

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
May 11, 2005

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

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

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Don Henderson

STAFF PRESENT

Duane Bowman, Development Services Director
Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Karin Noyes, Recorder

Board Member Henderson was excused from the meeting.

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER CRIM MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF APRIL 27, 2005 AS PRESENTED. BOARD MEMBER DEWHIRST SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

There were no changes made to the proposed agenda.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Don Krieman, 24006 – 94th Place West, said he watched the May 10th City Council meeting on the public access channel, and he urged the Board Members to do the same. He said the consultant recommended that a 25-foot height limit would be fine, but there would be no further investment in the downtown. He noted that much of the consultant’s recommendations are very similar to what the Planning Board recommended when they forwarded the Comprehensive Plan update to the City Council for review and approval.

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

Mr. Chave reminded the Board of their request to review the draft code amendment addressing essential public facilities one more time before it was presented at a public hearing on May 25th. He advised that the changes recommended by the Board at their last meeting, as well as the changes identified by the City Attorney in his February 2005 memorandum, have been incorporated into the new draft document. The Board also has the ability to make further changes to the document now.

The Board offered the following changes:

- **Section 20.16.030.D:** Board Member Freeman suggested that the words “a facility” should be removed from the second line and placed at the end of the first line. She also asked if the items in this section could stand alone or if they are linked. Mr. Chave clarified that they would stand alone. Any one of the five items could be used to describe an Essential Public Facility (EPF).
- **Section 10.16.045:** Board Member Dewhirst asked what would happen if the City hasn’t executed an interlocal agreement. Mr. Chave said an interlocal agreement would only be required if multiple jurisdictions are involved in a project. The intent of this section is that if there were an interlocal agreement, jurisdictions would have to abide by it, but in most cases that would not be an interlocal agreement.
- **Section 10.16.050.C:** Board Member Dewhirst asked why the reduced fee would only apply to essential public facilities for the disabled and not for other types of facilities such as those for the elderly. He suggested that this section should be broadened to include more types of uses. Mr. Chave explained that the intent of this section is to protect the disabled as required by the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). However, the Board could recommend a provision that would allow others to reduce the fee. But if that is the direction the Board wants to go, they should call out the specific types of EPF’s that would qualify.

Board Member Dewhirst said he believes that senior facilities or senior housing would be appropriate to fall into this category. Rather than using the term “disabled,” he suggested they use “ADA.” Mr. Chave responded that “disabled” is the term for the particular classification that has been identified in this section. “ADA” might be too broad and difficult to define. Board Member Dewhirst suggested that staff further define the intent of this section. Mr. Chave summarized that Board Member Dewhirst is interested in a broader application and a better definition. He said that while the term “disabled” is defined in the City’s code, he would ask the City Attorney if there is a different option the Board could consider.

- **Section 10.16.080.E:** Board Member Works asked that staff correct the spelling for the word “reduced.”
- **Section 10.16.080:** Chair Young said that should an EPF be proposed by a regional agency with jurisdiction for somewhere within the City limits of Edmonds, he does not want to give the agency latitude that could be construed as arbitrary and capricious. Otherwise, they could end up being allowed to do whatever the State law allows no matter what the local jurisdictional requirements are.
- **Section 10.16.090.A:** Chair Young pointed out that this section would place limits on the denial of an EPF project by a regional agency with jurisdiction. While he believes this section is important to the ordinance, the criteria listed are not clear.
- **Section 10.16.090.B:** Board Member Works suggested that this paragraph should be clarified by taking out some of the words. She also questioned why this language only applies to Regional Essential Public Facilities (REPF) and not all Essential Public Facilities (EPF).
- **Section 10.16.090.E:** Chair Young pointed out that the document uses both “Regional Essential Public Facilities” and “Essential Public Facility proposed by a Regional Agency with jurisdiction” to reference the same thing. He suggested that only one term be used throughout the document. He asked why Regional EPF’s are given special treatment in the proposed ordinance. He said he suspects that Regional EPF’s include such things as Metro and Transit Agency facilities since these agencies cross boarders. However, he said the proposed language does not make it clear about why the Regional EPF’s are being treated differently than all other EPF’s.

Chair Young pointed out that the language in this section requires that all EPF’s comply with the provisions of the proposed Essential Public Facilities Ordinance and ECDC Chapter 20.05. However, it also states that a Regional EPF

need only comply with the provisions of the EPF ordinance and be consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan. He said he would like to better understand the City Attorney's reason for calling out Regional EPF's differently. He summarized that the proposed language clearly states that there are two different standards, and he is unclear about why a distinction is being made. Mr. Chave pointed out that this section makes reference to ECDC Chapter 20.05, which contains the Conditional Use Permit Criteria. He explained that the criteria for a conditional use permit would not apply to a Regional EPF because they are beyond the scope of what the conditional use permit criteria were set up to do.

The Board agreed that it would be helpful to have further information from the City Attorney to explain the purpose of treating Regional EPF's differently than all other EPF's. Mr. Bowman reminded the Board that EPF projects are typically difficult to site. He suggested that the Board ask themselves why the City needs to distinguish between a regional and local EPF. Why shouldn't Regional EPF's have to meet the same criteria, including the requirement of a local conditional use permit? Chair Young said he is not necessarily concerned that there are different requirements for a Regional EPF because he assumes that the City Attorney has a reason for distinguishing between the two. However, if the City Attorney indicates that there is no legal basis for making the distinction, he would recommend that all EPF's be treated the same. He summarized that it is important for the Board to have a clear understanding regarding the basis for the distinction.

- **Section 10.16.110:** Board Member Works pointed out that, according to the language proposed in this section, an appeal to the Hearing Examiner's ruling on a conditional use permit would go to the City Council, but an appeal to a building permit application would have to go to Superior Court. She questioned why there are two different appeal routes. Mr. Chave advised that this section is consistent with the City's normal appeal procedures. Building permit appeals must go to the court rather than to the City Council. Since a conditional use permit is considered discretionary, the appeal would go before the City Council.
- **Section 10.16.130.C:** Board member Works suggested that before using an abbreviation for "Conditional Use Permit," the term should be defined.
- **Section 10.16.130.C:** Board Member Dewhirst asked if an appeal to the Conditional Use Permit (CUP) would only be allowed at the Snohomish County Superior Court. Mr. Chave answered that the courts would ultimately decide the appropriate level for the appeal.
- **Section 10.16.130C.2:** Board Member Crim pointed out that the dates identified in this section are no longer applicable since the ordinance is no longer interim. Mr. Chave advised that this language was taken from the interim zoning ordinance that was put together by the City Attorney. The entire section could be eliminated.

Mr. Chave reminded the Board that a public hearing is scheduled for the proposed ordinance on May 25, 2005. He said he would invite a representative from the City Attorney's office to attend the meeting and answer the Board's questions.

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION ON DEFINITION OF "FAMILY" IN THE EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE (FILE NUMBER CDC-05-4)

Mr. Bowman explained that, overall, the definition for "Family" has not been a significant code enforcement issue for the City. However, there were two incidents where this definition did come into play. One was related to a family who decided to add extra bedrooms onto their house to accommodate exchange students. The neighbors filed a complaint, and the City staff found that as the current definition is written, exchange students would not be allowed. The City Council considered this issue and adopted an interim ordinance that allowed exchange students. The other incident involved a rental house that had a large number of people living in it. However, the staff determined that this was allowed since all of them were related by marriage or genetics.

Mr. Bowman explained that the difficulty that this issue presents is that it is almost impossible to enforce. How can the City distinguish between people visiting the house and people who live there? He pointed out that people have a constitutional right to privacy and without clear evidence and most likely a court order, the City would not be allowed to go into someone's

APPROVED

house. He cautioned that having an overly restrictive family definition could be unconstitutional. He pointed out that the City's current definition has worked for over 20 years. Therefore, he said he does not recommend a significant change at this time. The issue regarding exchange students could be addressed by providing a specific exemption for exchange students or placing a limit on the number of exchange students allowed.

Mr. Bowman referred the Board to the sample ordinances he collected from other jurisdictions to provide insight on how others deal with the issue. He noted that the International Property Management Code includes standards that talk about square footage allowed for bedrooms, living rooms, etc. But it also brings up other issues that the City doesn't have the staff to enforce. He said he would not recommend the adoption of this code into the City's regulations. Mr. Bowman advised that a list of different court cases related to the issue of "family" were also included in the Board's packet. Again he recommended that the Board stick with the existing definition and allow him to craft some language to deal with exchange students. Creating a definition regarding the number of people who could live in a house would be almost impossible for the City to enforce.

Board Member Freeman said she does not like the idea of singling out one group of people (exchange students). She noted that all of the City's other definitions are generic and do not single out a particular type of people. She said she also does not like the idea that a group of people of any size could live in a house if they are related in some way, but a family of four would only be allowed to have one other unrelated person live with them. She said families should be able to invite non-related people to live with them. She referred to Kirkland's ordinance, which allows one or more persons, but no more than five unrelated persons to live together as a single household unit. She suggested that a definition of this type would cover any eventuality. Board Member Dewhirst said the Kirkland definition appears to be very similar to the City's existing definition. There could be any number of people living in a home, as long as they are all related. But if the people living in a home were unrelated, only five would be allowed. Board Member Freeman pointed out that the City's existing definition would not allow a family of five to have any unrelated persons living in their home. She emphasized that she feels this would be wrong. Mr. Bowman noted that if four related and two unrelated persons were living in a home, they would not meet Kirkland's definition, either.

Board Member Freeman pointed out that none of the other jurisdictions have definitions that single out a particular group of people. Therefore, she questioned why only exchange students would be allowed in these situations and not other unrelated guests. She said she would like the definition to be changed to allow a family to have a certain number of unrelated people live with them.

Board Member Crim pointed out that exchange student programs are carefully monitored by a number of agencies. Therefore, he suggested that exchange students should not even count when calculating the number of people who live in a house. They are only temporary guests.

Chair Young pointed out that, as discussed at the last meeting, the Board does not have serious issues with the definition of "family," and the staff has indicated that there is no serious enforcement problem. He recalled that the matter was referred to the Board by the City Council. Mr. Bowman reviewed that there is currently an interim ordinance in place to deal with exchange students. A problem was presented to the City Council, and they drafted an interim ordinance to take care of the problem and avoid possible enforcement action. Now the Board must clean up the definition so that the issue does not arise again in the future. The City Council asked them to figure out a way to address the issue of exchange students. Some options the Board could consider include: rewrite the definition for family, put in an exemption for exchange students, put a time period for how long an exchange student could live in a home, etc.

Again, Board Member Freeman said she would like to see something in the definition that would permit a family to have someone who is not related to them live in their home. She suggested that all of the issues should be dealt with at the same time, rather than just taking care of the issue related to exchange students.

Once again, Board Member Crim suggested that exchange students not even be counted as part of the number of people living in a house. Students who are visiting a home as part of an authorized program should be treated as guests. The remainder of the Board concurred. Board Member Freeman said she would like the ordinance to be changed to allow any non-related person to live with a family, not just exchange students. Board Member Dewhirst expressed his concern that

APPROVED

proposing significant changes to the definition of “family” could open up a lot of issues. Mr. Bowman agreed. He said that is he supports the concept of figuring out how to define exchange students as guests and then leave the remainder of the definition the way it currently exists.

Board Member Crim suggested that, in order to address Board Member Freeman’s concerns, the definition could be changed to treat all guests the same. No guest would be counted in the number of people living in a home. The Board discussed the possibility of defining the term “guest” as someone who does not have permanent residency in the home. All guests could be exempt, including exchange students. Mr. Bowman said he would prepare draft language to address the Board’s intent.

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

Mr. Bowman said this issue came from an appeal that was heard by the City Council regarding a Hearing Examiner’s decision that a tree house or other types of play structures should not be allowed in the setback area. The City Council overturned the Hearing Examiner’s decision and allowed the tree house to stay. They felt these types of structures should be allowed in the setback area, and they adopted an interim ordinance. The City Council has asked the Board to consider changes to the definition of “setback” and make a recommendation on the kinds of things allowed in them. He pointed out that the City’s current definition is different than most other jurisdictions because it includes both structures and uses. Most other jurisdictions refer to the setback as where the primary building is located in relationship to the lot lines.

Mr. Bowman said the City staff runs into a number of issues involving setback areas. For example, should temporary aluminum boat shelters be allowed in the setback areas? Should storage of recreational vehicles be allowed within the setback areas? Mr. Bowman suggested that the Board review the purpose of the setback areas and identify what should and should not be allowed to occur in them. He reminded the Board that the City Council previously determined that play structures could be located within a setback area.

Mr. Bowman advised that staff is currently drafting changes to the City’s nuisance laws, and these changes could help the City deal with issues such as recreational vehicles being parked on residential properties. The proposed new nuisance laws would be brought before the Board for review in the near future.

Mr. Bowman reminded the Board of their request that Mr. Chave compile a matrix of things that are currently allowed within a setback area. He said Mr. Chave is working on this matrix and on draft language for a setback definition. He said he is interested in hearing the Planning Board’s thoughts about how the setbacks should be used and the kinds of things that should be allowed in them. With regard to tree houses, Mr. Bowman pointed out that, typically when housing developments are constructed, the only trees that remain on the site are those within the setback areas. Therefore, tree houses are often built within the setbacks.

Mr. Bowman suggested that the Board focus their discussion on the purpose of setbacks, which is to separate the structures from each other to provide for fire and other safety features. However, the current code covers both structures and uses. Board Member Guenther said he obtained information from the City of Bellevue regarding how they regulate setbacks. They do a good job of defining setbacks and minor building elements. None of these are allowed within the setbacks. He provided a copy of the Bellevue Ordinance to staff and asked them to copy it and distribute it to all of the Board members.

Mr. Bowman said he is working to collect examples from other jurisdictions. Many of them talk about buildings rather than uses. He said structures are easy to deal with because there are issues related to privacy and fire safety. But uses are more difficult to regulate. Board Member Guenther said the City of Bellevue’s ordinance would not allow a tree house within the setback area. Mr. Bowman pointed out that in the City of Edmonds, tree houses and play structures do not require a building permit. Therefore, it is difficult for the City to regulate them.

Board Member Crim suggested that tree houses and other similar uses within the setback area could be best dealt with via the nuisance ordinance. Mr. Bowman agreed, but he reminded the Board that the City’s current nuisance ordinance is out of date. Staff is working on proposed amendments that would make the ordinance more enforceable. Board Member Crim

APPROVED

suggested that any reference to use be eliminated from the City's definition of "setback." Instead, they should deal with uses in the revised nuisance ordinance. He concluded that it is difficult to regulate uses. Board Member Dewhirst agreed, with the exception of uses such as parking and storage of vehicles. Board Member Cassutt agreed, as well. Board Member Dewhirst reminded the Board that there is a safety issue when vehicles are parked right on the property line and the City should regulate these situations. However, with the trend of smaller lots, the uses will probably be more intense than ever. Other than parking of vehicles, people will want to utilize all of their parcels.

Mr. Bowman asked if the Board wanted to allow vehicles to park in the rear yard. Board Member Dewhirst felt this would be okay, as long as it is behind the house and outside of the setback area. Mr. Bowman said some jurisdictions prohibit recreational vehicle parking in front of all residential structures. He said that if the Board opens the door by discussing recreational vehicles as part of their review of the definition of "setback," they should be aware that the issue is controversial.

Chair Young recalled Board Member Guenther's comments about safety within the setback areas for fire equipment access and fire safety. Board Members have also raised interesting points about uses that are allowed in the setbacks but intrude on the neighbors. He said that while people pay for their whole lot, they must also avoid imposing a significant impact on their neighbors. He suggested that any use should be allowed in the side yard setback as long as it doesn't bother anyone else. Property owners should not be allowed to construct anything that is much higher than the fence line or that generates a significant amount of noise. However, the fire department must also be able to access the back of the property.

The Board discussed whether or not patios and sport courts should be allowed within the setback areas. They agreed that a sport court would have much more impact to adjoining neighbors than a patio would. Mr. Bowman said it is sometimes difficult to distinguish between the two. For example, driveways are allowed within the setbacks, and someone could put up a basketball hoop on the side of the driveway. He questioned if this type of use should be allowed. Chair Young said he feels there is a difference between sport courts and basketball hoops, and sports courts tend to have significantly more impact to surrounding properties.

Mr. Bowman summarized that if a use generates a lot of noise or is a safety issue, the Board feels it should not be allowed within a setback. However, he again pointed out that trees are typically preserved in the setback areas, so that is where people want to build tree houses. Chair Young noted that these uses are only dealt with on a complaint basis. If something bothers a neighbor or invades their privacy, it should not be allowed.

Mr. Bowman further summarized that the Board wants to move away from uses with some exceptions regarding recreational vehicle parking and fire safety. They would like to allow things that do not impinge on safety and privacy. Mr. Chave said privacy is difficult to define. Mr. Bowman said he would bring back examples of how other jurisdictions define setbacks and what is allowed.

Chair Young recalled that several months ago when the Board discussed Ham Radio Antennas, they restricted them from the setback areas. Mr. Bowman said the Hearing Examiner was straight forward in his decision that the tree house should not be allowed, but the City Council applied a different interpretation. The Board members indicated that they did not think tree houses should be allowed within setback areas.

Board Member Guenther pointed out that the Board has not really talked about how the topography would affect the uses that are allowed in a setback area.

Mr. Bowman said staff would continue to put together the matrix and a draft definition for the Board's next discussion. Before they move into a public hearing, the Board could have further discussion to determine the direction they want to go.

UPDATE ON CITY COUNCIL WORK ON DESIGN GUIDELINES

Mr. Bowman reported that the City Council has been having roundtable discussions with Mark Hinshaw, the consultant they hired to help them with the Design Guidelines for the downtown area. Mr. Hinshaw reported to the City Council that he

APPROVED

reviewed the design guidelines that were initially forwarded to the City Council by the Planning Board more than 2½ years ago. He also reviewed the recent Comprehensive Plan Update and policies. Mr. Bowman advised that at the last meeting, the City Council discussed the direction they would like to go with the new design guidelines.

Mr. Bowman said Mr. Hinshaw encouraged the City Council to visit the Fairhaven area of Bellingham. Mr. Hinshaw expressed his belief that this area is similar to Edmonds in topographical features, with a ferry located at the bottom of the slope. It has a clearly historical downtown core and was originally platted just nine years after the City of Edmonds. Mr. Bowman reported that Mr. Hinshaw took the City Council Members and staff members on a tour of the Fairhaven area, and he participated in that tour. He pointed out that the Fairhaven district is laid out similar to Edmonds. To the east is primarily residential development, with views looking to the west onto Bellingham Bay. The downtown commercial area sits at the top of the hill and slopes down into the industrial areas. They have a port, a ferry, and a sewage treatment plant, with residential property to the south. He emphasized, however, that the Fairhaven District has no parking requirements for commercial uses at all, but they do require parking for the residential uses.

Mr. Bowman advised that as the City Council and staff visited Fairhaven, they took pictures to illustrate the current situation that exists. He presented a PowerPoint presentation of the pictures they collected and explained various features of the Fairhaven District. He pointed out that the buildings typically have first floor ceiling heights of 12 to 15 feet. He also pointed out the types of storefront treatments that have been used, which are critical to a vibrant retail community. They have large windows and the buildings are constructed right up to the sidewalk. This allows pedestrians to look right into the large windows. He said Mr. Hinshaw recommended that it is important for the commercial buildings in Edmonds to be constructed right up to the sidewalk, as well. However, the City has typically encouraged modulation. He has also suggested that it might be best for the ground floor in the downtown core to be limited to retail space only, since there is only a limited amount of retail space that works well. He showed pictures from Fairhaven to further illustrate this concept.

Next, Mr. Bowman provided pictures of new and old buildings that have been built next to each other. He noted that it is often difficult to tell which one is new and which one is old since they typically blend together well. He also pointed out that the streets include an 80-foot right-of-way, which allows for wider sidewalks and the four-story buildings that exist in the area are not over scale. He also pointed out that almost all of the businesses in this district have ornate and unique signs that work well with the buildings. The signs have been staggered and stepped down to address the change in topography. He advised that they also prune their trees from the bottom up to expose the retail area.

Mr. Bowman provided pictures to illustrate some of the unique and interesting spaces that have been provided next to the sidewalks using gazebos, fountains, etc. There are numerous opportunities for outdoor dining, but because the sidewalks are wide, these uses do not impede the pedestrian traffic. He also showed several pictures of the village green area, which includes large murals, bocce ball courts, a large screen on the side of the building and a stage area.

Mr. Bowman explained that design review for projects in Fair Haven is done by staff as an administrative decision, appealable to the Hearing Examiner. Building height is limited to 35 feet, and up to 54 feet with a conditional use permit. If their City Council approves a conditional use permit, it would be appealable to the Superior Court. He said that design guidelines were adopted in 1990, and most of the newer buildings are less than five years old. He showed examples of buildings that were constructed before the design guidelines were implemented and those that were built after. He noted that the newer buildings blend in much better with the older historic structures. He also provided pictures of a mixed-use structure that is currently being built just outside of the historic district. This building will be five stories high, with commercial space on the ground floor. There is no height limit in this area, so approval is based on an administrative decision. To the south of the five-story mixed-use building, a nine-story mixed-use building is being constructed. Their goal is to obtain residential space that would end up supporting the commercial and retail spaces. He noted that Fairhaven only has one vacant space in their downtown area.

Mr. Bowman encouraged the Board Members to watch the videotape of the last City Council Meeting, at which they also discussed the building heights and how the City should calculate building heights in the downtown area. He suggested that interested Board Members should also visit the Fairhaven District. Board Members Cassutt, Works and Freeman agreed to meet with Mr. Bowman on Friday, May 20th, for a tour of the Fairhaven District.

APPROVED

Mr. Bowman advised that Mr. Hinshaw discussed the concept of preserving the retail core around the fountain with the City Council. He also recommended that this area be expanded and that the height limit should be 25 feet. In the downtown areas surrounding the fountain area, he recommended that the City Council consider a building height limit of between 33 and 35 feet. In addition, he recommended that the City Council establish a conservation district for the arts area where there are older homes that could be converted to other types of uses in the future. Board Member Freeman said Mr. Hinshaw also made the statement that he believes “a matter of a few feet is pretty silly.”

Mr. Bowman said he does not see the City of Edmonds ever allowing four and five-story buildings in their downtown. Mr. Hinshaw is suggesting that they protect the core area, but allow the surrounding areas to be vibrant. He also informed the City Council that if they limit the height in the entire downtown area to 25 feet, everything would come to a screeching halt. Mr. Bowman reported that Mr. Hinshaw’s observations were amazingly close to those provided in the Board’s original recommendation to the City Council.

Again, Mr. Bowman urged the Board Members to watch the videotape of the last City Council Meeting. Board Member Crim suggested, and the remainder of the Commission agreed, that staff should provide each of them with a DVD copy of the meeting. Board Member Crim also requested that staff provide the Board Members with copies of Fairhaven’s ordinance and design guidelines.

Mr. Bowman recalled the reception the Planning Board received a few months ago by people on both sides of the building height issue. However, the people who are against increased building heights seem to understand Mr. Hinshaw’s comments. In fact, he reported that Ron Wambolt has praised Mr. Hinshaw on a number of occasions because he has been fair-minded. Mr. Hinshaw has been well received by both sides.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Mr. Chave reviewed that the agenda for the May 25th meeting would include a public hearing on a rezone request by A.D. Shapiro Architects for Hans Lammersdorf for a rezone of property located on Edmonds Way. A public hearing is also scheduled on the proposed code amendments addressing essential public facilities. If time permits, the Board would also have more discussion regarding various code amendments.

Mr. Chave pointed out that a public hearing on the definition of “family” was tentatively scheduled for June 8th. However, the Board needs further discussion before the hearing could take place. The Board could discuss the various code amendments that they are working on, and they might even have more information from the City Council about where they are headed with the design guidelines.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Young did not provide any comments during this portion of the meeting.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Dewhirst announced that City Council Member Richard Marin was recently chosen to be one of the new Sound Transit Board Members.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:17 p.m.

APPROVED