

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
October 12, 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
Virginia Cassutt
Judith Works
Don Henderson
John Dewhirst
Jim Crim

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Cary Guenther

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Karin Noyes, Recorder

Board Member Guenther was excused from the meeting.

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER CRIM MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 28, 2005 AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER WORKS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, WITH BOARD MEMBERS DEWHIRST, HENDERSON AND CASSUTT ABSTAINING.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

No changes were made to the proposed agenda.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

There was no one in the audience who expressed a desire to address the Board during this portion of the meeting.

FURTHER DISCUSSION ON POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS TO THE EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE ESTABLISHING ZONES AND OVERLAY DISTRICTS INTENDED TO IMPLEMENT THE DOWNTOWN WATERFRONT COMPONENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (FILE NUMBER CDC-05-80)

Mr. Chave reminded the Board that they have been charged with updating the City’s regulations to more fully implement the adopted Comprehensive Plan, and the regulations that apply to Downtown Edmonds are one component of this update. He advised that the Board must develop a regulatory framework for downtown that would implement the direction contained in

the updated Comprehensive Plan that was recently approved by the City Council. He recalled that at their July 26th meeting, the City Council put together an initial set of ideas on what an implementation scheme might look like. They have requested that the Board review this scheme and make their own recommendation back to them. He referred the Board to the draft district descriptions and the current language regarding building heights, both of which can be found in the adopted Downtown Plan.

Mr. Chave further advised that the Staff Report also includes information from other jurisdictions in the region regarding how they deal with inclusionary housing, which is a program that is used to address the issue of affordable housing. He explained that an inclusionary housing program would provide a density incentive to encourage affordable housing. The intent is to not concentrate affordable housing units into one particular location in the City, but to disperse them throughout. He pointed out that affordable housing is a significant issue for the City given the high cost of land. He also pointed out the importance of obtaining a good mixture of rental and owner-occupied affordable housing units. He emphasized that affordable housing is a significant goal of the City's Comprehensive Plan and inclusionary housing is a type of incentive program that could be considered as an option in some of the downtown districts.

Arts Corridor

Mr. Chave advised that staff met with the consultants who are working on the Streetscape Plan to discuss the Arts Corridor. The consultants will be reviewing ideas and projects that could help the City jump start the arts corridor concept. In addition, he had a discussion with the City Attorney regarding the option of requiring a developer to integrate art into a site or building design in order to construct a building up to 30 feet in height in the Arts Corridor area. The City Attorney advised that the City could not require that a developer contribute a set amount of money for art in order to construct a building to a greater height, since this would be considered "purchasing a bonus." The City could include this option as one of several a developer could choose to do in order to obtain the additional height, but it can't be the only option. He said another option the City could offer to developers is an opportunity to give money to a fund that provides art projects throughout the Arts Corridor.

Board Member Dewhirst asked if the consultant would be studying 4th Avenue starting at Main Street or if they would start at Bell Street, instead. Mr. Chave answered that the consultant's work would involve 4th Avenue from one block north of Main all the way to the new Arts Center.

Board Member Works asked if art that is integrated into future development would have to be reviewed and approved by the City. Mr. Chave answered that if the Board wants to support this type of concept, they must create a review process and decide who the decision maker would be.

Board Member Freeman suggested that in addition to the option of integrating art into building design, the City could also offer developers the option of providing a suitable place for art. This could be in the form of an open courtyard that is still on private property, but accessible to the public. This type of space could be located back off the street. Board Member Cassutt agreed that this option would be appropriate, and she pointed out that this would be consistent with the concept of allowing developers to put money into a fund for future art projects along the corridor.

Mr. Chave advised that the Streetscape Plan would address many ideas for encouraging art along the corridor. Staff anticipates the consultants would also provide ideas for how art could be incorporated into both public and private projects along the Arts Corridor. He reported that the consultant's goal is to have a final report to the Planning Board for review sometime in February.

Chair Young asked if the Board would be required to provide a recommendation regarding the downtown waterfront component of the Comprehensive Plan before the consultant's Streetscape Plan is available for review. Mr. Chave explained that it is important for the Board to start their discussion now and identify the types of research they would like the staff to do. But the specific details related to the arts should be coordinated with the Streetscape study since this document would provide valuable information. He said staff anticipates it would take some time for the Board to complete their work, and the City Council is not expecting a recommendation from the Board until about the middle of next year.

APPROVED

Board Member Freeman asked how many of the structures along the Arts Corridor have been identified on the map the Historic Preservation Commission put together to identify possible structures for inclusion on the Edmonds Register of Historic Places. Mr. Chave pointed out that several of the buildings along the Arts Corridor have been included on the Historic Preservation Commission's inventory. Board Member Freeman pointed out that historic structures could be considered as a type of art, so perhaps the City should also provide incentives that would encourage their preservation. Mr. Chave explained that the City's historic preservation program encourages property owners, through incentives, to get their buildings registered. He said it is important that whatever language the Board comes up with for the Arts Corridor also acknowledges the historic preservation opportunities, as well. He concluded that the Board's goal should be to identify appropriate incentives that would contribute to the overall goal of what they want the Arts Corridor to be.

Board Member Henderson requested clarification from staff regarding the incentives that would be offered to a person who places a property on the Edmonds Register of Historic Places. He also requested information about the restrictions that are placed on properties on the register. Mr. Chave answered that once a property has been placed on the register, any remodel or restoration work would require a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historic Preservation Commission to make sure the historic nature of the building would not be destroyed. This restriction would only apply to work that is done on the portions of a structure that are identified on the register, but it is not uncommon for only the historic parts of a building to be on the register. Mr. Chave emphasized that the incentives offered to properties on the register far outweigh the challenge of going through the approval process. For example, the City offers relief from the parking requirements for any expansion that is compatible with the historic character of the structure. Financial incentives are also offered, usually in the form of forgiving the additional value that is created by a restoration for a certain period of time for tax purposes. He pointed out that, typically, the historical incentives, by themselves, do not make a project work. But they can make a significant contribution to the feasibility of a project. Mr. Chave concluded by stating that a property owner could demolish a structure on the register, but it would require a lengthy process. This would allow the City time to find another solution to what the developer is proposing to do.

Board Member Works asked if affordable housing along the Arts Corridor would include lofts for artists. Mr. Chave answered affirmatively. He noted that this option is an element of the Everett Arts Corridor Project. Board Member Works noted that the City's restriction on lot coverage, the requirement that commercial space be located on the ground floor, etc. could make affordable housing an unrealistic option for the Arts Corridor. Mr. Chave agreed that this would be difficult, and that is why the incentives for providing affordable housing would have to be meaningful. Board Member Works suggested that the option of artist lofts be specifically mentioned in the description provided for the Arts Corridor.

Board Member Dewhirst asked if the Streetscape Plan Consultant would also consider options for encouraging nighttime displays of art since many of the performances would be during the evening hours. Mr. Chave said the consultant has already discussed the option of creating a decorative street lighting program along 4th Avenue. He suggested that Board Member Dewhirst raise his concern when the consultant comes before them in the near future to discuss the Streetscape Plan.

Board Member Dewhirst expressed his concern that when trying to effect a change using market forces, it may be that the Arts Corridor is not a feasible place for affordable housing. He said it will be hard enough to pull off the arts concept years from now, and encouraging affordable housing along the Arts Corridor might hinder their progress. Chair Young noted that staff is not proposing that affordable housing be required for any development along the corridor. The idea is to encourage the concept in order to provide inexpensive places for the artists to live and work. If this option were available as an incentive, the market could come up with a way to take advantage of the opportunity. Mr. Chave pointed out that affordable housing and artist workspace is a common element of both the Seattle and Everett Arts Corridor Plans. He said that while he does not think the City should require affordable housing along the Arts Corridor, it would be appropriate to provide tools for someone to go in this direction if feasible. Offering the inclusionary housing concept in the Arts Corridor would provide an appropriate tool for flexibility. He noted that the current development along the Arts Corridor provides some of the most affordable housing in the downtown, and it would be a shame to lose all of this with new development without at least encouraging affordable housing with new projects.

The Downtown Plan's Current Description for Height

APPROVED

Board Member Freeman pointed out that this description speaks to the concept of offering additional height in exchange for a clear public benefit. However, the list of public benefits does not mention the concept of inclusionary housing. She suggested that if inclusionary housing were added to the list of clear public benefits, it would open the door for the Board to consider the concept for any area in the downtown, and not just the Arts Corridor. Mr. Chave pointed out that this language was adopted as part of the Comprehensive Plan update. However, he agreed that inclusionary housing should be considered a clear public benefit.

Board Member Henderson suggested that whatever the Board decides to do with inclusionary housing in the Arts Corridor, it should be applied citywide and not just to a particular district. He disagreed with the concept of placing an incentive to encourage affordable housing in the description of just this one district. The concept should apply throughout Edmonds.

Board Member Freeman recalled that a recent report conducted by Mark Hinshaw indicated that the City would need many more residential units in the downtown to make it viable. Therefore, she suggested that the inclusionary housing concept be an option for each of the districts in the downtown. Mr. Chave explained that adopting an inclusionary housing concept that would fit all areas of the City would be difficult. In the downtown, this concept might include lot coverage incentives, etc. that might not be appropriate in other areas of the City. However, he pointed out that the City is currently considering a provision that would allow for a reduction in the parking ratio and additional density for senior housing developments. This same type of concept could be expanded from just senior housing to general inclusionary housing, but this would be a separate issue than what the Board is considering for the downtown area.

Board Member Crim pointed out that the current code allows buildings in the BC zone to be built right up to the property line. He asked if it could be considered a “taking” situation if the City were to require that a developer set the building back from the property line in order to obtain an additional five feet in height. Mr. Chave answered that the Board would have to come up with an overlay or new zoning designation for the Arts Corridor District that would identify the specific uses allowed in the zone, etc. The overlay or new zoning designation must be approved by the City Council as part of a legislative action.

Requests for Additional Information

Board Member Crim suggested that before the Board gets too far in their discussions regarding the downtown districts, they must first come up with a clear definition for how the height of the first floor would be measured. This definition must be very clear and specific. Board Member Dewhirst added that it would also be important for the Board to create a definition for the term “public art” as part of their Arts Corridor recommendation.

Board Member Dewhirst suggested that it would be appropriate for the Board to have some discussion with the Streetscape Plan consultant team to solicit their good ideas, as well. Mr. Chave said the consultant team includes planning and design people, but also an artist who was involved in some of the arts projects related to the Downtown Seattle stations. She has coordinated several arts projects in the area. Board Member Dewhirst suggested that if the Board is interested in pursuing the concept of establishing a program for developers to contribute to the arts, they should ask the consultants to provide additional information for what this might entail. Chair Young agreed, and he further suggested that the team of consultants be invited to the Board’s work session when they discuss the Arts Corridor in greater detail.

Mr. Chave pointed out that in addition the Arts Corridor, the Streetscape Plan consultants are also looking at options for the International District on Highway 99 and the entry points throughout the City.

Arts Corridor

Chair Young noted that the consultants would likely recommend pedestrian scale lighting along Fourth Avenue to give it vibrancy and make it more attractive. He reminded the Board that the concept for the Arts Corridor is to encourage pedestrian activity, and period street lighting has been used very successfully in other areas. The atmosphere generated by

APPROVED

this type of street lighting would be a good investment for the City. Mr. Chave agreed but noted that the cost of the lighting would be the City's biggest challenge, since it would cost more than a typical pedestrian lighting project. Chair Young suggested that one option would be to allow a developer to contribute to a street lighting fund in exchange for the greater height of up to 30 feet.

Board Member Dewhirst pointed out that the proposed language does not include provisions for outdoor dining space. He suggested the City encourage future development to make space for outdoor dining and other uses rather than using the sidewalk space for this purpose. Mr. Chave said the City's outdoor dining regulations have some flexibility, but in order to push the concept, they could lift the restrictions.

Board Member Dewhirst suggested that the concept of encouraging plazas along the Arts Corridor for outdoor dining, etc. could tie in well with a series of incentives related to lot coverage. Mr. Chave pointed out that plazas are not considered as part of the lot coverage unless they are covered. Board Member Crim agreed that lifting these restrictions would help the City encourage outdoor dining that has some options for cover.

Board Member Dewhirst said he would like the Arts Corridor to extend all the way to Main Street. Mr. Chave pointed out that the properties northeast of Bell Street are significantly different than the properties to the southwest. He advised that the zoning restrictions that are applied to the Arts Corridor might not be appropriate for these properties, as well. Before the Board recommends this change, they should carefully review the impacts. However, from a design standpoint, this segment of 4th Avenue South would be part of the overall streetscape plan for the corridor. But if the zoning is changed for these properties to require a greater setback etc., many of the existing structures would become non-conforming and property owners would have less flexibility when expanding or remodeling.

Mr. Chave explained that the Streetscape Plan would include all of 4th Avenue South to Main Street. Mr. Dewhirst agreed that it would be important to connect the changes along 4th Avenue to Main Street through the Streetscape Plan. Mr. Chave suggested that perhaps an overlay could be created for this area to provide the same types of incentives consistent with those proposed for the remainder of 4th Avenue.

Board Member Freeman noted that there are alleys behind the properties along 4th Avenue. She suggested that parking be provided off the alley to avoid curb cuts. Mr. Chave suggested they mention this concern when the consultant reports on the Streetscape Plan. Mr. Chave said the issue of alley access is addressed in the draft Design Guidelines; and currently, the City' first choice is to require alley access where possible.

5th Avenue North Directly Across from the Public Safety Complex

Board Member Henderson referred to the bottom of Page 2 of the Staff Report, which states that the City Council did not talk specifically about the strip of lots fronting on 5th Avenue North directly across from the Public Safety Complex. Questions have been raised about whether the height for these lots should remain at 25 feet or if they should be allowed to go to 30 feet if they resemble single-family construction, similar to the standards suggested for the Arts Corridor. Board Member Henderson suggested that the Board must create more criteria for determining whether or not a proposed development would resemble single-family housing. Mr. Chave noted that Design Guidelines should be used to address this concern, but the Board must first consider whether this strip of property should be a continuation of the Arts Corridor or if it should be separate.

Board Member Freeman expressed her belief that these properties should be separate from the Arts Corridor properties. She noted that the Comprehensive Plan identifies the area as mixed-use commercial, but she questioned the need to zone the properties commercial. Board Member Cassutt agreed. Board Member Freeman suggested that the best use for these properties would be residential. Mr. Chave pointed out that this would require a Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Again, Board Member Freeman pointed out the need for more housing the downtown area. She further pointed out that the residential portions of mixed-use buildings are being sold before construction has been completed. In addition, she pointed out that the retail or commercial spaces must be cohesive and contiguous in order to be successful. Board Member Cassutt

APPROVED

noted that the recent consultant report indicated that the commercial space in the downtown is sufficient in size and should not be expanded.

Mr. Chave suggested that the Board could consider the use of these properties to be similar to what is outlined for the mixed-use residential district. This would not prohibit commercial development, but it would allow the construction of an entirely residential building. Board Member Works pointed out that this could be one possible location for affordable housing if appropriate incentives were offered.

The Board agreed that the properties fronting on 5th Avenue North directly across from the Public Safety Complex should be identified as mixed-use residential. Board Member Freeman added that the market forces would guide the future redevelopment of these properties.

The Downtown Plan's Current Description for Height

Chair Young referred to the language in the downtown plan regarding building height, which was recently adopted by the City Council. Mr. Chave clarified that while the City Council adopted the language related to height, as well as the language that describes each of the districts, they did not adopt the two maps. However, they agreed to send the maps back to the Planning Board as a representation of their current thinking.

Chair Young said his interpretation of the City Council's adopted language regarding height in the downtown is that as long as a development proposal would maintain the goals identified in the downtown plan, they would not quibble over the exact height of the structure. They indicated that pedestrian scale and character should drive the height of structures in the downtown. He recalled that the Board heard many comments from professionals that there is no relationship between the height of buildings and the pedestrian experience. He concluded that as long as a building looks like it is three stories high and doesn't infringe on the pedestrian scale or human experience of the street, it shouldn't matter how many stories or how high it is. Mr. Chave said that appeared to the viewpoint of the majority of the City Council members, as well. They didn't want to talk about an exact height limit, but what the structures would look like from the street level.

Mixed Commercial

Mr. Chave explained that the area identified on the map as Mixed Commercial is not uniform in character. He advised that when the mixed commercial concept was presented to the City Council, staff separated the issues of zoning and height. The City Council's discussion tended to get mixed up between the two, but the main idea was that the City did not need to create a separate zone for each of the areas. Instead, they could create an overlay to identify the differences.

Mr. Chave reported that the City Council discussed a 25-foot base height limit for the Mixed Commercial areas, but allowing up to 33 feet in height on properties located on the downward slopes since no views would be blocked. They felt that some public benefit should be derived in exchange for the additional height.

Chair Young suggested the Board use caution when discussing the issue of view. He recalled that the Board has gone on record a number of times saying that the only view the City has any responsibility to control is the east/west view along public rights-of-way. He suggested that this be made clear in the text of the Downtown Plan. Mr. Chave pointed out that the purpose of requiring any floors above the 2nd story to be setback is to expand the corridor when higher buildings are being constructed. Board Member Works agreed with Chair Young that if the City tries to protect personal views, they could end up with legal problems in the future. Chair Young cautioned that they must be careful how the language reads to make sure the City's position is clear.

Board Member Henderson said he does not see how stepping the third story back would provide any public benefit from the street level. Mr. Chave pointed out that this would not be a requirement, but one of the options an applicant could consider in order to obtain the additional three feet of height. He felt it would be appropriate to require a developer to choose at least

three of the criteria in order to get the additional height. Board Member Henderson said he would like to remove this concept as one of the criteria.

Board Member Freeman said it is important that the City have a goal of creating wider sidewalks in the downtown area. Therefore, she suggested that an additional setback should be a mandatory requirement in this zone. Mr. Chave noted that the Economic Development Director would also insist that a 15-foot first floor ceiling height also be a mandatory requirement.

Board Member Crim asked why the City Council decided to have a 15-foot first floor requirement instead of just 12-feet. Mr. Chave said 12 feet would be the minimum necessary, but historically, commercial areas have 15-foot ceiling heights. Board Member Henderson asked if it would be possible to construct a three-story building if the first floor must be 15-feet high. Mr. Chave answered affirmatively. He suggested that the Board hold off on their discussions regarding the height of the first floor until Board Member Guenther was present to provide his professional expertise. Board Member Crim pointed out that the Board must also come up with a definition to describe exactly how the first floor ceiling height would be measured- Again, Chair Young emphasized that the concern is not about exact height, but how the structure would look and its impact to the pedestrian scale.

Board Member Crim said the map shows the area across from the public safety building as Mixed Commercial, but the height limit would be set at 25 feet. Mr. Chave said the 25-foot height limit was attached to the properties located along the Arts Corridor. When the City Council talked about creating the Arts Corridor, they didn't specifically address this property. That is why it is still identified with a 25-foot height limit. Board Member Crim suggested that the height limit in this small area be set at 30 feet rather than 25 feet. Mr. Chave said the City Council indicated that the lower part of the downtown should have a 25-foot height limit, with up to 33 feet in height if certain criteria could be met. They also discussed that the upper portions of the downtown should have a 30-foot height limit. If these properties were no longer part of the Arts Corridor, it would be appropriate to set the height limit at 25 feet, plus an additional 5 feet if certain criteria could be met.

Board Member Dewhirst asked if the design guidelines would be changed to include specific requirements for the various districts. Mr. Chave answered that the design guidelines are intended to be more generic in character, and would not provide specific direction about how the Arts Corridor should look different from the other districts. Therefore, they must create separate design criteria for each of the districts.

Board Member Works pointed out that there are numerous good designs that have flat roofs so she would be concerned about only allowing an additional five feet of height if the design includes a pitched roof. Board Member Freeman agreed that they should not eliminate the ability for architects to be creative.

Board Member Dewhirst suggested that the Board's discussion should focus on how the height would be regulated since basic design guidelines would be adopted in the future. He cautioned that the Board should not try to over regulate the downtown. Mr. Chave said the City Council's discussion to date has been to set a basic height limit and provide additional incentives that would allow for additional height. On the map, staff tried to identify the basic height limit that was discussed by the City Council and the amount of extra height that could be allowed.

Board Member Freeman pointed out that adding the inclusionary housing option to the Mixed Commercial areas would provide space for additional residential units in the downtown, but she felt they should place a cap on what the final height of a structure could be. Rather than spend a significant amount of time discussing an exact height limit, Board Member Cassutt suggested that the Board allow the City Council to decide what the final height limit should be.

Retail Core

The Board discussed whether or not housing should be allowed in the Retail Core areas. They agreed that residential units should be allowed on the upper floors as long as there would be no curb cuts on the main street to accommodate access and parking needs. Board Member Freeman suggested the Board consider the option of changing the parking requirements in the Retail Core to recognize that in the future there could be a need for housing for people who do not own cars.

APPROVED

Shoreline Commercial

Mr. Chave pointed out those properties within 200 feet of the shoreline fall under the Shoreline Management Regulations, which require view corridors through the lots. He suggested the Board revisit the zoning that is applied to the Shoreline Commercial areas to make sure it is consistent with the Shoreline Master Program. Even for buildings that are not necessarily within the 200-foot shoreline jurisdiction, the Board should consider if they want to require view corridors for properties within the Commercial/Waterfront Zone.

Mr. Chave reminded the Board that they must come up with criteria for the master plan areas that are identified in the Comprehensive Plan. Chair Young noted that the Port of Edmonds' Master and Strategic Plans would also have an impact on the Board's final recommendation for the Shoreline Commercial area. Mr. Chave noted that the Port's Executive Director would be invited to provide an overview of their updated Strategic and Master Plans to the Board in the near future.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Mr. Chave reminded the Board that the Mayor has identified \$140,000 in the 2006 Budget to hire a consultant to help the staff rewrite the Comprehensive Plan, which is required by the State. This work would likely start in February of 2006 and take two years to complete.

Mr. Chave noted that the October 26th agenda includes a progress report on the Streetscape Plan, further review and discussion of the Skate Park Work Group's proposal to locate a skate park at the Civic Center Playfields, and a public hearing on a consolidated project application for a contract rezone (File No. R-05-54/ADB-05-124). Because all of these items could take a fair amount of time, he said it is reasonable to assume that the Board would not have time for further discussion on zoning and overlay districts to implement the Downtown Waterfront Plan. Neither would they have time to further discuss the setback issue. The last two items would have to be postponed to a future meeting.

Mr. Chave reviewed that the November 9th agenda would include a progress report on the economic development element of the Comprehensive Plan and a review of additional zoning changes to implement the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, the Board could review the draft code amendments for Title 20 and proposed code amendments related to zones and overlay districts in the downtown. The November 16th meeting agenda would include further review and discussion on the setback issue and further discussion on potential amendments to establish zones and overlay districts to implement the Downtown Waterfront component of the Comprehensive Plan. Also, staff would invite the Port's Executive Director to provide an overview of the Strategic and Master Plans on either November 9th or November 16th.

Mr. Chave reported that the City would receive a grant from the State to hire a consultant to help them update their Shoreline Master Program. He noted that the State guidelines have been changed significantly and the changes must now be integrated into the City's Critical Areas Ordinance, as well. He said staff anticipates this would be a large project and must be completed and adopted by July 1, 2007.

Mr. Chave announced that a public open house on the Streetscape Plan is scheduled for October 17th at 7:00 p.m. in the Rhododendron Room of the Edmonds Conference Center. The focus of the meeting would be the 4th Avenue Arts Corridor. He encouraged all of the Board Members to attend.

Mr. Chave reminded the Board that the State American Planning Association Conference is scheduled for the end of October in Bellevue. He pointed out that the Board has some funds available to subsidize the enrollment fee of some of the Commissioners who want to attend the conference. Board Members Freeman and Dewhirst indicated their desire to attend the conference, and Mr. Chave asked that they forward their receipts to him for City reimbursement of the registration fees.

APPROVED

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Young complimented the Board on the great discussion they had regarding the downtown districts, and he encouraged them to keep up their level of enthusiasm since they have a lot of work still left to do.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Henderson requested that staff provide a map of the downtown that shows all of the current zoning. Mr. Chave agreed to provide a copy of the City's current zoning map to each of the Board members. Board Member Young indicated that he would access the zoning map from the City's Website, so he did not need a printed copy.

Board Member Dewhirst announced that his daytime phone number had changed.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

APPROVED