical percentage is workable. Staff suggests that discretion be built into the guidelines so that tradeoffs can be made and a "balance" of design factors can be considered in building and site design. They also concurred that code-related height and bulk standards must be complied with. To accomplish this, staff recommends that the word "shall" be considered to be mandatory, and the word "should" be defined in the guidelines as follows:

APPROVED

Where the word “should” is used in these guidelines, the guideline is expected to be followed and implemented in the design. However, guidelines identified as “should” may be waived or modified by staff or the ADB as a “design departure” if it can be demonstrated that the design exceeds another guideline that will compensate for the proposed departure.

Mr. Chave said that if this option is considered, the Board must decide which guidelines are candidates for flexibility and which are not. They also must discuss who would be allowed to grant the departure (staff or the ADB, etc.). He suggested that the more significant guidelines should require an ADB review instead of staff review.

Mr. Schmidt agreed that the staff’s recommendation is better than allowing a specific percentage for the departure. The staff’s recommendation also puts the responsibility on the designer to make sure that the departure is important enough to the project to spend extra time going through the review process. It also allows flexibility for the City to exempt a developer from certain requirements if they are providing some other feature that would compensate for the departure. Not only would this provide flexibility to the builder and developer, but it would also allow the ADB to have greater input into the design of a plan. However, he pointed out that the down side to the staff’s recommendation is that the community would always have to be mindful that exceptions are possible. He suggested that it would be appropriate to add some type of notification requirement so that the community could feel confident that they would be notified of projects that impact them.

Mr. Witenberg questioned what the role of the ADB would be in the code departure review process. He said that if the role of the ADB is changed, as has been discussed previously, then the ADB would not be able to conduct quasi-judicial hearings. If code departures are to be determined by the ADB, the citizens will have no voice in the process. He questioned whether there is some other alternative to allow for community input, while at the same time meet the flexibility that the developers are seeking.

Mr. Schmidt emphasized that notification would have to be provided by City staff to the residents living within a 200-foot radius of the subject property indicating what standards are proposed for deviation. This notice would invite the public to attend and participate in a public hearing. He suggested that if the citizens know that notification for code departures is required, they would not be as nervous about the concept. Mr. Chave added that this question is related to the process which will be discussed at a future date. The Board will need to consider the threshold for the notification requirements and who will be responsible for making the decisions.

Mr. Witenberg said that he understands that the process issues are separate from the design guidelines, allowing flexibility in the design guidelines would lock the City into a process that requires community input. Therefore, this discussion should be part of the Board’s consideration on issues where they want to allow flexibility. Mr. Chave said that the process for implementing the design guidelines would be very similar to the existing City processes and notification requirements.

Mr. Dewhirst said that he finds it interesting that people are asking for more predictability in the design guidelines while at the same time they are asking for flexibility. Mr. Crim added that they are also asking that the design guidelines be simplified.

Mr. Dewhirst recommended that the staff and consultant develop a matrix setting out the major elements of the guidelines by category and then identify the acceptable range of flexibility for each. Another column of the matrix could indicate who would be responsible for deciding whether flexibility would be allowed or not. This would provide a range for code departure that the community would probably find more acceptable. It allows the flexibility that has been requested, but gives predictability within that range. Mr. Schmidt suggested that they could include this information on the matrix that has already been created. They could identify which elements are absolute requirements (shall) and which are more flexible (should). They could also identify the acceptable deviation for each of the flexible elements. Mr. Witenberg supported Mr. Dewhirst’s request for a matrix to help the Board and public see the issues more clearly.

Mr. Dewhirst said the Board must also consider the criteria that would be used to determine whether flexibility should be allowed or not, and how much. Mr. Crim suggested that it would be better to allow staff to make as many of the code deviation decisions as possible, using reasonable criteria. This will ensure that the process remains simple. Mr. Schmidt

suggested that the matrix include a column identifying the items that “shall” be complied with. A second column could be added to identify those elements in which minor deviations could be allowed, and the third column could list the larger issues that would require ADB approval before a code departure would be allowed. The Board agreed that this type of matrix would be appropriate.

Cascade Design Reference #1 (Page 7, Item 2)

Mr. Schmidt explained that a six-inch caliper tree is a fairly common size for replacement requirements. These trees are usually between 15 and 30-feet tall and can be transported with nursery-sized equipment. He said the comments he provided would require tree replacement only for good quality horticultural varieties of trees and not for native weed trees such as Alders and other native trees that are multi-stem suckers, in poor health or have been previously topped. This clarification would also allow a developer to replace the existing trees off-site if it were determined that there is insufficient space on-site. This could include off-site street trees or trees in parks or other public spaces in order to maintain a similar level of vegetation within a neighborhood.

Mr. Dewhirst inquired how the tree retention requirements proposed in the guidelines relate to the requirements for the native growth retention for salmon. Mr. Chave said that it is difficult to connect these two requirements City-wide. However, it will be more apparent in areas close to streams, etc. The salmon requirements include a stream buffer corridor, and the design guidelines would not remove that requirement in any way.

Mr. Dewhirst said he noticed that no replacement ratios have been identified. Mr. Schmidt answered that he feels an appropriate replacement ratio would be 1 to 1. This would allow a developer to replace a ten-inch caliper tree with two, five-inch trees or one, ten-inch tree. Mr. Chave added that the Edmonds Stakeholders expressed that they felt the one-to-one replacement ratio was too high. However, if the list of trees that must be replaced is limited to only good quality trees, then perhaps this will minimize their concerns. He said the stakeholders’ other concern was related to the developers inability to replace the trees because of space. This issue could be addressed by allowing the developer to replace the trees off-site, if appropriate.

Ms. Cassutt inquired what happens after a developer is finished with a condominium project and people purchase and move into the units. Can the new owners decide to change the landscaping significantly by removing some of the required trees. Mr. Chave said that any significant change to the landscaping from what was approved as part of the landscape plan would require City approval. Ms. Cassutt suggested that these types of changes are done all the time without City approval. She did not feel this issue should be a significant concern.

The Board amended the consultant’s recommended change as follows: “Tree replacement shall be required only for good-quality horticultural species and not “native weed” trees such as Alders and other native trees that are multi-stem suckers, in poor health, or have been previously topped. Significant trees are considered 8-inch deciduous or 18-inch conifer or evergreen, with a 1-to-3 replacement ratio.”

Mr. Witenberg requested that the changes to the draft design guidelines be identified in underline/strikeout format. He also suggested that staff should insert different options for the public to consider during the public hearing. For example, different replacement ratios could be considered. The Board also agreed that it would be helpful to review recent projects to see how they would be impacted if the replacement ratio was changed.

Staff Reference #2 (Page 2)

Ms. Lindh recalled that at a previous hearing there was some concern expressed by developers that they know how to create plans and shouldn’t be required to hire an architect to review their plans. She said she supports this request as long as the plans that are brought before the City meet the requirements of the staff and ADB for review purposes. She said she doesn’t see why the plans should have to be signed off by a professional. Mr. Schmidt said that this is a requirement of other cities

in the area, but it is definitely a policy issue that the Board must decide. He said that since Edmonds is a fairly sophisticated market, it is likely that they will usually receive quality plans.

Mr. Monlux agreed with Ms. Lindh that unless the staff has been burdened with poor proposals, there is no need for this requirement. Mr. Chave said staff has seen projects over the years with relatively little creativity applied. Hopefully, the design guidelines will improve this situation. He said that, generally, architects have a certain amount of responsibility and desire to provide good designs. They are always trying to find something unique or different to a project. Mr. Schmidt agreed and suggested that this requirement could be more important for large projects.

Mr. Guenther inquired how many projects of more than 18,000 square feet in size over the past few years were not designed by an architect. Mr. Bullock answered that since the beginning of 1999, there were approximately eleven projects that were over 18,000 square feet in size. Seven were designed by an architect and four were not.

Mr. Dewhirst expressed his opinion that there should be flexibility allowed for small and medium projects, but an architect should be required for large projects. Ms. Lindh disagreed and said that if the goal is to make the guidelines easier to apply and more flexible, there is no need to require a professional architect.

Mr. Schmidt noted that a structural engineer must still stamp the designs as required by the Uniform Building Code standards.

Ms. Langendorfer inquired regarding the purpose for requiring the stamp of a licensed professional. Mr. Bullock said the intent is that plans that are stamped by a licensed architect could result in better designs. Because architects have a certain level of "vanity" they may work harder to create unique features for the development. Mr. Chave added that architects have more stringent requirements in order to be licensed. There are certain standards that can be expected as a result of this requirement. They are likely to have a greater wealth of knowledge to draw upon to resolve a design problem. While he realizes that obtaining the services an architect can cost the designer additional money, they may receive additional ideas that they would not have thought about otherwise.

The Board conducted a straw vote to determine whether they were in support of requiring the stamp of a licensed professional or not. Three members were in favor of the requirement, but only for large projects. Four were not in favor of the requirement for any size of project. One member was undecided. The Board requested that staff specifically seek the Architectural Design Board's opinion regarding this issue.

THE BOARD TOOK A TEN-MINUTE BREAK AT 8:25 P.M.

Staff Reference #17, 18 and 19 (Pages 33 and 34)

Mr. Dewhirst said that many of the Board members are having a hard time visualizing the roof issues. He said that before they can continue, some drawings or pictures labeled with the various options that the staff and the stakeholders group is proposing would be helpful to the Board. He said the Board does not feel they have enough understanding of the various concepts being considered. Mr. Schmidt indicated that this type of information could be provided to the Board.

Mr. Schmidt said that anything that breaks up the 4:12-pitched roofs (including vaults, turrets, etc. as recommended by the stakeholders) would be appropriate. He said it is important to break up the roof line. He noted that a major concern is the flat roof issue. He said he could provide drawings or photographs to further illustrate this concept. The intent was to provide flexibility in the design guidelines to allow a flat parapet as long as there is some three-dimensional size. The proposed language would provide three options for accomplishing this effect.

Mr. Dewhirst inquired regarding the real goal of this standard. He noted that Page 33 talks about view blockage. He said his understanding was that the goal was to create more interesting buildings from the street viewpoint. He said he has a hard time visualizing whether or not a two-foot variation in elevation would appear any different from the street looking up 25 to 30 feet. He said he would like some drawings and pictures from the street viewpoint to see the impact of the three concepts being proposed.

APPROVED

Mr. Schmidt clarified that one of the goals of this section of the design guidelines is to reduce the opportunity for an undifferentiated gutter running along the edge of the building resulting in a long, monotonous roof line. The second goal is to create some flexibility for roof design. The existing regulations require a 4:12 pitch for roofs that are over 25-feet high. This did not allow for variety, and the result is roofs that are almost flat in appearance from the ground level. The purpose of the standards is to allow flexibility for the architect to include some design features to break up the undifferentiated face. He suggested that an 8:12 pitched roof is the minimum that would provide the desired break. The ideas presented by the Edmonds Stakeholders identify more ways to break up the roof line, and these are all appropriate, as well.

Mr. Schmidt pointed out that the City's existing 30-foot height limit does not accommodate a three-story building, but it will accommodate more than a two-story building. He noted that the market price of land in Edmonds is increasing the demand for structures with three-stories. He said the intent of the proposed design guidelines is to allow for creative roof designs so that a developer can obtain three stories, if possible.

Mr. Chave noted that the Council's specific direction was that the existing height limit not be changed. Ms. Cassutt recalled that when the Board met with the City Council at a joint meeting recently, some Council members indicated that they would be interested in considering a change in the height limit for different areas of the City. Mr. Chave agreed that much of Highway 99 has the ability to accommodate heights much greater than 30 feet. Ms. Cassutt suggested that there are other areas in the City where a greater height limit would also be appropriate such as Westgate and the medical area around Stevens Hospital. Ms. Cassutt agreed that the design guidelines should provide options for developers to construct three full stories with a pleasing roof design.

Staff Reference #11 (Page 21)

Mr. Chave recalled that there were some comments at the hearing stating that the 2-foot setback requirement was onerous. There was a person who specifically testified about a corner lot situation where this requirement would be a problem. Staff agrees. However, the public benefit of additional setbacks adjacent to sidewalks is one staff feels the Board should consider. Staff supports the idea of allowing niches in lieu of the uniform 2-foot setback, and would recommend including this concept. They also recommend requiring the setback only along one property line to resolve the concern related to corner lots. It should also be clarified that this requirement only applies to the first floor. He requested that the Board provide further input on this issue.

Both Ms. Cassutt and Ms. Lindh agreed with the Edmonds Stakeholders that this requirement should be eliminated.

Mr. Schmidt explained that the downtown sidewalks are very narrow with trees planted amongst them. Any sandwich board sites, tables, benches, etc. on the sidewalk further reduce this space. He said that downtown Kirkland has had to deal with this same issue. The buildings have been setback so those individuals going opposite directions can pass on the sidewalk without having to go out into the street. He suggested that one option would be to average the 2-foot setback over the entire face of the property. For instance, you could provide a niche at the entrance of the building or along the window where people step aside. The intent was to extend the sidewalk, increase pedestrian opportunities and provide more variety. Another possibility is to eliminate the 2-foot setback requirement if a plaza of 1,000 square feet or greater is developed to provide a significant benefit to the public and the environment.

Mr. Bullock recalled that a significant point of the Hyatt-Palma Study that was completed a few years ago was to encourage more activity on the sidewalks allowing more tables and chairs, and display racks, etc. With the size of the sidewalks in the downtown, this is difficult. The 2-foot setback would be a way to reclaim some of the space so that some of these activities could occur while still allowing the activity inside the building to take place.

Mr. Dewhirst suggested that there is a big difference between making the 2-foot setback a requirement or letting a developer respond to what they think they can do design wise. If the City is concerned about the width of the sidewalks in the downtown area, they need to change their sidewalk requirements. Mr. Chave answered that if the sidewalk widths are

increased it would have to be done by cutting into the property. The City would be required to purchase land for right-of-way.

Mr. Chave said another option to consider would be to not make the 2-foot setback a requirement, but an incentive. If a developer provides a setback, the City could allow bay windows or some other feature that adds to the façade modulation to extend out over the sidewalk. The Board agreed that, given the small lots sizes in the downtown area, this option should be identified as an incentive category and not as a requirement. Mr. Chave said he would approach the City Council regarding this concept to determine their reaction.

Staff Reference #10 and 15 (Pages 20 and 31)

Mr. Schmidt explained these sections require that trash and utility storage and mechanical equipment cannot be located within 20 feet of the property line. He noted that developers tend to place their trash and utility equipment as far away from their facility as they can. This equipment is often noisy and visually unpleasant and should not be located next to an adjacent property.

Mr. Monlux inquired how this requirement is different than the existing code. Mr. Chave answered that these structures are not allowed in the setback areas now. The stakeholders expressed concern that this was too much of a restriction, but staff feels this is a significant policy issue that the Board must decide. The stakeholders also stated that the placement of mechanical equipment is covered by the Uniform Mechanical Code. Mr. Chave said that this document describes how to place the equipment, but does not regulate where it should be located. He said the City has noise standards to protect adjacent properties, but this is only regulated on a complaint basis and the solution is often difficult after development has been completed.

The Board agreed to support the requirements for trash and utility storage and mechanical equipment placement. However, they asked that the phrase “within 20-feet of the property line” be eliminated.

Cascade Design Reference #2 and 3 (Pages 8 through 12)

Mr. Schmidt said that buffer averaging to allow for shared driveways is important to provide as an incentive. Mr. Schmidt explained that shared access could require cross deed restrictions or easements and additional paperwork, but it also creates more flexibility by reducing the buffer requirement along the entire shared property edge. This allows for more density and flexibility in site planning a project. It also improves auto and pedestrian circulation and safety. Mr. Chave added that the proposed language would make this concept mandatory, but it could be changed to indicate an exception for properties that are unable to comply.

Cascade Design Reference #4 (Page 17)

Mr. Schmidt said he agrees with the stakeholder’s recommendation to use the Seattle triangle concept. He said that is precisely the intent they wanted to achieve in the design guidelines. He said the proposed area setback would be a 15-foot requirement, but would allow a column supporting the upper floors into the area. This guideline does not preclude a column such that the second floor could hang over the car safety area in order to minimize the loss of building area above the ground level. The City of Seattle requires only a 10-foot triangle, but does not allow a column in that space. He added that the access drive in the setback area could be sloped to the degree allowed by the code. He concluded that he would prefer the proposed 15-foot triangle, which allows a column because it provides more safety for pedestrians and more flexibility and cheaper structural solutions. Seattle’s 10-foot triangle, with no visual obstructions, would be a compromise on pedestrian safety and require a more expensive structural system to clear the safety triangle area.

Staff Reference #24 (Pages 45-46)

APPROVED

Ms. Langendorfer recalled that at the hearing there were some comments about the types of materials allowed for the façade of the building. She questioned the need for these restrictions. Mr. Schmidt said that by limiting certain materials to 35 percent of the building, the City could encourage developers who want to use the spray applied exterior materials or vinyl or aluminum siding to use these on the back and not the entire building. These materials would only be allowed on one third of the building, with a higher quality of materials on the remainder. Mr. Schmidt noted some of the weather-related concerns associated with the lower-quality materials.

Staff Reference #23 (Page 44)

Mr. Dewhirst expressed his concern about requiring so many different types of windows. Mr. Chave said this is not a requirement, but one of the options a developer can choose under the Façade options. Staff reviewed the downtown buildings to determine how easy or difficult it would be to meet this requirement and could not find a single building that did not comply with the number or size requirements proposed for windows. He described how this concept could even be applied to large structures such as grocery stores.

Staff Reference #22 (Page 43)

Mr. Chave said that staff is studying further options to address the issue of building sizes and the requirements for each category. Staff might propose that small buildings be required to comply with two categories of façade requirements because one may not be enough. He noted that the standards for small buildings are actually less than those for other sizes. Complying with two categories would not be difficult and would ensure a better design. Mr. Chave said staff would provide photographs and other information regarding this issue at the next meeting.

Mr. Dewhirst requested that staff approach the ADB with the concept of holding a joint meeting with the Planning Board. Mr. Bullock said the ADB has already expressed their willingness to meet with the Board. The Board agreed that they would like to have at least one more meeting with the ADB regarding design guidelines. They suggested that perhaps this joint meeting could take place on April 25, 2001. Mr. Dewhirst suggested that perhaps a second workshop could be held to actually apply the requirements to a set of proposals.

CONTINUED REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE ECDC REGULATING PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS (PRDs) AND PROPOSED NEW REGULATIONS PERTAINING TO MASTER PLANS.

Mr. Bullock recalled the comment made by Mr. Hertrich at the beginning of the meeting related to the issue of zero lot lines found in the proposed PRD ordinance. He referenced the decision criteria for modifying development standards (Page 5, Item 2) which states that no exterior setback of the PRD may be reduced from that required by the underlying zoning unless a certain set of criteria is specifically addressed for that setback. This is designed to protect the adjacent property owners.

Mr. Witenberg said that the Board has been considering the PRD issue for almost two years, but he is having a difficult time figuring out how the proposed ordinance is different than the existing ordinance. He said it does not help him to see a note on the side of the page referencing the old ordinance when he doesn't have the old ordinance to compare it with in underline and strikeout form. He said he would like to have a synopsis or cover page describing why the changes are being proposed and how the purposes of the new ordinance are different from the existing ordinance. He would like to know what was good about the old ordinance and what was not, and why it should be discarded.

Mr. Bullock said he was under the impression that the Board had so many different discussions about the same things over and over again that they understood the proposal. The reason the document is not done in underline/strike out format is that the current ordinance is very disjointed and difficult to explain and apply. One of the intents of the new proposal is to create a coherent document outlining the process, what it allows and how it can be applied. Many things in the new ordinance are similar to the existing ordinance, and he tried to reference these situations. These differences have been discussed by the

APPROVED

Board on a number of occasions. He said he hasn't changed the purpose section because he was under the impression that the Board was in agreement as to the purpose of the new ordinance.

Mr. Chave agreed that the underline/strikeout format would not be helpful in this case because of the disjointed arrangement of the existing ordinance. He suggested that staff could split the page and in the margin they could indicate how the new ordinance is different from the existing ordinance. The Board agreed that would be helpful.

Mr. Witenberg inquired if the City Attorney has reviewed the draft ordinance. He questioned whether or not the standards are specific enough to apply. He noted the use of several terms that do not appear clear to him. For example:

- Page 7, Item A.2: What is the definition of "unusual compatibility problems?"
- Page 4, Item A.1.c: What is the definition of "harmonious use of materials?"
- Page 5, Item A.3 at the top: Is there a percentage limit on the amount of modification?
- Page 5, Item A.1: The words "High quality" should be deleted.

Mr. Chave said the City Attorney has already reviewed the ordinance on two occasions. Mr. Bullock added that any modification or reduction in the requirements would require a subjective review by the Hearing Examiner or the City Council. They will have to make the finding that the request meets the intent of the criteria.

Mr. Chave said the Board could certainly make the ordinance more specific, but he cautioned that they should stay away from inserting percentages. Since the intent is to make the ordinance easier for the public to understand, the Board should consider suggestions that are made for clarification.

The Board discussed whether or not the PRD ordinance could be forwarded to the Council as a separate item or if they should wait to make a recommendation until after the master plan ordinance has been completed too. The two items could then be sent to the Council with the Board's recommendation. The Board decided that they did not want to wait to make a recommendation on the PRD ordinance until after the master plan ordinance was done. They scheduled a public hearing for May 9, 2001. They directed the staff to prepare a draft PRD ordinance similar to what was prepared for the community facilities ordinance by italicizing some of the policy issues that are still undecided.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

The Board discussed the recent Council decision to send the community facilities issue related to churches on collector and distributor streets back to the Board for more review. This issue was scheduled on the May 23, 2001 agenda as a public hearing. It will be introduced to the Board for discussion on April 25, 2001. Staff will attempt to schedule a joint ADB/Planning Board meeting on April 25, 2001. The Board discussed that the other items that were scheduled on the April 25 agenda will either be rescheduled to a later date or presented to the Board in written form.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Mr. Dewhirst provided no comments during this portion of the meeting.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no Board member comments during this portion of the meeting.

MOTION BY MS. LINDH, SECONDED BY MR. MONLUX, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 10:00 P.M. MOTION CARRIED.

APPROVED