

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES September 24, 2003

Vice Chair Young 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.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

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

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Karin Noyes, Recorder

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER DEWHIRST MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 10, 2003 AS CORRECTED. BOARD MEMBER FREEMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

There were no changes made to the proposed agenda.

Board Member Crim announced that the public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan land use maps would not be closed at the end of the meeting. Rather, the Board would continue the hearing to the October 8th meeting.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

No one in the audience expressed a desire to speak before the Board during this portion of the meeting.

BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Dewhirst suggested that the next time the Board Chair meets with Mayor Haakenson and the City Council President, he might inquire as to what the City Council plans to do with the design guidelines document that was forwarded to them by the Board with a recommendation of approval.

Board Member Crim advised that he has discussed this issue with the Mayor. Mayor Haakenson has indicated that he believes the City Council will likely postpone their review of the design guidelines document until after the election.

Board Member Hopkins asked why the public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan is being continued to the next meeting. Board Member Crim answered that additional hearings related to specific areas on the Comprehensive Plan Map have been

scheduled for the October 8th meeting. Tonight's public hearing is for general comments related to the Comprehensive Plan. During the October 8th hearing, additional general comments might come up, and it is important to allow the public an opportunity to express these concerns.

PUBLIC HEARING ON REGULATIONS CONCERNING AMATEUR RADIO ANTENNAS (FILE NO. CDC-03-4)

Mr. Chave advised that this is the second public hearing the Board has held on the draft regulations for amateur radio antennas. An updated draft was provided to each of the Board Members, which identifies a multi-tiered approach. Small-scale amateur radio antennas would be approved outright. Larger ones would require either a staff review or would have to go before the Hearing Examiner for review. He emphasized, however, that the Hearing Examiner would not really conduct a permit review, but would provide an opportunity for interaction between the applicant and any surrounding neighbors who are concerned about the proposal to see if there are adjustments that could be made to minimize the impact to surrounding properties. He also emphasized that the Hearing Examiner would not have the ability to turn down a proposal for an amateur radio antenna that has received an FCC license. Rather, the Hearing Examiner would referee a negotiation process to minimize the impacts as much as possible.

Sylvia Hochman, 300 Second Avenue North, said she has quickly reviewed the proposed ordinances and has two items to clarify and one suggestion to make. First she referred to Section D.5 on Page 2. This section limits the number of satellite television antennas that are permitted on any residential lot. However, nowhere in Section E, which relates to amateur radio antennas, is there any mention of a limit on the number of amateur radio antennas that would be allowed. She said she feels there should be a limit placed on the number of antennas allowed.

Next, Ms. Hochman referred to Section E.1 on Page 3, which states that roof mounted antennas may not exceed 12 feet in height. However, she noted that Section E.4, also on Page 3, states that the height of a ground-mounted tower or rooftop antenna may not exceed 65 feet when extended. She suggested that these two sections conflict with each other.

Ms. Hochman said she believes there is a flaw in the proposed procedure that is not addressed and could lead to misunderstandings. Section F.3 states that the process shall be an interactive one in which the Hearing Examiner works with the licensee to craft conditions which place the minimum burden on adjacent property owners while permitting the owner of the satellite antenna or holder of an amateur radio license to exercise the rights which he or she has been granted by federal law. It goes on to state that impacts on view and on the values of neighboring properties may be considered when imposing reasonable conditions. Ms. Hochman expressed her belief that the code should be amended so that the process can be set in motion when the permit is applied for before the Hearing Examiner step is reached. This should take place before the installation is started.

Ms. Hochman said she and her husband had good reason to believe that when they moved into their home, codes were in place to restrict rooftop antennas of any kind since none of the homes in the area had them. When the Waldburger's antenna went up, it was quite a shock. Considering the back and forth that went on between the neighbors and Mr. Waldburger, the situation could have been much less intense if the neighbors had been alerted of the possibility and been able to reach a satisfactory solution before the antenna was installed. She suggested that this be an amendment to the proposed language.

Mr. Chave advised that the City received a letter on September 22, 2003 from **Virginia Stewart, 300 Second Avenue North**. It stated: "I have already written my feelings about the dismantled antenna at 325 Second Avenue North. I want to add that I agree with the FCC that citizens must be able to communicate by amateur radio. I am aware that cities may make up their rules regarding the size, placement, etc. in their community. I am told rules often differ from city to city. I think our city should make a ruling that allows the minimum size to be installed that lets operators communicate with each other. That would mean that adjoining neighbor's needs and desire are also met."

Bob Preston, 809 Cary Road, said he is an amateur radio operator in the City. He said he was confused by the comments made by Ms. Hochman, and he would like to have time to review the proposal before commenting on it. He noted that no fee is being proposed for the Hearing Examiner process. This would mean the fee would go from \$1,400, which is the current fee, to no fee. He said he was in the City offices a few weeks ago and was told that nothing would be done with the

APPROVED

amateur radio antenna regulations until the end of the year. Therefore, he was surprised to learn that a public hearing had been scheduled. He asked that he be given time to review the document and provide his comments at a later date.

Board Member Works referred to Section E.1 on Page 3 and inquired if a lattice tower would be excluded. Mr. Chave answered that lattice towers would be included. Board Member Works noted that at the last meeting, the Board discussed that local jurisdictions have the ability to prohibit lattice tower structures in residential neighborhoods. Mr. Chave noted that Section E.1 merely provides a general definition of what constitutes an amateur radio antenna. The regulations listed above identify what is allowed. He noted that Section E.4 pertains to permitting, whereas the definition about height refers to the permissible structures. Sixty-five feet is the threshold. If an antenna exceeds that height, the applicant would have to obtain a waiver. An applicant would be allowed to have an antenna that cranks up to 65 feet, but then it has to be taken down to around the normal height limit for the zone. From a practical standpoint, Mr. Chave said a lattice tower would not be able to locate on top of a roof, but it could be placed on the ground.

Mr. Chave clarified Ms. Hochman's concern. He said Section E.1 is pertaining to permitting, whereas the definition about height refers to the permissible structure. This section identifies a threshold for height, and if an applicant wants to go over that height, either a staff review or a Hearing Examiner process would be required. It would still allow an antenna that cranks up to 65 feet in height, as long as it does not exceed the normal height allowed in the zone when it is not cranked up.

Regarding fees and charges for the Hearing Examiner process, Mr. Chave said the Board has the ability to make a recommendation to the City Council who is responsible for setting fees by resolution. Previously, the Board has discussed the option of charging a fee for the Hearing Examiner process. However, the staff's recommendation, as presented by the City Attorney, is that the fee must be minimal at most simply because the City does not want the fee to become an obstacle for someone exercising their rights under their Federal license. He noted that the Hearing Examiner process would be different than a conditional use permit process, so it would not be obvious that a conditional use fee should be charged. The Hearing Examiner process, as proposed, would be an interactive process. If a fee is to be set, it must be done by the City Council. However, the Board could forward a recommendation to them related to the fee.

To address Mr. Preston's request that he be given additional time to review the document and provide comments, Board Member Crim pointed out that the Board will only be making a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council will hold an additional public hearing before taking any official action on the item. Any action by the Board would simply be a recommendation to the City Council. Mr. Preston would have time before the City Council public hearing to review the documents carefully.

Mr. Chave noted that the interactive Hearing Examiner process could be triggered as the result of an applicant finding that the City's regulations would not allow he or she to exercise their rights according to the Federally approved license. Or it could be triggered by a neighbor who wants the Hearing Examiner to mediate a discussion between the applicant and the surrounding property owners to minimize the impacts of the proposed antenna. He explained that any application that exceeds the threshold identified in E(2) would require a staff review, and notice would be provided to property owners within 300 feet of the subject property. The neighbors would, therefore, know what is being proposed before an antenna is erected. The surrounding property owners would have the ability to find out more about the proposal by contacting the City, and at that point, they would have the ability to request a Hearing Examiner process.

John Waldburger, 327 Second Avenue North, thanked the Board, the staff and the City Attorney for all of their hard work on this issue. He reviewed that about 18 months ago he put an amateur radio antenna up after obtaining a building permit from the City. He said he has lived in three other homes in Edmonds and had amateur radio antennas at each location without being aware that a conditional use permit was required. However, soon after he put the antenna on his existing home, the City notified him that he would have to pay \$100 per day unless he took it down because he was in violation of the code. He said he contacted the FCC about his rights, and they agreed that his rights were being violated because \$1,400 for a permit seemed to be excessive. However, they also agreed that the City does have the right to have codes and the best option would be for him to work with the City officials rather than going through the court system.

Mr. Waldburger said he wrote letters to the City Council and they referred the issue to the Planning Board for consideration. The proposal that is now before the Board is a two-tiered process so that smaller amateur radio antennas that are put on the

roof and are no greater than 12 feet in height can be erected without any permits or notification requirements. The bigger antennas would still require a conditional use permit through a different process, and the Board still must make a recommendation as to what the fee for this process should be. He said it makes sense to him that smaller antennas be permitted outright, and it would probably violate Federal Law PRB-1 if the City were to make the process so onerous that people would be unable to put up their antennas. However, he agreed that it does make sense to require larger antennas to go through a Hearing Examiner review process.

Mr. Waldburger recalled that at the last meeting the City Attorney and Mr. Chave stated that, to their knowledge, there has only been two times when problems with amateur radio antennas have come up. Yet there are over 250 amateur radio operators in the zip code areas 98020 and 98026. These operators are not being subject to the conditional use permit requirement because they have small antennas and none of the neighbors have complained. But they have not obtained a conditional use permit as required by the City of Edmonds regulations.

Sylvia Hochman said that, as she sees it, the whole situation did not come to a head until the new antenna was put up. Until that time, there were two poles with a thin antenna dangling in between. However, the mast for the new antenna was vertical, which they found to be annoying. However, when the larger antenna was attached to the mast, it ended up cutting across the sky in a large horizontal and became something they didn't want. She said she was hoping that the Hearing Examiner process would allow the neighbors and the applicant to sit down and work out a resolution that would substitute the vertical antenna for a horizontal one, which would not be as offensive. She said she does not want to battle over rights and desires, but it would be a nice neighborly thing for him to do. That is why she wrote that as part of her suggestions so that the next group would not have to go through this situation. She said she still hopes that perhaps since the new antenna has not been put back up, there could be a way to resolve the situation with much more common acceptance.

Sue Waldburger, 327 Second Avenue North, clarified for the record that she and her husband were rather surprised at the implication that they failed to speak with the neighbors about this situation. She said the neighbors have never approached them. In fact, she and her husband had never even heard of Mr. and Mrs. Hochman until this process started. They try to be excellent neighbors and are surprised at the suggestion that they are ignominious. She said that one of the neighbors from the condo association came to them to talk about Burger King trash that was being left out in the neighborhood, and they did talk about the antenna briefly. She said they would have been happy to speak with the neighbors, but they didn't know there was a problem until the City notified them.

Board Member Dewhirst said that two things still bother him about the proposed ordinance. First is that he thinks there should be some fee attached to the interactive Hearing Examiner process because it is going to cost money and those involved should pay the fees rather than having the money come out of the City revenues. While he is having a hard time figuring out what that fee should be, he is convinced that the average tax payer should not have to pay for a special privilege that the Federal Government has given certain people.

Board Members Cassutt and Crim suggested that the proposed ordinance should be forwarded to the City Council with the suggestion that the City Council set a modest fee for the Hearing Examiner process. Mr. Chave suggested that perhaps two fees should be set. One for those applications that exceed the threshold and require a staff review, and then a higher fee could be set for situations in which either the applicant or the surrounding property owners request a Hearing Examiner process. He said that the normal staff decision fee is about \$500. Perhaps the fee for the Hearing Examiner could be set at half that amount or less. He suggested that before staff makes a recommendation for a fee, they should check with other jurisdictions to see what type of fee they charge for this same type of service.

BOARD MEMBER CASSUTT MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD FILE CDC-03-4 TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL AND REQUEST THAT THE CITY COUNCIL SET A FEE FOR THE HEARING EXAMINER INTERACTIVE PROCESS. A NOTE SHOULD BE ATTACHED TO THE BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION STATING THAT THE STAFF WOULD RESEARCH THE FEES THAT ARE CURRENTLY CHARGED BY OTHER JURISDICTIONS FOR THIS TYPE OF SERVICE. BOARD MEMBER YOUNG SECONDED THE MOTION.

APPROVED

Board Member Young said he has mixed feelings about sending the proposal to the City Council. On one hand, it is at the point now where it is really a policy issue. He said he agrees that there should be a fee or fees attached and they should be set by the City Council. He recalled that the last time the Board discussed this issue, the City Attorney explained that he would draft language that would allow the minimal required to meet the rights an amateur radio operator would have under their FCC license. He said he has to assume that is what the proposed language does. However, he said the proposed language is difficult to understand. While he will recommend that the file be forwarded to the City Council with a recommendation of approval, since this is not a burning issue, he would also support a City Council request that further policy direction be provided. The proposed language is very awkward.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Board Member Crim requested that Mr. Chave draft a transmittal letter to attach to the Board's recommendation to the City Council.

PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TRANSLATING THE EXISTING LAND USE MAPS FROM GENERALIZED DESIGNATION AREAS TO SPECIFIC, PARCEL-BASED LAND USE DESIGNATIONS (FILE NO. CDC-03-7)

Mr. Chave advised that this first public hearing on the Comprehensive Plan Map conversion would be general in nature. At the next meeting, public hearings will be held on the parcel-specific map changes that have been submitted by the City and citizens. He emphasized that tonight's hearing should focus on the overall Comprehensive Plan, as well as the changes in designation for some of the elementary school sites.

Mr. Chave said that, at this time, the City has a very generalized Comprehensive Plan map that does not purport to show the land use for any particular property, but just the general land use patterns for the City. He displayed a copy of the existing Comprehensive Plan Map for the Downtown/Waterfront Activity Center, which gives an overall picture of what the land use is supposed to be. He then displayed a copy of the proposed Comprehensive Plan Map for this same area, showing different individual properties with a lot more detail. He explained that the general circular shapes on the existing Comprehensive Plan Map were made into hard edges with specific boundaries.

Mr. Chave explained that, historically, the existing "bubble" style Comprehensive Plan Map has been a problem because it is not exactly clear as to what the land use designation is for properties that are located around the perimeter of the bubble shape. He further explained that the "bubble" style map was used in 1995 because land use designations were a new concept, which the City staff had no experience with. Therefore, it was felt that it would be better to have a more generalized map to allow property owners more flexibility when seeking zoning changes. He noted that when a rezone request also requires a change in the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map, a property owner becomes more limited since the Comprehensive Plan can only be amended once a year. This creates a significant obstacle for someone who wants to change the zoning on a particular property that seems logical. The idea was to provide some flexibility in zoning over the intervening years to allow justifiable changes to occur before setting hardened boundaries. Staff believes now is an appropriate time to take the next step.

Mr. Chave recalled that the Board discussed that they did not want to confuse the process of converting the Comprehensive Plan Map by discussing the policy issues at the same time. Therefore, they decided to work on the map revisions in 2003 in preparation for policy discussions and changes in 2004. The advantage of having a detailed map going into next year's discussion is that it can provide a tremendous amount of information to help the Board in their analysis of policy issues. In addition, a lot of agencies and the Federal Government are using a common GIS System to produce and distribute their maps.

Mr. Chave displayed a proposed Comprehensive Plan Map for each of the activity centers within the City including the Medical/Highway 99 area, Five Corners, and the Westgate Corridor.

APPROVED

Mr. Chave reminded the Board that a few years ago, the City changed their regulations regarding community facilities so that elementary schools were permitted in single-family residential zones. However, many of these school sites are zoned Public, which is no longer necessary. Staff is recommending that the land use on these sites be converted back to the underlying single-family residential zoning. He emphasized that this would not change the status of the schools or what they are permitted to do, but it would make the zoning for the schools consistent with the surrounding neighborhoods and with what the current development regulations would allow.

Mr. Chave suggested that rather than close the general public hearing at the end of the meeting, the Board could continue it to the next meeting. There may be some aspects of the individual proposals that come up at the next meeting that would require the Board to revisit parts of the overall Comprehensive Plan Map at the same time.

Board Member Crim inquired regarding public attendance at the Comprehensive Plan Workshops. Mr. Chave reported that there were a few dozen citizens at the workshop session, but there were no particular issues raised.

Peter Beck, 723 Hanna Park Road, said he attended the open house and discussed the Comprehensive Plan Map with members of the City staff. He referred to the proposed Comprehensive Plan Map for the Medical/Highway 99 Activity Center. He noted that a portion of the dotted red line that is used to identify the boundary of the activity center is actually located in Mountlake Terrace. Since the Board and staff are attempting to make the map more accurate, this boundary should be changed to follow the boundary of the City of Edmonds.

Mr. Beck pointed out that although the hearing is general, it is important that an inventory of all of the potential areas that are going to be adopted in the future be brought to the table now. He questioned how the Board could validate something on a general basis when they don't know the consequences of the parcels that will be affected such as in the Westgate area. He noted that in the Westgate Activity Center, the area to the right of 100th Avenue West would likely be the subject of future debate. There is also another little section of property in that area that needs specific consideration. Mr. Chave said that both of these areas would be the topic of the parcel specific public hearing on October 8th.

Mr. Beck said it appears that staff is asking the Board to take action on a general basis without considering the detailed changes. Mr. Chave clarified that the Board would accept all public testimony during this hearing, have a discussion and then continue the public hearing to the next meeting. After hearing the comments related to the specific proposals on October 8th, the Board could revisit the general map if necessary.

Mr. Beck closed his remarks by stating that the more information the Board has the more accurate their decisions will be.

Board Member Crim explained that the Board is trying to approach the Comprehensive Plan Map changes gently because they present a substantial change from the way it has been done before. The Board did not want to jam the entire process through in one public hearing. The intent was to address the general topics first and then the lot specific changes at the next meeting. Mr. Chave noted that the lot specific changes have quasi-judicial aspects that lend themselves to a little bit different process than what is being discussed at the hearing tonight.

Brett Carlstad, 20420 – 68th Avenue West, Edmonds School District, said he appreciates the opportunity to work with the Board and the staff as the Comprehensive Plan Map has evolved over the years to get to finally become parcel specific. He said the District is pleased and understands, from a land use planning perspective, the City's desire to change the elementary school sites back to the underlying zone and allow elementary schools to operate in all residential zones as outright permitted uses.

Mr. Carlstad referred to the map, which identifies the former Woodway High Site as "the Old Woodway High School Site." He asked that this reference be changed to "'Former Woodway High School Site" because the last permanent program on that site was the high school, but the facility is not considered old. In addition, he said the Woodway Elementary site should be identified as the "Old Woodway Elementary Site." The site identified as the Maplewood K-8 Site actually has two programs operating in the facility: the Maplewood K-8 Parent Co-Op and the Handicap Center for the District. Mr. Chave said it is probably wise to avoid attaching program names to the individual District sites. He agreed that whatever name the

District wants to use to identify their sites would be okay with staff. Mr. Carlstad pointed out that if the City adopts the District's Capital Facilities Plan, the names for the individual sites would be updated.

Mr. Carlstad advised that at the Madronna K-8 and Woodway Elementary sites there is a dashed line between the two parcels. However, while there are two educational programs going on, the site is actually only one legal parcel.

Don Krieman, 24006 – 95th Place West, said he would like to be notified of upcoming hearings related to the Comprehensive Plan, particularly regarding the re-designation of school sites. He said he would like to know if this re-designation would make the school sites more sellable. He said he lives close to a commercial district near the Madronna and Woodway School sites. He said he is concerned that the zoning not destroy the trees and the hills. Again, he said he would like to be notified of the next hearing and what the proposed changes for school sites would mean.

Mr. Chave explained that the two school sites mentioned by Mr. Krieman are already zoned RS, so there would be no changes in the zoning or in the Comprehensive Plan map for these sites. However, there are a few school sites, generally in the northern part of the City, that had been zoned Public. These sites will be taken back to Single-Family Residential. He said that, in his estimation, there would be no change in sellability or what the owners of the properties would be able to do with the sites. As long as they continue to be used as a school site that is owned by the district, the change should have no impact on the District's ability to operate their future programs. However, if one of the sites were to become surplus and sold, restrictions would be tied to its use. Any future owner would have to abide by the single-family residential zoning requirements. If the properties remain as public zoning, the new owner would have to abide with what the public use zoning designation would allow. He explained that when the community facilities ordinance was adopted, the public use zone became more of a regional zone. Because elementary schools are permitted outright in any zone, it makes sense to rezone the properties back to single-family residential because it provides more protection to the residential neighborhoods if the use were to change in the future.

Board Member Dewhirst inquired if it would be possible for the District to redevelop a school site that is located in a single-family residential zone. Mr. Chave answered that if a new school facility were to be built in a single-family residential zone, there are certain provisions in the community facilities code that would accommodate the District's needs.

THE BOARD CONTINUED THE PUBLIC HEARING TO OCTOBER 8, 2003.

Board Member Dewhirst said the map is a lot more clear than the draft one they reviewed at their last meeting. It addresses a lot of the issues that were brought up previously by the Board. He referred to one parcel in the Downtown/Waterfront Activity Center (on the east side of 6th and Walnut). Mr. Chave said the land use that is identified on the new map represents the existing land use in that area. Board Member Crim pointed out that kitty corner from that property is a large lot that the Board has held several reviews on.

Board Member Crim noted that the only change to the map since the last time the Board reviewed it was in the Westgate area. One of the earlier maps shows the extreme west of the corridor as low-density residential, but in reviewing the map they found and corrected that as being consistent with the small lot single-family land use.

Board Member Crim said the comment Mr. Beck made related to the boundary of the Medical/Highway 99 Activity Center being in Mountlake Terrace is pertinent and a change would be appropriate.

Board Member Dewhirst pointed out the Medical/Highway 99 Activity Center and inquired if the area to the northwest and south that are currently designated as single-family residential would remain as part of the activity center. Mr. Chave said the activity centers allow for a mixture of uses, which includes single-family residential. He said the notion of including single-family residential neighborhoods that are close to the activity centers is to get across the concept that single-family residential uses are not incompatible with urban activity centers. Including single-family residential neighborhoods does not presume that the zoning would eventually be changed to multi-family. While they are located within the boundary of the activity centers, the Comprehensive Plan Map shows them as single-family residential and the zoning would not be changed.

APPROVED

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Board Member Crim advised that a public hearing on the proposed parcel specific Comprehensive Plan Map amendments is scheduled for October 8, 2003.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

Mr. Chave said he provided Board Member Dewhirst with maps the staff received by email to illustrate that next year, when the Comprehensive Plan Map is converted to the GIS System a lot more analysis would be available. The maps he provided to Board Member Dewhirst were created by Snohomish County for the DNR and FEMA using grant funding. One is titled "Preliminary Liquefaction Susceptibility Map" and the other is titled "National Earthquake Hazard Reduction Program Soils Type Map." He said Snohomish County was able to produce these maps using the GIS system, and Edmonds would have the ability to lay these maps out on their specific properties, as well. He said he provided copies of these maps to illustrate the type of information the Board can expect as part of the Critical Areas Ordinance review that will occur next year to make sure that the Comprehensive Plan is consistent with the analysis. He said this could potentially have an impact on zoning patterns in the north part of the City.

Mr. Chave reported that at the last City Council Meeting, Mr. Bullock provided an historical sketch on zoning, building heights, modified roof designs, and building designs. He divided his slide presentation into the following timer periods:

- Prior to 1956 before zoning codes and regulations were enacted by the City.
- From 1956 to 1964 when the height limit was 45 feet.
- From 1964 to 1981 when the height limit was 35 feet.
- From 1981 to the present date when the height limit has been 25 feet, plus an additional five.

Mr. Chave said Mr. Bullock provided slides depicting buildings that were constructed during each of the four time periods so that the Council could see the different characteristics of each. There was even a difference between 1981 to 1997 and 1997 to the present date as a result of actions on the part of the ADB and the City Council regarding roof modulation as opposed to modulation of buildings. He urged the Board members to view the City Council presentation when it is available on the public access channel.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

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

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

None of the Board Members provided additional comments during this portion of the agenda.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:15 P.M.

APPROVED