

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

November 20, 2002

Chair Dewhirst called the regular meeting of the Planning Board to order at 7:00 p.m. in the 3rd Floor Fourtner Room of City Hall, 121 – 5th Avenue North.

PRESENT

John Dewhirst, Chair
Jim Crim, Vice Chair
Wayne Zhan
Virginia Cassutt
Janice Freeman
James Young
Cary Guenther

STAFF PRESENT

Duane Bowman, Community Services Director
Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Scott Snyder, City Attorney
Karin Noyes, Recorder

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of November 13, 2002 were not available for approval yet.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

There were no changes made to the proposed agenda.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Ray Martin, 18714 – 94th Avenue West, said that he did not attend the first meeting in October, but he understands that his name was mentioned. He said he checked the minutes from that meeting but was unable to see anything about this discussion. Mr. Martin recalled that he mentioned something to the affect that the Growth Management Act should not be used as a club, and then he quoted specific parts of the Growth Management Act. He said he was told that Board Member Young had taken exception to these comments.

Board Member Young explained that he did reference Mr. Martin's comments as part of the approval of the minutes, but his reference had to do with incorrect RCW citations. He asked that the minutes be changed to reflect the correct references.

Mr. Martin said he does not believe the Growth Management Act was designed to be a club to pound people down. It would not be successful used in that manner. He said he believes the Growth Management Act does encourage citizen participation.

WORK SESSION WITH THE CITY ATTORNEY ON LEGAL ASPECTS AND RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN PRD'S REGULATORY REFORM AND THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT (GMA)

Mr. Snyder said his understanding of the Board's task is that the City Council has not indicated a desire for the Board to review the underpinning components of the Comprehensive Plan that led to the creation of the PRD ordinance. Rather, the City Council has assigned the Board with the task of fine-tuning the existing ordinance to address the ambiguities and vagaries. He noted that the best way to avoid legal challenge is to provide clear and detailed regulations.

Mr. Snyder said that one of the best examples of this is the Architectural Design Board (ADB) process. He noted that 15 years ago, all hearings and appeals went before the ADB. While citizens found that they had very little they could appeal related to the subdivision ordinance, the ADB ordinance allowed for a lot of aesthetic judgment and the public had the ability to appeal these decisions. This resulted in a significant number of appeals because the criteria was not clear. A lot of the City's energy and money was spent on appeals. He referenced the court case Anderson vs. Issaquah, which mandated that when a city attempts to regulate aesthetic judgments, they need to provide both pictures and words to convey their intent. When the City clarified their ordinance, the number of ADB appeals dropped dramatically.

Mr. Snyder pointed out that most of the comments from the public and the City Council were related to the criteria in the front of the PRD ordinance because of the ambiguities. Not many concerns were raised about the pictures and detailed information that was provided at the end of the ordinance.

Mr. Snyder referred to the list of recommendations that was provided by the Board related to the PRD ordinance. He said he found the list to be clear. The items on the list follow up on the Council's request that the Board clarify the existing ordinance and address the details. He cautioned that it is important to avoid the creation of criteria or regulations that would lead to the impression that the PRD Ordinance is a type of rezone. They must make it clear that a PRD is a quasi-judicial decision that can be made within a zone and cannot be used to increase the density allowed. The PRD ordinance should avoid anything that could be construed as a rezone. It should be made clear that the PRD ordinance is an alternative method of establishing bulk requirements within the zone. Standard subdivisions have very specific setbacks and lot density requirements, and these can be determined by using the tables set forth in the sections pertaining to each zoning district throughout the PRD ordinance. He proposed that footnotes be added to the tables to indicate that in addition to the standard subdivision method of calculating the bulk standards, the PRD ordinance provides an alternative method.

Mr. Snyder specifically referenced Item B at the top of Page 2 of the document he provided. This states that, "PRDs are not rezones. In no event shall use of a PRD result in an expansion of the uses permitted by the underlying zone, or in density in excess of the maximum established by the Comprehensive Plan and zoning ordinance." He explained that the footnotes provided in each table would indicate that the density could be determined by the maximum lot size or by dividing the square footage of property to be developed by the number of units to be developed. However, the number of units allowed by the Comprehensive Plan could not be exceeded. The Comprehensive Plan addresses the density as so many units per acre, and the zoning map defines lot size by square footage. However, one concept that must be made clear in the ordinance is that, regardless of which alternative is used to calculate the bulk standards, the density must meet the requirements of the zoning designation.

Board Member Guenther noted that last week the Board recommended approval of a Comprehensive Plan change for a piece of property without changing the zoning. If the Comprehensive Plan amendment is approved by the City Council, the applicant would have to come back with a rezone request to bring the property into compliance with the new Comprehensive Plan designation.

The Board discussed the option of allowing the density for a subject property to be rounded up. Board Member Dewhirst suggested that if rounding up is allowed for PRD's, it should be allowed for all subdivisions throughout the City. He noted that the Board is recommending that rounding up no longer be allowed.

Mr. Snyder referred to the Board's third recommendation, which is to clarify the public benefits that could be derived from the use of PRDs. The Board provided a list of the possible benefits. He suggested that most of these benefits should be

APPROVED

listed up front as the reason the PRD ordinance was adopted in the first place. He said that these items are more legislative findings rather than criteria. He suggested that most of the items could be eliminated as criteria. For example, the preservation of critical areas is already covered by the City's critical areas ordinance. If the preservation of open space is going to be considered a benefit derived from the PRD, then this should only apply to critical areas that are below the threshold of the City's critical areas ordinance. Another option would be to consider the preservation of a historical structure as a possible PRD benefit. Staff recommends that if a PRD application is going to be required to satisfy a criteria for additional benefit, it should be over and above what is normally required of a subdivision. Mr. Snyder also suggested that design issues, such as streetscape, should be deferred to the ADB for review.

Mr. Snyder advised that the Board's fourth recommendation is to require a neighborhood meeting for PRD's in single-family zones. He said this would be easy to accomplish. He reported that in talking to a citizen who has attended PRD neighborhood meetings in the past, the desire was expressed to incorporate or preserve the neighborhood meeting proceedings as part of the public record. It would be easy to insert a provision into the ordinance requiring that a postcard notice of the filing of the development application be sent to all the citizens who attended a neighborhood meeting. This would allow the citizens to become involved early in the design review process. It would also allow them sufficient time to develop their comments regarding the proposal.

Mr. Snyder referred to the Board's fifth recommendation, which is to clarify the permit and decision process for PRDs. He noted that the City Council has expressed their desire that the PRD hearings take place before the Hearing Examiner, with appeals going straight to the courts. Mr. Bowman said that if the Hearing Examiner is going to be responsible for making the decision and all appeals go straight to the courts, perhaps the Board should consider the inclusion of a reconsideration clause as part of the process. This would allow the Hearing Examiner to reconsider the issue if an applicant or citizen feels an error was made. In some cases, this can prevent the issue from having to go to the courts as an appeal.

Board Member Dewhirst recalled that the City Council's direction was that the ordinance be clear enough that appeal arguments can go straight to the court. The Board members agreed with the reconsideration clause option that was suggested by Mr. Bowman to allow for the reevaluation of the Hearing Examiner's decision. They also agreed that appeals to the Hearing Examiner's decision should go to court.

Mr. Snyder said the Board's sixth recommendation is that access, parking and traffic requirements for a PRD should be the same as those required for similar standard subdivisions. He said this is one area where the Board should be cautious about making sure the PRD ordinance does not appear to be a rezone. However, the PRD ordinance should not place more requirements on parking, access and traffic than what is required for that zone. PRD's have to meet all of the same street standards, etc. as a standard subdivision.

Because it is important that the PRD ordinance not be construed as an opportunity for a developer to rezone property, Mr. Snyder suggested that rather than title Section 20.35.030 "Modification of Standards," it should be titled, "Alternative Standards." He referred to the deletions and modifications that he has proposed for this section. He particularly noted in his proposal that Items 1.c, 1.b and 1.c would be deleted from the ordinance since a PRD must meet the same density standards required for any other development in the zone. He said he does not see a need to include street and utility standards in this section either since these are all addressed in the subdivision ordinance. Also, the Engineering Department already has the flexibility to vary the water standards upon request.

Board Member Crim said another issue that has not been discussed in detail is the ownership of the roads in a standard subdivision or PRD. The density calculations for a standard subdivision exclude the property that will be used for roads. If a PRD development owns and maintains their own roads, could this property be considered part of the gross lot size when doing the density calculations? Mr. Snyder said that he and staff have discussed that the standards for roads should be the same for both standard subdivisions and PRDs. If alternative road designs are allowed to accomplish specific purposes in PRDs, the same should probably be allowed in standard subdivisions. A PRD would still have the benefit of clustering the homes, which a standard subdivision would not be allowed to do. He suggested that since this issue has not been raised as a concern, perhaps the Board should leave it alone and focus on the other issues that have already been identified.

APPROVED

Mr. Bowman explained that the City Council has previously set the standard for public and private roads. Roads serving five or more lots must be public, but roads serving four or fewer lots can be private. This is the same for both PRDs and standard subdivisions. He added that private roads must be built to meet the City's standards, but the private owners would be responsible to build and maintain them. This results in a cost savings to the City. In order to ensure that the streets are properly maintained in the future, Mr. Bowman suggested that the homeowners association requirement be strengthened by requiring that the association be incorporated as part of the PRD development.

Mr. Snyder advised that when he is asked to review homeowners association documents for PRD's, his main focus is not consumer protection. He looks to see if the homeowners association has established a mechanism so that someone is responsible to follow through on the developer's promises.

Board Member Guenther inquired about the City's policy for deeding private streets back to the City. Mr. Bowman said this issue arose as a result of a subdivision application. Board Member Dewhirst said he was surprised that the City Council brought up the issue of making some streets private because in places he has worked, this has always been a battle. Irrespective of whether or not they are built to street standards, the problem comes in with long-term maintenance. If the homeowners fail to keep the street maintenance up, significant problems start to occur. He said he can understand the City's desire to start passing some of these streets off, but his experience is that it always comes back to haunt the jurisdiction in the future. Mr. Bowman suggested that the Board probably does not want to dive into this issue as part of the PRD ordinance review. There are ways to structure homeowner maintenance requirements so that roadway maintenance is done at specific intervals.

Mr. Chave suggested that staff should provide information to the City Council to reference the criteria that is the same for both standard subdivisions and PRDs. Mr. Snyder said he would attempt to footnote the ordinance draft for the Council so that they can understand that a particular policy that they may be having a problem with was already established as a City standard.

Mr. Snyder referred to Section 20.35.050—Decision Criteria for PRDs. He noted that design issues are currently covered in the design guidelines that were recently approved by the City Council. Therefore, the references to design in this section are redundant and should be deleted. He said he would try to provide internal references back to the design guidelines throughout this section. Next, he referred to Item A.2 of this section. He suggested that this is confusing because roads must meet road standards no matter where they are located, and it is difficult to quantify how much better the circulation can be. A recent case before Snohomish County held that a standard subdivision requirement that requires a developer to establish roads to the boundary to connect to other streets cannot be required. He suggested that perhaps providing alternative connections to the City's street system beyond those compelled by State law could be considered a type of incentive. This would give the City some benefit from the PRD.

Board Member Dewhirst suggested that this section also take into account other types of traffic than vehicular, such as pedestrian and bicycle traffic and getting people to the bus stops. Board Member Crim agreed, and suggested that the term "transportation system" be used in place of the term "street system." This would include all types of transportation.

Next, Mr. Snyder referred to Item 3, and questioned how the City could quantify the minimization of impervious surfacing materials. If the structures were clustered, the result would be a reduction in impervious surface. Board Member Dewhirst said that another option for reducing the impervious surface is to build to a greater height, thus reducing the footprint size. Another is to reduce the length of the driveways. Mr. Snyder pointed out that it is important to provide some space within the development for guest parking. Board Member Freeman noted that some PRDs have established covenants that prohibit RV parking, etc. because there is insufficient space.

Mr. Bowman pointed out that there are new and different design standards that are being implemented in regards to impervious surface. There are a lot of exciting things people are doing in regards to surface water management, and a developer could choose to use one of these alternatives.

Mr. Bowman suggested that in Section 20.35.050.A, Item 1 should be a requirement of every PRD. Then the applicant could choose which one of the other four criteria they want to meet. He pointed out that if the perimeter design concept that is

recommended by the City Attorney is incorporated into the PRD ordinance, providing usable open space or recreational facilities would probably not be a problem. He noted that Council Member Wilson had some good suggestions about how to design usable open space and make sure it is maintained in the future.

Mr. Bowman suggested that the use of the term “substantial” in this section would not clarify the PRD ordinance as requested by the City Council. He suggested that perhaps they should use a percentage number. Mr. Snyder cautioned that without a minimum number to start with, this option would not be possible. He agreed with Mr. Bowman that if the buffering proposal he has presented is accepted, open space would probably not be an issue.

In terms of preserving significant natural features (Item A.5), Mr. Snyder suggested that this would be a redundant criteria if a developer were only protecting the critical areas they are required to protect. If this criteria is used, the developer should have to protect more than is required. He noted that he included the preservation of historic or landmark structures in this criteria, as well.

Next, Mr. Snyder referred to Section 20.35.050.C and said one problem with the current ordinance is that it does not define what the buffer should be. One proposed alternative to address this would be to buffer by ensuring that every lot on the back perimeter meets the standard backyard setback standard for the zone. Another provision could state that the distance from the property line cannot be reduced, either. This is consistent with the requirements of a standard subdivision. Another alternative would be to require that a landscape buffer, open space or passive use recreational area be provided that is at least equal to the depth of the rear yard setback applicable to the zone. Using either of these two proposals would allow a PRD to cluster the homes, but the backyard setback would have to be equal to that of a standard subdivision. The Board agreed that the Attorney’s proposal should be incorporated into the document. Mr. Snyder emphasized that this would ensure the surrounding neighbors at least a backyard setback as well as adequate perimeter spacing.

Mr. Snyder said another buffer issue is how the development appears from the street. He suggested that perhaps there should be a requirement that the buildings be designed with modulation so that the development does not appear to be town homes from the street view. He noted that people in surrounding single-family neighborhoods want to have the feel of a homogenous neighborhood, and one way to do this is to ensure there are no significant transitions from development to development.

Board Member Dewhirst suggested that perhaps the front yard setback should also have to meet the requirements of the zone, which is about 25 feet from the street. Mr. Snyder said this would at least provide a starting number for the person reviewing the application to use to judge whether or not an application meets the standard. Board Member Guenther pointed out that this would also help to address the parking issues that have been brought up because longer driveways would be possible. Mr. Bowman said one option is to create combined driveways to serve two lots. This option works well when clustering structures. Board Member Freeman asked how shared driveways could also provide adequate parking space. Mr. Bowman answered that parking space can be provided in the driveways, but the developer would have to make sure there was still adequate space for other users to back out.

Mr. Snyder suggested the buffer adjacent to abutting public ways should be equal in depth to the front yard setback requirements for the zone. This would make the PRD ordinance consistent with the standard subdivision requirements. Mr. Chave suggested that rather than calling it a front yard setback, the requirement should apply to property lines that abut the public right-of-way.

Mr. Snyder reviewed that the Board’s eighth recommendation is to provide further clarification of Sections 20.35.010 A, D, E and I (purposes), 20.35.040 (criteria for modifying development standards) and 20.35.050 (decision criteria for PRD’s). He agreed that some clarification could be provided in all of these sections. He specifically noted Design Criteria 4 in Section 20.35.050.A, which is to increase open space or recreational facilities on site over what is required through the PRD process. This could be clarified by identifying the percentage of additional open space required to meet this criteria. Board Member Dewhirst added that this section could also be clarified by stating that the open space must be held in common ownership by the owners of the property in the PRD development. He pointed out that the sample ordinance from Sumner makes this a requirement and adds that the owners are responsible to maintain all open space, too. Board Member Crim said this section could also clarify that the open space is for the PRD property owners to use and not the public.

Mr. Snyder referred the Board to Section 20.35.090—Final Approval. He suggested that language could be added requiring the developer to provide documentation that a homeowners association has been organized for the PRD development. This is easy to do because the builder will be the homeowners association until the development is turned over to the owners. This requirement would ensure that before the City gives final approval for the project, a homeowners association has been organized and can be accountable for the enforcement of the PRD requirements.

Mr. Snyder pointed out that the Sumner ordinance requires that each planned residential development provide not less than 20 percent of the gross site area for common open space. However, if the City requires that all PRDs provide for the standard minimum lot size allowed in the zone, there may not even be a need to require 20 percent of open space. Mr. Bowman pointed out that if all of the lots in the PRD must meet the lot size requirements of a standard subdivision, there would be no need for a developer to apply for a PRD.

Mr. Snyder advised that the critical areas ordinance does not allow the open space to include the critical areas. . The only critical areas that can be considered as part of the open space is the portion of the trail running through the critical area. He suggested that perhaps this type of requirement would be counterproductive if the City is going to require developers of a PRD to set aside 20 percent of the space for open space. Board Member Dewhirst said this would depend on how the term “open space” is defined. In PRDs with large lots, active open space is probably not necessary, but for developments with smaller lots, it can make a big difference. He said that open space can either be a good thing or it can be misused. He said he would like to formulate some language that at least integrates the active open space requirements into the ordinance.

Mr. Snyder suggested that this could be addressed by requiring 20 percent of the property to be dedicated for usable open space that does not include critical areas for PRD projects that propose to reduce the lot sizes below 80 percent of what is required for a standard subdivision. He pointed out that when critical areas are used for buffering, there is still no place for children to play in PRDs with small lots. If the lot sizes are reduced by more than 80 percent, the developer should be required to provide a certain percentage of usable open space.

Mr. Bowman said that if this concept is used, the ordinance needs to quantify the term “usable open space.” Mr. Snyder said that he intends to incorporate the criteria presented by Council Member Wilson’s motion, which suggests that usable open space must be something that is open or available to the property owners in the development. It has to be something more than native growth protection area.

Mr. Bowman pointed out that there are different ways to create open space such as a common courtyard that can be considered recreational space. The PRD standards need to address open space in more dense zones, in particular. Mr. Snyder suggested that perhaps a developer could even be allowed to use the rooftop as a usable open space, if the proper amenities are provided. Mr. Bowman agreed, and emphasized that the goal of this provision is to require a developer to provide usable open space for the residents of the development, and not the general public.

Mr. Snyder said that he intends to get the Board a draft document for their consideration within the next two weeks so that the Board can review the document and provide further direction. The Board agreed that they would review the draft PRD ordinance at the December 11 meeting. The draft would be available to the Board by Friday, December 6.

Mr. Snyder recalled a concern expressed earlier by Board Member Dewhirst that the ordinance should avoid a rezone impact by making it clear that the ordinance only deals with bulk standards. It does not change the density of a zone. Board Member Dewhirst said his concerns were in reference to the allowance of rounding up the number of lots allowed. He said he felt it would be more appropriate to calculate the density the same way it is calculated for standard subdivisions.

Mr. Snyder said that if the City is going to allow alternative methods for calculating bulk standards that could affect the density, the PRD ordinance could appear to be a method of rezoning a property. It is not the intent of the ordinance to allow more units on a property than would be allowed using the standard subdivision density calculations.

Mr. Chave recalled that Mr. Snyder has suggested that perhaps it would be appropriate to establish a maximum density for each zone that is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. One alternative for calculating the density would be to use the

minimum lot size standard for subdivisions, and the other alternative would be to use the PRD standard. Neither alternative would allow a property developer to exceed the density allowed in the zone. However, a developer would have some alternatives for modifying the bulk and dimension standards. Using this concept, there could be no argument that a PRD is a type of rezone. Mr. Chave noted that if the maximum density concept is incorporated into the ordinance, the rounding up issue would be a mute point because the maximum density would set the standard.

Mr. Chave explained that at this time, the Comprehensive Plan establishes the general maximum density requirements, but these need to be changed to be more consistent with the zoning map. He noted that the Board's 2003 work program includes a review of the Comprehensive Plan Map to make it more consistent with the zoning map.

Board Member Dewhirst said he was under the impression that the land use designations in the Comprehensive Plan identify the range for density that could be achieved by various zoning districts. He clarified that staff is now recommending that each land use category have a maximum density. Mr. Chave agreed, but said the maximum density could be different depending upon the neighborhood. Mr. Snyder suggested that they need to convert the minimum lot size to a maximum density number and not allow rounding up.

Board Member Dewhirst said it is likely that the City will also be faced with the problem of being asked to step back from the maximum density by a certain percentage to accommodate lots that are almost large enough to meet the requirements to allow an additional unit. Mr. Snyder said as long as the maximum lot density is established in Chapter 16, this could be allowed. Mr. Bowman cautioned that this type of allowance would have to be applied across all zones. If rounding up is allowed in one zone, it would have to be allowed in all other zones, as well. Ms. Snyder pointed out that if the density requirements are taken out of the subdivision and PRD ordinances and placed in the zoning code and made applicable to any form of development in the Code, they would not have to worry about individual differences.

To clarify Board Member Guenther's question, Mr. Chave explained that any development of five or more units would require a public street. If a development is less than five units, it can have a private street. Board Member Freeman pointed out that the code, as currently written, would not allow gated communities because developments of more than four units have to be served by a public road which cannot be locked.

Board Member Guenther inquired if a development of four or fewer units, with a private road, would be allowed to calculate the road area into the total square footage of the property when determining the density. If so, this would allow an increase in density in some situations. Mr. Snyder clarified that whether a road is public or private, all rights-of-way are excluded from the lot size calculations. Board Member Dewhirst pointed out that if a maximum density is identified, the issue of density calculation would be simplified and developers would be prevented from getting around the standard to develop more units than the zoning would allow.

Mr. Chave suggested that it might be helpful to the Board if a representative from the Engineering Department was present at the December 11 meeting to answer their questions regarding public and private roads. The Board agreed.

Board Member Young referred to Mr. Snyder's recommended Section 20.35.030.3, which states that the PRD process does not authorize the division of land. He said he thought the intent of the PRD ordinance was to provide an alternative form of subdividing a property. Mr. Snyder explained that the PRD ordinance does provide an alternative method of developing the bulk standards, but the subdivision process is the exclusive method of dividing a property. Even if a PRD is approved, an applicant must also obtain approval for a subdivision. Usually, the two applications run concurrently.

Board Member Young requested that Mr. Snyder address the relationship between the PRD ordinance and the Growth Management Act. Mr. Chave referred the Board to the memorandum he provided prior to the meeting related to the Growth Management Act Growth Targets for the 2004 Comprehensive Plan updates.

Board Member Young inquired regarding how much responsibility the City has to address the Growth Management Act mandates. Mr. Snyder said that to clarify this issue, he would footnote other ordinances and requirements that were used to establish the principles and tools used in the PRD ordinance. He said that if the PRD ordinance is eliminated from the City code, the City would lose a major tool for infill development, and they would need to revisit the issue. It is likely that the

APPROVED

Board would have to review the Comprehensive Plan and determine where changes could be made to increase the density in order to meet the Growth Management Act mandates.

Mr. Snyder referred to Ray Martin's comment that on an individual basis, the Growth Management Act will not force people to subdivide their lands. He agreed, but added that the changes would take place over a lengthy period of time as properties change ownership, etc.

Board Member Young explained that the Board is trying to balance the Growth Management Act requirements with concerns that have been expressed by the community. The proposed changes are excellent, but it is important to understand that there are certain disadvantages to the community if the PRD ordinance were to be rescinded. The density would have to be accommodated in other locations in the City. Mr. Snyder said he and the staff are responsible for helping the City Council and the public understand that many of the objections that have been expressed towards the PRD ordinance are not creatures of the ordinance, but requirements of State law and other established City policies. These situations can be footnoted throughout the ordinance.

REVIEW OF GROWTH MANAGEMENT GROWTH TARGETS FOR 2004 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATES

Mr. Chave referred to the set of spreadsheets that the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) has circulated around to provide more detail for the Edmonds area, based on draft projections of population and employment. He noted the three forecast and analysis zones that are related to Edmonds, Esperance and Woodway. He pointed out the last page of the document includes data from the recently completed Buildable Lands Report.

Mr. Chave said the City is being requested to respond to the County and to the PSRC by December 2 with their initial reaction to the projections. He noted that the Edmonds area is being projected to accept approximately 14,000 additional people by 2030, while the capacity for the entire area is only half of that. He also cautioned that staff believes the employment projections identified for Edmonds are unreasonable, as well. They will be voicing their concerns to the County and the PSRC in the near future. He said it is important for the City to make sure that the low range that is set for them is below the maximum capacity. The City cannot increase their capacity without making some significant changes to the Comprehensive Plan.

The Board members briefly reviewed the employment figures and agreed with staff that the projections have some serious flaws.

Mr. Chave requested that the Board members provide their comments regarding the document to staff so that their concerns can be voiced before the December 2 deadline.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Mr. Chave suggested that staff meet with the chair and vice chair of the Board to discuss the extended agenda for 2003.

Mr. Chave announced that the Public Facility District's purchase of property closed today. Because there is no longer an interest in rezoning the property, the rezone hearing that was scheduled for December 11 has been cancelled. However, there is an interest in changing the zoning of the library building across the street and potentially selling it off. They no longer need a Comprehensive Plan amendment because the library is located in an area identified in the Comprehensive Plan as multi-family. This issue will not be on the Board's agenda until at least January.

Board Member Dewhirst reviewed that the December 11 meeting agenda would include a work session on the PRD ordinance. The Board would also begin their discussions regarding the Comprehensive Plan Map amendments. Mr. Chave said he would provide a report on the GMA Growth Projections, as well. Board Member Dewhirst pointed out that the Board also needs to elect new officers at the next meeting.

APPROVED

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Board Member Dewhirst reported that the EIS for the Brightwater Project is available. A CD of the document can be obtained to put on a personal computer.

Board Member Dewhirst inquired regarding the Mayor's progress in finding a new Board member. He noted that applications for the position closed on November 8. Board Member Crim said he spoke with Mayor Haakenson about this issue, and he indicated that he would be interviewing the candidates later this week.

Board Member Dewhirst reported that he attended a cottage housing session in Shoreline that was very informative. He said he would make some copies of the materials he received for each Board Member.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

None of the Board Members provided comments during this portion of the meeting.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS TO DISCUSS, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:00 P.M.

APPROVED