

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

April 23, 2003

Chair Crim 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

Jim Crim, Chair
James Young, Vice Chair
Virginia Cassutt
Janice Freeman
John Dewhurst
Cary Guenther
Ronald Hopkins
Judith Works

ABSENT

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Dave Gebert, City Engineer
Don Fiene, Assistant City Engineer
Noel White, Public Works Director
Karin Noyes, Recorder

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER DEWHIRST MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 26, 2003 AS CORRECTED. BOARD MEMBER CASSUTT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

There were no changes made to the proposed agenda.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Board Member Young inquired if the public would be allowed to comment on those items scheduled on the agenda, but not as a public hearing. If so, he suggested that the title be changed to make this clearer. Mr. Chave suggested that this discussion be deferred to the end of the meeting. The Board agreed.

ANNUAL REPORT ON ADULT ENTERTAINMENT ZONING

Mr. Chave explained that staff used a mapping process to identify potential sites that meet the criteria of the Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC) for adult entertainment zoning. He said that as per the regulations, these sites must maintain a 300-foot separation from residential or public use zones. They must also maintain a 300-foot separation from parks, libraries, schools, churches, community centers, residential uses approved by a contract rezone, museums and hospitals. In addition, a 500-foot separation is required from bars or taverns. He referred the Board to the maps that illustrate where the available sites are located. Mr. Chave advised that, using the criteria in the ECDC, staff identified approximately 20 business locations as possible sites for adult entertainment businesses at the time the ordinance was

adopted in 1996. He noted that the adopted ordinance required an annual evaluation to assure that these types of businesses still had sites available to them so the City could avoid legal challenges.

Mr. Chave reported that staff reviewed the current land use pattern and found that, since 1996, two additional protected uses (commercial establishments with bars on the premises) have located in such a way as to reduce the number of sites available by two to four locations. This leaves between 16 and 18 potential locations for adult entertainment businesses. Since this does not appear to seriously erode the total number of locations available and bar locations can change from year to year, staff does not recommend any changes to the zoning regulations at this time. However, they will continue to monitor the situation during the next year.

Board Member Young inquired if local jurisdictions are required to provide specific places for adult entertainment uses. Mr. Chave replied that the law states that local jurisdictions cannot preclude adult entertainment uses, and they must show that there are actual locations where they can be located.

Board Member Guenther noted that there are very few parcels of property that fall within the allowable areas. Adult entertainment uses can only be located in Edmonds on property that is within the areas identified on the maps.

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE EDMONDS SCHOOL DISTRICT CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN (2002-2008) AS PART OF THE CAPITAL FACILITIES ELEMENT OF THE CITY'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (FILE NO. CDC-03-17)

Mark Johnson and Brett Carlstad were present to represent the Edmonds School District.

Mr. Johnson provided a brief overview of the District's Capital Facilities Plan for the convenience of the audience, since the Board received a presentation of the plan at a previous meeting. He explained that the Capital Facilities Plan is an inventory of capital facilities that are owned by the District. It identifies the size and location of each. The Plan also describes the District's forecast of anticipated student enrollments, as well as plans for expanding facilities in the future.

Mr. Johnson explained that the District carefully tracks the student enrollment rates since this provides a guide in determining what the long-term capital facility needs will be. He said that in addition to the District's enrollment calculations, the Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction and Snohomish County also provide enrollment calculations for the Edmonds School District. Because each uses their own methodology, the results are different. However, the trend is moving downwards because of demographic factors which change over time.

Mr. Johnson advised that changes were made to the 2000-2005 Capital Facilities Plan to create the 2002-2008 Capital Facilities Plan Update. One change is related to the slight downward trend in the overall enrollment on the six and twenty-year horizon. He noted that the District still does not qualify for mitigation fees. In addition, changes were made to the plan to reflect the impacts of Initiative 728.

Board Member Young noted that the overall long-term enrollment projections are slightly down for the next several years. He asked if the District sees changes in the demographic makeup of the community aside from numbers. Mr. Johnson answered that the Capital Facilities Plan identifies the enrollment increases and decreases on a grade-by-grade basis in Appendix A.

Board Member Dewhirst requested that the District representatives provide more information about why the Edmonds School District does not qualify for mitigation impact fees. Mr. Carlstad explained that Snohomish County is the only jurisdiction within the boundaries of the Edmonds School District that has a mitigation fee ordinance, but the Edmonds School District does not qualify for these funds.

Regarding the issue of demographics, Mr. Carlstad explained that the near-term enrollments will be flat or down slightly, and these estimates are conservative. The bottom line is the District is graduating larger classes than the new classes coming in.

APPROVED

The District is also seeing a change in the student numbers at all levels. He noted that Edmonds School District is not the only district where this situation is occurring.

Mr. Carlstad said that during the late 1980's the enrollment growth was significant and difficult to accommodate. Mitigation fees would have required new residential development to pay a per unit fee to the District. While these fees would not have provided the full compensation to the District to allow them to bring new facilities on line, the fees could have been used to purchase and place portables to accommodate the growth. He explained that mitigation fees are designed to bridge tight and difficult times.

Board Member Young inquired if mitigation fees could also be used as a tool during times when enrollment is declining. Mr. Carlstad answered that Snohomish County leans towards only using mitigation fees during times of acute need. Board Member Young noted that the last bond issue failed and there needs to be some other way for the District to obtain their funding. Mr. Carlstad explained that the capital bond that was voted down by the voters dealt with capacity issues. The intent was to upgrade existing older facilities so that they meet the Districts needs and the new code requirements. He said he would defer issues related to mitigation fees to the City staff and City Council, who have considerably more knowledge.

Mr. Carlstad explained that while the need for additional facilities is no longer necessary during times of declining enrollment, the District still has the need to renovate and remodel existing facilities. This is generally funded by voter approved local bonds. When there are unhoused students, this becomes a more immediate need as opposed to upgrading and adequacy issues.

Board Member Young suggested that perhaps it is time to redefine what constitutes an emergency for which mitigation fees could be used. Mr. Carlstad said the District is researching this opportunity. He said that, right now, the District is having to take funds out of their general operations budget to bolster some acute needs in the facilities area. The District has been fortunate to have had voter support over the past ten years, and the facilities are in good condition at this time. However, the District is having to make choices so that they do not put kids and staff members in inadequate and dangerous facilities. He said he is not sure that a mitigation ordinance would address the needs of the Edmonds School District at this time. However, he said the District would like the City to consider a school impact fee ordinance or an interlocal ordinance with the County.

THERE WAS NO ONE IN THE AUDIENCE WHO EXPRESSED A DESIRE TO SPEAK BEFORE THE BOARD. THEREFORE, THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Mr. Chave explained that the Board must make a recommendation to the City Council either for or against the District's proposed Capital Facilities Plan before the document can be forwarded to them for consideration. He noted that capital improvement programs are not required to meet the "one amendment per year" rule for changing the Comprehensive Plan. These amendments can be brought forward at any time.

Board Member Hopkins inquired if the District's Capital Facilities Plan has always been part of the City's Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Chave answered that the District's Capital Facilities Plan was adopted a number of years ago because the District has numerous facilities located within the City of Edmonds.

BOARD MEMBER DEWHIRST MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD FILE NO. CDC-03-17 TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL. BOARD MEMBER YOUNG SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Chave said he does not recall anyone ever approaching the City Council in person with a request to adopt a mitigation fee ordinance. The District has written letters to the Council in the past encouraging them to consider an ordinance related to impact fees. He explained that impact fees can be a problem in Edmonds because of the City's low rate of growth. In addition, State law limits impact fees to address incremental changes in capacity, not improvements to bring existing facilities up to standard.

APPROVED

Board Member Young agreed that the current law limits the use of impact fees to emergency situations. However, what was considered an emergency 20-years ago may not be now. He asked what would be the appropriate avenue to begin a discussion related to impact fees. Mr. Chave emphasized that the City staff has a responsibility to implement the current State law. Taking the issue before a political body would be the appropriate course of action.

PUBLIC HEARING ON THE CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN (2003-2008) AS PART OF THE CAPITAL FACILITIES ELEMENT OF THE CITY'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (FILE NO. CDC-03-45)

Don Fiene, Assistant City Engineer, briefly reviewed the proposed draft 2003-2008 City of Edmonds Capital Facilities Plan. He noted that this document is updated on a yearly basis as per the Growth Management Act mandate. He added that most of the projects identified in the Capital Facilities Plan are also identified in the Comprehensive Plan. In addition to the spreadsheets on the various funds, staff also provided a Capital Facilities Project Description Booklet. This booklet describes each project and provides a cost breakdown and rationale, as well. He reviewed each of the funds identified in the Plan as follows:

Fund 112

Mr. Fiene said that, this year, a lot of emphasis was placed on the funding impacts to the 112 Fund, which funds a wide range of transportation projects such as street overlays, traffic signals, non-motorized transportation, traffic calming, etc. He said that prior to passage of Initiative 776, the 112 Fund had an annual revenue of about \$766,000, of which \$350,000 came from vehicle registration fees. This revenue was lost as a result of I-776, and Fund 112 was reduced by 46 percent. To help address this problem, staff has proposed that the City Council approve a mitigation fee ordinance. If the mitigation fee ordinance is not approved, further cuts would be required in the future years. He pointed out that one significant impact of I-776 is a 60-year overlay program instead of a 38-year program (optimum is 30 years). Funding for other projects was cut substantially, as well. He reviewed a list of projects and identified the proposed funding cuts for each.

Mr. Fiene advised that the City would still fund the 220th Street Project. The plans include a wider road, left turn lanes at key intersections, and construction of sidewalks and bike lanes on each side of the road. He noted that two schools are located near the street. While the estimated cost of the project is \$4 million, about 60 percent of the funding will come from State and Federal Grants. Funding will also come from the Edmonds School District and the Stormwater Management Fund (412). Only about 18 percent of the funding will come from the 112 Fund.

Mr. Fiene said the City will also move forward with the planned improvements on Olympic View Drive. While the right-of-way is actually located within the City of Lynnwood's boundaries, the west side of the street is in Edmonds, as are the adjacent property owners. At this time, there is no walkway along the street, which is very busy. There are also several schools and one City park located near the street. He concluded that pedestrian improvements to Olympic View Drive are important to both Lynnwood and Edmonds.

Fund 113

Mr. Fiene said the 113 Fund is the transportation fund for the Edmonds Crossing Project where all the different transportation modes will be linked together at Marina Beach Park. He emphasized that at least \$2.2 million of local or State funding is needed in order to utilize the \$9 million Federal Grant that was set aside for the project. If the City is unable to obtain State funding, they could end up losing the Federal Grant, as well.

Fund 116

Mr. Fiene explained that Fund 116 is the building maintenance fund. This fund was impacted both by I-695 and I-747. He explained that there are a lot of buildings throughout the City that are maintained by the City staff such as the Anderson Center, the Edmonds Library Building, City Hall, the Fire Station, the Public Safety Building, etc. The 116 Fund provides funding for capital improvements to these facilities. This year, the fund was reduced from \$100,000 to \$56,000 as a result of the two initiatives passed by the voters. He said the lack of funding will defer building maintenance projects and could lead to overall deterioration of the City's capital assets.

Fund 125

Mr. Fiene said that Fund 125 is used for parks, open space, recreation and beautification projects. It includes the construction and maintenance of trails, environmental protection, education, sports field improvements, waterfront improvements, etc. He noted that the waterfront bulkhead and walkway project is scheduled to take place in 2003.

Fund 326

Mr. Fiene said the 326 Fund is the public safety building construction fund. The current project is the new fire station on 196th Street. This project is making good progress.

Fund 330

Mr. Fiene advised that Fund 330 is the Limited Tax General Obligation Bond Program. This fund will be used to replace the library roof, as well as many improvements at the Anderson Center.

Fund 412

Mr. Fiene advised that the projects funded by the 412-100 Fund are dictated by the 2002 Water Comprehensive Plan. The 412-200 Fund includes projects that are dictated by the draft 2003 Stormwater Plan that came before the Board recently. The projects identified in the 2000 Sewer Comprehensive Plan are funded by Fund 412-300.

Fund 414

Mr. Fiene noted that the wastewater treatment plant projects are funded by the 414 Fund.

In summary, Mr. Fiene reminded the Board that many transportation projects have been cut or delayed as a result of the passage of I-776. The Building Maintenance Fund (Fund 116) has suffered as a result of the passage of I-695 and I-747. The Edmonds Crossing Project has funding problems due to the difficulty of obtaining State and Local matching funds for the Federal Grant.

Mr. Fiene recommended that the Board forward the draft Capital Facilities Plan to the City Council with a recommendation of approval. He noted that the Council has scheduled a staff presentation of the plan on May 6, 2003.

Board Member Dewhirst referred to Fund 116 and inquired how long it would be before things start getting real bad, if the funding deficiencies are not addressed. Noel Miller, Public Works Director, said that within the next three years the City will start to see the effects if they continue in the current direction. They need to figure out how to obtain funding to do maintenance on City structures. Board Member Dewhirst inquired if the City Council would be able to transfer funds from the 125 Fund to the 116 Fund. Mr. Miller agreed that is one option.

Board Member Dewhirst inquired if staff has prioritized the important needs of the City facilities so that when funding is available, they will know what should be done first. Mr. Miller answered that this prioritization has been done and is reflected in the six-year plan. But some of the major projects that have already been deferred for many years have been funded through the bonds that were issued to the 330 Fund account.

Board Member Young asked if, during the staff's process of scoping back the transportation aspirations, any thought was given to capital investments that could reduce the future maintenance costs. For example, overlaying a street could save the City from having to fill potholes. Mr. Fiene agreed that if street overlays were done, the need to fill potholes would be significantly reduced. However, he noted that another impact of the budget reduction is the loss of at least one staff member in the street maintenance area.

Board Member Young inquired if the staff anticipates any additional revenue to the City if the proposed gas tax increase is approved. Dave Gebert, City Engineer, replied that the revenue generated by the increased gas tax would only be used for specifically identified State projects. It would not be distributed to the local jurisdictions.

Board Member Young inquired how long the 220th Street Project would be. Mr. Fiene replied that the project would improve roughly one mile of roadway. Board Member Young noted that the City has identified an expenditure of \$4 million for improvements to what constitutes only a fraction of the street system in the City. He said he does not feel the City would

APPROVED

be able to obtain grant funding for this type of project in the future. Mr. Fiene agreed, and noted that the project just barely received grant funding.

Board Member Young said it is important for the public to realize the current funding situation. Grants will not fix all of the problems. Now is the time to get these facts out on the table so people can realize the impacts they have to deal with as a result of recent legislation.

Lucien Schmidt, 545 Third Avenue South, distributed a packet of information to the Board. He suggested that before the Board forwards the draft plan to the City Council for consideration, they should give serious thought to rewording the project description, benefit and rationale for the City Park Improvements (Project 125 in the Project Improvement Booklet). He noted that the description of the City Park Improvement Project in last year's booklet made it clear that there is a study underway to compare the one-way versus two-way traffic at City Park. However, Mr. Schmidt noted that any discussion of a study or the possibility that the City Park Master Plan would be amended was taken out of the 2003 description. He asked that this be addressed before the document is forwarded to the City Council. Mr. Schmidt referred to his suggestion for how the issue could be cleared up to reflect reality. He noted that this was part of the packet of information he provided to the Board members. He concluded his statement by saying that in view of the efforts on behalf of the public and the City Council, the facts should be reflected in the project description.

Mr. Fiene said that Arvilla Ohlde, the Parks and Recreation Manager, has responded to Mr. Schmidt's concerns and has indicated that she would rewrite the project description to address his issues. The new description would be incorporated into the booklet prior to the City Council's review.

Roger Hertrich, 1020 Puget Drive, agreed with Mr. Schmidt that the project description for the City Park Improvement Project should be changed to clearly reflect reality. Mr. Hertrich pointed out that the Edmonds Crossing Project is mentioned over and over again in many documents. He asked that the Board keep in mind, as they review the plans in the future, that there is no emergency vehicle access over the tracks as part of the project plans. This presents a serious concern for the safety of those people who may be involved in an emergency situation at the same time that a train is blocking the access point. It is important to plan for these situations. There must be an emergency access route over the tracks.

Mr. Hertrich referred to the Transportation Plan update that was reviewed by the Board at an earlier meeting. He suggested that there was a lot of skewed information provided by the consultant for the project. The City Council members were accused of dealing with small items that did not matter, but they were really just asking questions. He said that, in the future, he hopes the Board will ask questions about traffic centers and traffic lights, etc. He said that according to the consultant's report, the intersection at Ninth Avenue and Casper Street is considered to be the most dangerous in the City. However, there are no accident records available to support this claim. The City's traffic engineer said he envisions major accidents at this location in the future, yet there is no history to support his statement. He said the traffic appears to get through this intersection quite safely now, and the information provided by the consultant was misleading in an attempt to get the City Council to agree to a traffic light that is unnecessary. This same type of problem has occurred at other intersections, as well. He urged the Board to be more inquisitive in the future.

Next, Mr. Hertrich referred to the 220th Street Project, which only obtained grant funding because walkways were included as part of the plan. He suggested that the plan does not include enough left turn lanes on the street. He said there are a lot of people living along this street, and they need to have a middle turn lane to improve traffic flow. However, because of the bicycle lanes that are proposed on both sides of 220th, there is not enough room.

Mr. Hertrich said he does not see any mention of the upcoming costs associated with the new arts center, yet this will be a major facility. The City will be involved in upkeep and maintenance and the project should be included in the Capital Facilities Plan. In addition, Mr. Hertrich noted that the Public Works vehicle replacement program funding has not been reduced. He suggested that if the economy goes down and the use goes down, then the life of the vehicles should be increased. He said this is one of the many ways that the City could save money.

Board Member Dewhirst asked Mr. Fiene to address the future L & M for the Arts Center Project. Mr. Fiene explained that the Public Facilities District is a separate entity and is not an actual part of the City of Edmonds. The Public Facilities

District should come up with a Capital Facilities Plan as a separate entity, and they may come before the City Council at some point with a request for funding. Mr. Chave further explained that the Public Facilities District Project would be located on a site that was already approved for public use so the project will be backed by the conditions of the conditional use permit that was approved at that time. However, he emphasized that the Public Facilities District is a separate entity and should not be part of the City's Capital Facilities Plan.

Board Member Hopkins noted that the spreadsheet for Fund 125 identifies an expenditure of \$90,000 over the next five years for the Cultural Arts Center. Mr. Fiene explained that while some City funding may go towards this project, the City would not be the owner of the property. Board Member Cassutt suggested that if City funding is so tight, perhaps the City should not be funding the Public Facilities District project.

Board Member Hopkins said that, from the project description, it appears that the Public Facilities District Project is a City project. The Board agreed that the project description should be clarified.

Board Member Cassutt recalled that the Board reviewed the City Park Master Plan a few years ago. She agreed with Mr. Schmidt that the project description for the City Park Improvement Project should correctly address the one-way traffic issue before it is forwarded to the City Council for review. The Board agreed.

BOARD MEMBER DEWHIRST MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR FILE NO. CDC-03-45 (CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN) WITH THE FOLLOWING CLARIFICATIONS:

- THAT THE CITY PARK IMPROVEMENT PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND RATIONALE BE CLARIFIED.
- THAT THE PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND RATIONALE FOR THE STUDY OF THE CULTURAL ARTS PROGRAM AT THE PROPOSED ARTS CENTER BE AMENDED.

BOARD MEMBER CASSUTT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

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

DISCUSSION REGARDING POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS TO THE EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE MAKING THE DECISION OF THE HEARING EXAMINER ON PERMIT APPLICATIONS FINAL WITH APPEAL TO SUPERIOR COURT AND CLARIFYING THE RULES OF RECONSIDERATION OF HEARING EXAMINER DECISIONS

Mr. Chave advised that this item was placed on the agenda to allow the Board to discuss the potential amendments to the ECDC making the decision of the Hearing Examiner on permit applications final. He said that, as per the Board's earlier request, Mr. Bowman has contacted the Washington Cities Insurance Authority (WCIA), the Port's insurance carrier, to request their input regarding the proposal.

Mr. Chave said staff has also been contacting other jurisdictions in the area to find out what they are currently doing in this regard. He briefly reviewed the information staff obtained from Lynnwood, Mountlake Terrace, Mukilteo and Snohomish County. He said that staff is still waiting for further information from Shoreline, Redmond and Everett.

Board Member Crim inquired regarding the current guidelines for hearing examiner reconsideration. Mr. Chave said the time period is the same length as the appeal time period, and the two run concurrently. However, if someone requests reconsideration at the end of the appeal period, the appeal period must be extended. Board Member Crim suggested that this appears to be one area where some fine-tuning needs to be done. Mr. Chave agreed. He recalled that the City Council adopted a new fee schedule recently, but they decided not to charge a fee for reconsideration of hearing examiner decisions.

Board Member Crim said that if the Board wants to hold a public hearing on this issue in May, they should have some recommendations or a list of alternatives available for the public to review prior to the hearing

APPROVED

Board Member Dewhirst inquired if the staff's poll of other jurisdictions also identified what they do for appeals to hearing examiner decisions (i.e. whether it is to the council or the court). Mr. Chave said staff is waiting to receive copies of code from other jurisdictions, and this information should be available at some point.

Board Member Crim referred to the letter that was drafted by the City Attorney, Scott Snyder, regarding the issue. He said the letter laid out the issues very well, and should be made available to the citizens who are asking questions. Board Member Cassutt agreed. Board Member Crim noted that the only issue that isn't discussed in the Attorney's letter is related to hearing examiner reexaminations.

Mr. Chave said that when the Board discusses this issue next, staff could provide a flow chart and some options for modifications that would improve the process.

Board Member Crim pointed out that this is a highly political issue rather than a planning issue. But it is the Board's responsibility to gather data in an organized fashion to pass on to the City Council, and this will include a public hearing process.

Mr. Chave said that staff would provide an actual written summary or matrix at the next meeting showing what other jurisdictions do, as well as some additional information on hearing examiner reconsiderations, process versus appeals, and actual communications from the WCIA as previously requested by the Board. Board Member Crim suggested that in addition to written comments from the WCIA, it would be helpful if one of their representatives could come before the Board for a question and answer session.

The Board discussed the fact that if a public hearing on this issue is scheduled for May 28th, then the hearing would need to be advertised prior to the Board's next meeting on May 14th. Board Member Young said he would like to have at least some written communications and perhaps a presentation from the WCIA before the Board sets a date for the public hearing. If the Board has both the description from the City Attorney, as well as information from the insurance carrier, they will be able to make a better recommendation to the City Council.

Board Member Crim said he does not see a need for the Board to fashion a recommendation to the City Council before they get all of the data collected. He suggested that the Board could go ahead with the public hearing on May 28th, but they need to have as much information as possible available to the public before the hearing. If the matrix could be available prior to the hearing in addition to the letter from the City Attorney, the public could then be invited to listen to the WCIA's comments as part of the public hearing.

The Board agreed that they should continue to gather information and hold the hearing on May 28, 2003. They emphasized that no decision would be made on that date. The Board agreed that the public hearing notification should clearly identify the issue that will be considered, but it should also clearly emphasize that while the issue is being considered, the Board has not formed a recommendation.

Board Member Hopkins asked that staff provide a brief description of the hearing examiner qualifications. Mr. Chave indicated that he would provide written materials that describe the hearing examiner qualifications. He explained that the City seeks proposals for hearing examiner and an interview process is conducted. The City Council selects the hearing examiner and approves the contract. The City looks for hearing examiners with land use and planning experience. The hearing examiners they have had up to now have had extensive experience with other jurisdictions, as well. He further explained that the hearing examiner provides an annual report to the City Council to describe the number of cases and issues that have come up over the past year. This report normally takes place in November. Board Member Young requested that staff provide City Council minutes from the last time the hearing examiner's report was provided to the Council.

Board Member Works requested that staff provide information regarding the cost of filing fees for Superior Court. Mr. Chave said he would provide this information before the next meeting.

APPROVED

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Board Member Crim reviewed that the next meeting agenda includes public hearings regarding the hedge regulations and the amateur radio antennae regulations.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Board Member Crim provided no additional comments during this portion of the meeting.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

The Board discussed the wording of the agenda item “Requests from the Audience” and whether or not the public would be allowed to speak to the Board on issues that are scheduled on the agenda, but not as public hearings. The Board agreed that the title of this agenda item should be “Requests from the Audience: For items not scheduled for public hearings.” This would make it clear that the public can speak to the Board on all items scheduled on the agenda, with the exception of those that are scheduled as public hearings. Board Member Young observed that this wording would be consistent with the City Council’s agenda.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:05 P.M.

APPROVED