

**PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**  
**April 27, 2005**

Vice Chair Freeman called the regular meeting of the Planning Board to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Public Safety Complex, 250 – 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

James Young, Chair (arrived at 7:18 p.m.)  
Janice Freeman, Vice Chair  
Jim Crim  
John Dewhirst  
Judith Works  
Cary Guenther  
Don Henderson

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT**

Virginia Cassutt

**STAFF PRESENT**

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager  
Karin Noyes, Recorder

Board Member Cassutt was excused from the meeting.

**READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**BOARD MEMBER WORKS MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 23, 2004 AS CORRECTED. BOARD MEMBER DEWHIRST SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA**

No changes were made to the proposed agenda.

**AUDIENCE COMMENTS**

**Don Krieman, 24006 – 95<sup>th</sup> Place West**, pointed out that a few weeks ago Chair Young and Vice Chair Freeman attended a City Council meeting to express the Board’s intent when they forwarded a recommendation of denial for the proposed Capital Improvement Plan, particularly the elements related to transportation improvements and the unacceptable level of service that was proposed. While he felt this was a courageous and well-intended action, it may have gone over the heads of some of the City Council Members. He said the Planning Board has done all they can do by forwarding a recommendation of denial to the City Council. With an election coming up in the near future, the budget problems will become painfully obvious to a lot of people. The Board’s actions could pay large dividends for the citizens of Edmonds in the future. The City Council has now been put on notice that there are significant problems with the City’s budget.

Board Member Freeman pointed out that Chair Young spoke before the City Council on behalf of the Planning Board, and she was in attendance to lend support.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON POTENTIAL CODE AMENDMENTS ADDRESSING METHADONE TREATMENT FACILITIES (FILE NUMBER CDC-05-16)**

Mr. Chave said the City Council has requested that the Planning Board review methadone treatment centers and formulate a recommendation regarding any code changes that should be made to address them. He pointed out that the City does not currently have specific regulations related to methadone treatment centers, but they do regulate where they can be located through the zoning ordinance. These uses are permitted outright in the medical use zone and in the multi-family residential zones with a conditional use permit. Also, the proposed draft regulations related to essential public facilities would further regulate the use. If the State were to site a methadone treatment facility in Edmonds, it would normally be treated as an essential public facility. Because the City already has a number of regulations to govern this use, Mr. Chave said staff is not recommending any new ones. Since the two would work hand-in-hand, he suggested that the Planning Board's recommendation related to methadone treatment facilities could be forwarded to the City Council at the same time as their recommendation regarding essential public facilities.

In addition, Mr. Chave suggested that the Board could further address the issue of methadone treatment facilities when they review the mixed-use (BR) zoning option that has been proposed for the area around the hospital. At that time, the Board could review the proposed zoning structure to see if methadone treatment facilities should be allowed in the new zone because of its close proximity and relationship to the medical use zone. Mr. Chave recalled that at a previous meeting, the City Attorney pointed out that the State regulations are much stricter than they used to be. The regulatory environment is now much stronger, and combined with the regulations that are being proposed for essential public facilities, staff does not feel any additional regulations would be necessary for methadone treatment facilities.

Board Member Henderson recalled that the City Attorney previously indicated that the City of Everett has a regulation on their books that prohibits methadone treatment facilities from being located in close proximity to a school. Mr. Chave said staff could provide more information regarding Everett's regulations. Board Member Henderson pointed out that Edmonds High School is located across the street from Stevens Hospital, and he questioned if it would be reasonable to allow methadone treatment facilities to locate next to the school. Mr. Chave answered that methadone treatment facilities are considered medical uses, and usually they are sited within medical zones as opposed to other locations. He reminded the Board that when the hospital zone was created, the high school was already located across the street. There was some recognition that the high school was in the general vicinity. However, because of the topographical change that exists, most of the hospital site is oriented towards Highway 99 rather than towards the high school. He said that if a methadone treatment facility were proposed for somewhere in the medical use zone, perhaps the actual site decision might have something to do with where it is placed on the site relative to the school. If methadone treatment facilities are permitted uses within the medical use zone, the City would be limited as to how they could regulate the use. However, he said he feels it would be highly unlikely that a treatment facility of this type would be located towards the western portion of the medical use zone towards the high school. Board Member Freeman questioned if people who visit the hospital use the bus stops on Highway 99 rather than those that are closer to the high school. Mr. Chave answered that this would be difficult to determine.

Board Member Works inquired if the City has received any proposals for methadone treatment facilities. Mr. Chave answered that they have not. However, there are methadone treatment facilities proposed in both Lynnwood and Everett. He reminded the Board that the existing code would allow these facilities in the multi-family residential zones as a conditional use. When the Board reviews the proposed new BR zone, they should also consider whether or not the City should continue to allow these uses in the multi-family zones or if they need to be limited to the medical zone and the BR zone only.

Board Member Crim inquired if the City Council has established a time line for when they want the Board to forward a recommendation to them. Mr. Chave said he does think this issue is urgent right now. Board Member Crim suggested that since the City's existing regulations appear to be adequate, perhaps they should forward their recommendation to the City Council now. Mr. Chave said staff would prefer to present the Board's recommendation on methadone treatment facility regulations and essential public facility regulations to the City Council at the same time. However, the Board could make a recommendation regarding methadone treatment facilities now, and it could be forwarded to the City Council once they have completed their review of the essential public facility regulations.

**APPROVED**

NO ONE IN THE AUDIENCE EXPRESSED A DESIRE TO ADDRESS THE BOARD. THEREFORE, THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Board Member Dewhirst suggested that the Board make their recommendation regarding methadone treatment facilities now, and then they could wait to forward it to the City Council until after they have completed their review of the essential public facilities regulations. The remainder of the Board concurred.

**BOARD MEMBER DEWHIRST MOVED THAT THE PLANNING BOARD FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION TO THE CITY COUNCIL THAT THE PRESENT REGULATIONS GOVERNING METHADONE TREATMENT FACILITIES ARE ADEQUATE AND NOTHING NEEDS TO BE DONE AT THIS TIME. BOARD MEMBER CRIM SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Chair Young arrived at the meeting at 7:18 p.m.

**REVIEW OF DRAFT CODE AMENDMENTS FOR TITLE 20 ECDC – REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR STAFF, HEARING EXAMINER, PLANNING BOARD, AND CITY COUNCIL DECISIONS (FILE NUMBER CDC-05-15)**

Mr. Chave reported that staff has almost completed the draft outline for the new ordinance related to Title 20 of the Edmonds Community Development Code. Once the draft has been completed, it would be forwarded to the City Attorney for review. He said the draft would not be available for the Board’s review for at least a month.

**REVIEW OF POTENTIAL CODE AMENDMENTS ADDRESSING ESSENTIAL PUBLIC FACILITIES (FILE NUMBER CDC-05-17)**

Mr. Chave reported that the City Attorney’s Office has completed research on essential public facilities regulations in other jurisdictions. A summary memorandum and the sample regulations were provided in the Board’s packets. In addition, the City Attorney is recommending the Board amend the draft ordinance to clarify that SEPA and ADB review would apply. Also, depending on the final outcome of the Snohomish County versus King County legal action (Brightwater Project), the City Attorney has suggested that the ordinance provide for revocation in the event that an approved application fails to adhere to the conditions of approval. Board Member Dewhirst asked if it would be better for the Board to wait to make a recommendation to the City Council until after the legal action related to the Brightwater Project has been adjudicated. Mr. Chave said the City Attorney would like to have something on the books to defend the City’s ordinance and allow them to appropriate review proposals. Once adopted, the regulation could be adjusted based on the outcome of the court decision. If some part of the City’s ordinance was found to be unconstitutional by the court, the rest of the ordinance would still stand.

Mr. Chave suggested that the Board schedule a public hearing on May 25<sup>th</sup> for the proposed essential public facilities ordinance.

Chair Young advised that the State has created a list of uses that are considered essential public facilities. He noted that one of the jurisdictions surveyed by the City Attorney adopted this list as part of their essential public facilities ordinance. Mr. Chave said he would obtain a copy of the list prior to the public hearing. Chair Young inquired if the Board’s mandate would be to come up with code provisions that serve everything on the State’s list. He noted that the list is large and covers a very broad range of uses. Board Member Freeman said that she reviewed the list, which includes types of essential public facilities that would not be pertinent to Edmonds. Mr. Chave said the City could come up with their own list of what they consider to be essential public facilities. But if a new facility is proposed that is not on the City’s list, they would typically make the claim that the facility is an essential public facility anyway. Therefore, any list that is adopted by the City should be considered a starting point rather than an all-inclusive list. While not being on the list could slow a project down, it could not preclude it.

Chair Young clarified that the intent of the City’s ordinance should not be to preclude essential public facilities, but he questioned if there are ways to group the types of facilities and select geographic areas in which the uses could occur. Mr.

**APPROVED**

Chave said certain types or classes of essential public facilities are identified in the zoning regulations based on zone, but coming up with geographic selection criteria would be difficult. He said there are some limits or restrictions on the uses based on the zone, but if the site selection criterion gravitates towards a specific zone and the City's ordinance precludes the use, the City could have a problem. Mr. Chave said the City must have places where essential public facilities could potentially be permitted. He referred to the Federal Way ordinance and pointed out that there is nothing on their list of essential public facilities that would not be permitted in an equivalent zoning area in the City of Edmonds. The essential public facilities regulations would be a type of overlay or conditional use process on top of the zoning.

If the City does not have any zones that preclude essential public facilities, Chair Young asked why the City needs to make changes now. Mr. Chave explained the purposes of the proposed essential public facilities ordinance. First most of the typical essential public facilities that will be proposed for Edmonds could be handled through the zoning ordinance. But an essential public facility could be proposed in the future that the City's zoning ordinance cannot deal with properly. If the zoning code is silent about essential public facilities, then the proponent could determine that the City doesn't have any regulations to cover the use and they can put it anywhere they wanted to. The proposed regulations would permit the use, but only through a conditional use permit. Secondly, allowing essential public facilities as a conditional use would enable the City to apply criteria that the facility would have to meet.

Board Member Freeman noted that the City's proposed ordinance does not address the economic impacts associated with an essential public facility, such as those the Brightwater Project would have created. She suggested that economic impacts should be included as an element of the proposed regulations.

Board Member Freeman said the proposed regulation would require informational public meetings in the City, but the ordinance does not identify how the meetings would be set up. The entity trying to place the facility should not have control of the meetings. This should be the responsibility of the City. Mr. Chave said the entity would be responsible for creating a public participation plan. If it is not to the City's liking, they could make modifications to the plan as appropriate. Board Member Freeman referred to the Brightwater Project that was previously proposed for Edmonds and pointed out that it is important for the City to maintain control over the public meetings.

Board Member Dewhirst asked if the suggestions made by the City Attorney on Page 2 of his March 29<sup>th</sup> memorandum were integrated into the draft ordinance. Mr. Chave said his understanding is that the City Attorney's recommendations were incorporated into the draft document that is now before the Board for consideration.

Board Member Dewhirst referred to Item 9 in Section 20.16.070 on Page 5 of the draft ordinance. He said that while this section speaks about a mitigation plan, it would not necessarily allow the City to require far ranging mitigation for large facilities that site in Edmonds. Mr. Chave pointed out that mitigation is also covered in Item 10 on Page 5. Board Member Dewhirst advised that this language only speaks about mitigation for impacts related to the environment and does not address economic impacts to the City.

Board Member Crim reminded the Board that the purpose of their review is to put together an ordinance that could be used for a public hearing. Once a public hearing has been held, the Board would have an opportunity to revise the language further. He suggested that the current draft ordinance could be used for public hearing purposes. Board Member Henderson disagreed. He said he would like the draft ordinance to be as accurate as possible prior to the Board holding public hearings.

Chair Young asked that staff provide the Board with a list of possible essential public facilities prior to the public hearing. Board Member Crim agreed that the list from the Revised Code of Washington should be included as part of the ordinance.

The Board agreed that Item B on the top of Page 4 of the draft ordinance should be changed by inserting the words "and managed by the City" after the word "scheduled." The Board agreed to add the word "and informational public meeting" after the word "review" in Item C at the top of Page 4. This would make it clear that the entity proposing the essential public facility would have to pay the costs associated with the informational public meeting. The Board agreed that the number of public meetings necessary would depend upon the size of the proposed project. Mr. Chave suggested that a minimum of two meetings be required, and then the City could have the discretion to require more meetings at additional locations. He noted that this could all be laid out in the public involvement plan that is required for any essential public facility project. Mr.

**APPROVED**

Chave indicated that he would forward the Board's comments and concerns to the City Attorney and ask him to draft language that would address their issues prior to the public hearing.

Board Member Dewhirst referred to Item D at the top of Page 2 of the draft ordinance and asked why the Federal Government was left out of this section. Mr. Chave said his understanding is that, by and large, Federal facilities are outside of the City's purview to regulate. Board Member Dewhirst pointed out that State facilities are also outside of the City's purview. However, the State has made an administrative decision to follow local comprehensive plans in the siting of essential public facilities. Mr. Chave said he would bring this issue to the attention of the City Attorney. Chair Young clarified that the State, through the Growth Management Act, has made the commitment to be consistent with local comprehensive plans, but the Federal Government is not bound by this decision.

Board Member Dewhirst pointed out that the City of Everett had a lot of information in their Comprehensive Plan related to military facilities, and they were able to extract significant mitigation from the Federal Government through pressure from congressional officials. Chair Young clarified that, in this situation, the Port of Everett wanted the Navy base in their area and that is why the City of Everett included it in their Comprehensive Plan.

The Board asked that staff incorporate their comments into the draft ordinance prior to the public hearing. Mr. Chave said an updated draft, with comments from the City Attorney would be provided to each Board member at the next meeting.

Chair Young said he found the matrix that was provided in the Bothell ordinance to be helpful. The matrix identifies what types of essential public facilities would be permitted outright in each zone and which ones would require a conditional use permit. The majority of the Board agreed, and Mr. Chave said he would attempt to put together a matrix.

#### **REVIEW AND DISCUSSION ON DEFINITION OF "FAMILY" IN THE ECDC (FILE NUMBER CDC-05-4)**

Mr. Chave recalled that this item was forwarded to the Planning Board by the City Council. He explained that an interim ordinance is in effect which modified the definition of "family" in the Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC) to allow families to house exchange students. He said the purpose of the Board's discussion is to allow them to formulate a permanent code amendment for consideration at a public hearing. He referred the Board to the minutes from the City Council meeting in which the issue was discussed. In addition, staff provided a copy of the existing code language with the change the City Council adopted. Also included in the Board's packet is a letter from Sound View School, which is a school that has experience with international students being housed by local families.

Board Member Freeman noted that the City Council is asking the Board to formulate permanent code language. They do not want to change the ordinance every time a new situation arises. Mr. Chave referred the Board to Appendix 4, which contains the code language that defines "family." He explained that the previous definition for family did not allow exchange students.

Board Member Dewhirst said he finds it distasteful for the City to start counting noses in houses. The current definition limits the number of exchange students allowed in a home to one, but there are many cases where people house more than one exchange student at the same time. There are various programs in the community that sponsor students, and they are very selective and have a lot of support facilities to deal with problems that arise. He said he does not believe the City should have any control over these situations. He questioned what would happen if someone who has exchange students living in his/her home gets into a spat with the neighbors and the City gets involved. He suggested that this could end up sending a bad message home with the exchange students, and it is inappropriate for the City to regulate this use.

Mr. Chave shared one incident that occurred in a neighborhood when a property owner built a new home that included a number of bedrooms. The neighbors expressed concern that this property owner was intending to house a number of exchange students on an extended basis. A question arose about whether this should be permitted or not. This issue expanded to how the City permits exchange students, in general. It was discovered that allowing exchange students ran counter to the City's definition for "family." It was determined that there could be situations where very large homes are

building in order to house a number of students. If there were no regulations regarding the number of people who could live in a house, there would be no protection for the neighborhoods.

Board Member Dewhirst pointed out that a change in the definition would only address situations related to exchange students and not situations where people allow friends to stay in their homes for extended periods of time. Again, he expressed his belief that the City should not regulate who lives in single-family homes. He noted that the current language would allow any number of people to live in a home, as long as they were all related. But if they are not related, they are limited to a set number. He suggested that this is not equal treatment. Chair Young agreed.

Board Member Henderson suggested that the City's ordinance should allow people to use their single-family homes as a type of boarding house where everyone living in the unit eats together and rents out a bedroom. He questioned what changes in the existing ordinance would be necessary for this to be allowed in the City. Mr. Chave said that, currently, the occupancy of homes in the single-family residential zones is bound by the definition of "family." A person would be allowed to rent rooms in a home if they can meet the definition for family. For example, one person living in a home could rent a room to four other unrelated individuals and still be legal under the definition of family. But a family of four would not be allowed to rent rooms to more than one person. Family is defined as either a family of related individuals or five unrelated individuals. Board Member Henderson suggested that a better solution could be to limit the number of people who can live in a home based on the square foot size of the structure. This would enable the City to eliminate the definition for "family" entirely. The City would no longer have to determine if the people living in the home were related or not.

Board Member Works asked how likely it is that a large number of exchange students would all want to live in the same house. Board Member Henderson answered that the Rotary Club sponsors several programs where groups of six students live in local homes for a week or two and then go on their way. Mr. Chave said the typical situation is for families to host one or two students. But in one situation, the neighborhood was concerned that a new structure was being built to host a number of exchange students on a permanent basis.

Chair Young suggested that changing the definition of family is not the correct way to address the situation. Board Member Crim agreed. He said that if a home is proposed that is out of character with the neighborhood, the design criteria could control the problem. Mr. Chave disagreed. He said the only control the City would have is related to setback, height, and lot coverage. Board Member Freeman recalled a recent situation on Finn Hill where one family build a home that accommodated 32 related people on a single lot. She recalled her previous suggestion that the lot coverage requirements be changed to prevent these situations from occurring in Edmonds. She agreed that the City should not be able to discriminate between related and non-related people living in a home.

Chair Young said it would be helpful to invite Mr. Bowman to the next meeting to explain the enforcement problem to the Board since it appears the Board is unclear about exactly what they are trying to fix. He said he would not be able to make a recommendation to the City Council until he knows exactly what the problem is. Mr. Chave said it would be helpful to also obtain information from the City Attorney on definitions of family that are used by other jurisdictions. The Board agreed.

Board Member Henderson again stated that the City should get rid of the whole concept of "family" and address the number of people that can live in any given size structure regardless of whether they are related or not. Board Member Freeman agreed, but she cautioned that the City would not be able to tell families not to have more children because their home is not large enough based on City standards.

Board Member Crim referred to the letter that was submitted by Sound View School regarding the issue of exchange students. He agreed with the suggestion made in the letter that the City's regulations are overly restrictive.

Board Member Dewhirst pointed out that there are a lot of non-traditional households being formed now, and the City's current definition for "family" does not hold up to these trends. There are a lot of people who have boarders as a trade off for services to help elderly or sick people stay in their homes. He felt the current definition of "family" conflicts with this concept.

**APPROVED**

**REVIEW AND DISCUSSION ON DEFINITION OF “SETBACK” AND CLARIFICATION OF WHAT STRUCTURES/BUILDINGS CAN BE PLACED IN SETBACKS (FILE NUMBER CDC-05-5)**

Mr. Chave explained that this issue is the result of an appeal to the City Council on a tree house located in a setback. At the time, the City Council found that the City’s regulations were contradictory and ruled that the tree house could remain. Then they adopted an interim zoning ordinance clarifying that additional tree house “structures” could not be located in a setback until the Planning Board had studied the issue. He referred the Board to the minutes from the City Council discussions. Issues the City Council discussed include what types of things should be considered “structures,” whether and how all structures should be limited in setbacks, and what permits and/or fees should be required. Mr. Chave advised that the City Council adopted an interim ordinance that modified the definition of “setback” in the ECDC. This ordinance essentially reinstated the rule the City staff has applied in its interpretation of the ECDC over the years. Mr. Chave advised that the City Council is now asking the Board to discuss the issue and formulate a permanent code amendment for their consideration.

Board Member Henderson asked if a building permit would be required for a tree house structure. Mr. Chave answered that the Building Code does not regulate tree houses.

Board Member Freeman asked what types of things are allowed in the setback under the current regulations. Mr. Chave replied that over the years there has been a great deal of ambiguity about what is and is not a structure. Staff’s traditional interpretation of the code is that anything that is permanently affixed to the ground is a structure and must be located outside of the setbacks. However, the code is not always clear about this issue.

Board Member Guenther inquired if there is a conflict between the building code and the development code. Mr. Chave answered that the building code does not really deal with things on the ground such as walkways, etc. But it does deal with such things as pools and the fences that are constructed around them. Board Member Freeman inquired if a garden shed would be considered a “structure.” Mr. Chave answered that the building code does not deal with structures that are less than 200 square feet in size, but the development code does not allow them to be located within the setback.

Board Member Henderson shared a situation in which two of his neighbors built a garden shed that straddles the property line between their two homes and has been in place for more than 15 years. Now a neighbor on the other side of the street is angry with one of these property owners and has complained to the City about the shed being located in the setback area. Although neither of the property owners have a problem with the shed being located in the setback between their two homes, the City has told them they have to take it down because it is within the setback area. He suggested that if both of the neighbors impacted by the shed are in favor of it, the City should allow it to remain in the setback. He suggested that the Board discuss issues such as this, as well. Mr. Chave said he would provide a list of examples of the types of structures that have created problems in the past.

Board Member Freeman recalled that the Board has received complaints from citizens about the storage of recreational vehicles within the setback areas. Board Member Guenther said the Board should also address setback issues from a public health, safety and welfare point of view. When structures are built up to the property line or recreation vehicles are parked along the property line, it could make it difficult or impossible for emergency equipment to get access between the properties. He noted that the building code requires certain fire resistant walls for structures that are built right up to the property line, as well. He emphasized that the setback regulations must address the fire safety needs, too. Mr. Chave said another issue that must be considered when discussing structures within the setback areas is related to use. Structures such as pools and playground equipment have more activity, and they might not be desirable uses within the setback areas.

Mr. Chave said he would prepare a matrix of the various kinds of structures and what setback requirements would be applied for each. Chair Young suggested that recreational vehicles should be discussed as a separate issue. Although they raise a legitimate concern, they are temporary and can be moved. Mr. Chave advised that staff plans to bring the issue of recreational vehicles within the setback areas before the Board for discussion at a future date.

**APPROVED**

## **ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS**

Mr. Chave advised that he was unable to prepare an updated extended agenda for the Board's review.

## **PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS**

Chair Young congratulated the Board on their discussion of the Capital Improvement Program. He distributed copies of the "Revenues and Appropriations Bill" that was just approved by the Legislature. Money will be coming to the City as a result of this legislation, but it is unclear whether these funds would be distributed similar to the gas tax distribution. Mr. Chave said the preliminary calculations done by the Engineering Department indicate that the City could receive \$84,000 the first year and \$168,000 the next year. Engineering staff is researching the formula that will be used for distributing of the money. Chair Young clarified that this money would be in addition to the current distribution of gas tax funds and would help the City provide matching grant funding.

Chair Young said the Legislature also approved the "Safe Routes to School Program." Money will be available for cities to evaluate routes to and from schools and how to put in safety features. There will also be a pedestrian and bicycle pathway program that is separate and unrelated to the school route program. He said he looks forward to the City seeking funding from both of these programs to improve their pedestrian and bicycle pathways. There will be a lot of money on the table over the next few months for pedestrian improvements, and the City's Comprehensive Plan would be consistent with these grant opportunities.

Chair Young announced that the Chamber of Commerce has extended an invitation to the Board Members to attend a luncheon on May 26<sup>th</sup>. He said he plans to attend and talk about possible transportation improvements that are needed. Board Member Crim pointed out that if more than a few Board Members attend the luncheon, it could be considered a meeting if a quorum is present. He suggested that, instead, one or two Board Members could attend and report to the group. The remainder of the Board concurred, and Chair Young and Board Member Guenther agreed to attend the luncheon on behalf of the Board.

## **PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

Board Member Guenther said he came prepared to discuss File Number CDC-05-15 related to the review procedures for staff, Hearing Examiner, Planning Board and City Council decisions. He referred to an article he found on the Municipal Research Service Center website titled, "*Use of Hearing Examiners by Cities and Counties in Washington.*" Mr. Chave advised that staff would provide a copy of this article to each Board Member. He also advised that the website provides links to other city and county codes, the Revised Code of Washington, and articles related to this issue. He encouraged the Board members to visit the site often at [www.mrsc.org](http://www.mrsc.org).

Board Member Dewhirst congratulated the Chair and Vice Chair for appearing before the City Council to present a strong case for the Board's recommendation to deny the proposed Capital Improvement Program. He felt Chair Young's statement was appropriate and well within the bounds of normal décor, but there was also a lot of emotion behind his comments, as well.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

**APPROVED**