

**CITY OF EDMONDS  
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES  
March 22, 2006**

---

---

Chair Freeman called the regular meeting of the Planning Board to order at 7:03 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Public Safety Complex, 250 – 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

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

**STAFF PRESENT**

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager  
Dave Gebert, City Engineer  
Don Fiene, Assistant City Engineer  
Brian McIntosh, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director  
Frances White Chapin, Cultural Services Manager  
Jennifer Gerend, Economic Development Director  
Karin Noyes, Recorder

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT**

Virginia Cassutt  
Don Henderson

Board Members Cassutt and Henderson were excused from the meeting.

**READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**BOARD MEMBER CRIM MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF MARCH 8, 2006 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. VICE CHAIR DEWHIRST SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA**

A discussion regarding the upcoming retreat was scheduled as Item 9a. The remainder of the agenda was approved as submitted.

**AUDIENCE COMMENTS**

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

**REPORT ON REQUEST FROM HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION FOR THE BOARD TO CONSIDER AN AMENDMENT TO THE EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE (ECDC)**

Mr. Chave reported that on March 9<sup>th</sup> the Historic Preservation Commission approved a draft ordinance proposing an amendment to the ECDC to expedite the registration of historic properties already on the State or Federal Registers. They are asking the Planning Board to set a public hearing for the ordinance. The Board agreed to schedule the hearing for April 26, 2006.

**REPORT FROM HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION REGARDING 4<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE CORRIDOR ADAPTIVE REUSE INCENTIVES**

Mr. Chave reported that the Historic Preservation Commission has worked with the Edmonds Economic Development Director to create a list of potential incentives that could be implemented along the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue Corridor to encourage the adaptive reuse of existing buildings along the street. While no action is required at this time, the Historic Preservation Commission is asking the Board to keep the proposed incentives in mind as they consider zoning regulations for the downtown area, specifically the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue Corridor.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PLAN (ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ELEMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN)**

Ms. Gerend referred the Board to the updated draft of the Economic Development Element of the Comprehensive Plan. She said that when she first started to draft the element, she decided it would be best to take a very moderate approach so the document would be easily accepted by the City Council. She briefly reviewed the following changes that were made to the document since the last time they reviewed it:

- Page 8 – The “City Revenues and Sustainability” Section was changed to be much more involved than she originally intended. She explained that in many jurisdictions, this discussion would typically take place during the budget process, but that is not the case in Edmonds. Therefore, she felt it appropriate for this section to emphasize the link between each year’s budgetary constraints and the ongoing land use decisions.
- Page 18 – New language was provided as Section C “Implementation.” She explained that this section provides a list of near term, obvious goals that could be implemented such as:
  - Adopting design guidelines to ensure quality commercial space.
  - Resolving downtown zoning and height regulations consistent with an expressed vision.
  - Approving recommended reforms stemming from the work of the Highway 99 Task Force.
  - Studying and approving updated Comprehensive Plan language and zoning regulations for the neighborhood business districts.
  - Studying and adopting a package of incentives for use in business recruitment and retention efforts.
  - Adopting a local purchasing policy, setting a priority for doing business with local companies, if within a specified range of price competitiveness.

Vice Chair Dewhirst referred to the list of City weaknesses found on Page 13. He particularly asked Ms. Gerend to elaborate on why the City’s existing land use and parking regulations in the business districts could be considered a weakness. As an example, Ms. Gerend referred to the Five Corners and Firdale Village areas and pointed out that changing the height limit in these zones could result in more creative mixed-use developments.

Vice Chair Dewhirst referred to the opening paragraph on Page 18, which speaks to the need of cooperative involvement on the part of the City Council, Mayor, commissions and boards, committees and staff. However, it does not address the need for the City to partner with business groups such as the Chamber of Commerce. He noted that the Comprehensive Plan speaks about partnering with business organizations in the community to make the plan work. Board Member Works inquired if the Chamber of Commerce has been invited to provide feedback on the proposed Economic Development Element. Ms. Gerend answered that she has provided regular updates to the Chamber, but she has not heard any particular comments related to the document. They appear to be supportive of it.

Chair Freeman referred to Policy 2c on Page 15 and suggested the language be changed to clarify the intent. The Board agreed that Policy 2c should be changed to read “Revise parking requirements, especially in the downtown, to encourage business development.”

**APPROVED**

Chair Freeman advised that the City Council appears to be considering the option of limiting buildings in the downtown retail core to two stories, and then providing inducements, such as eliminating the parking requirements, to encourage development. She asked how long the City Council would have to wait before determining whether or not the changes are working as intended. Ms. Gerend answered that much of the analysis done for the Downtown Plan Update shows the logical pace for development in the downtown to be one or two mixed-use projects in the BC zone per year. Whatever the City Council decides, they would be able to gauge its effectiveness by determining whether or not new development keeps up with the identified logical pace. Chair Freeman summarized that it could take more than two years for the City to test whether or not the changes are effective.

Board Member Young expressed his concern about the format of the proposed Economic Development Element, particularly that it does not identify clear goals, objectives and policies. While none of the language in the plan should be eliminated, he suggested that it be disaggregated to provide a clear understanding of the objectives and the policies that would be used to achieve them. Ms. Gerend responded that before preparing the draft document, she reviewed economic development plans from other jurisdictions. She suggested that, if the Board is curious about changing the format of the document, they should consider examples of what other jurisdictions do.

Vice Chair Dewhirst expressed his belief that there are sufficient items in the proposed document to measure its success. He said he views the collective community vision as the goal, and the items in the text provide both vision and information about how to reach the vision. He summarized that he does not see a need to change the format at this time.

THERE WAS NO ONE IN THE AUDIENCE WHO EXPRESSED A DESIRE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PUBLIC HEARING, SO THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

**VICE CHAIR DEWHIRST MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD THE DRAFT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ELEMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL. BOARD MEMBER WORKS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

#### **REVIEW OF DRAFT PUBLIC STREETScape PLAN**

Ms. White Chapin reviewed that at their last meeting, the Planning Board conducted a public hearing and provided comments regarding the draft Streetscape Plan, which includes the core document and six appendices. She advised that following the public hearing the consultant added new language as an introductory section to Appendix B – Highway 99. They also made minor revisions to Appendix E – 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue Arts Corridor.

Vice Chair Dewhirst recalled that when the City Council last reviewed the draft Streetscape Plan, some members expressed concern about the type of light standards that were proposed. It was suggested that the same light standards that are used on Main Street also be incorporated into the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue Arts Corridor Plan. He asked if this concern could become a major issue in the future. Ms. White Chapin responded that the staff and consultant have held several discussions with various groups, and there seems to be a lot of enthusiasm for creating a distinctive look on 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue that is different from what already exists in other areas of the downtown, and that is what the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue Arts Corridor Plan recommends.

Board Member Works referred to Page 28 and requested clarification about why flags, banners and similar items would detract from the established character of the downtown and should be strongly discouraged. Ms. White Chapin answered that this language was adopted by the City Council years ago. The initial concern was that the City's sidewalks are narrow and additional banners or flags in the public rights-of-way would make access even more difficult. Board Member Works agreed, but pointed out that attractive flags or banners could be placed in higher locations without disrupting the pedestrian access. Ms. White Chapin explained that over the past 15 years, there have been numerous situations in which the City Council has discouraged the concept of using banners as opposed to more unique things like the flower program.

Vice Chair Dewhirst said that while he agrees that banners in the rights-of-way in the core downtown area might not be appropriate, banners could provide an inexpensive way to establish an identity in areas such as Five Corners, Westgate or

Firdale Village. Ms. White Chapin pointed out that the language in this section was intended to apply to the downtown area. That being the case, Vice Chair Dewhirst suggested that the words "in the downtown" be added at the end of the paragraph to make the intent more clear. The remainder of the Board concurred.

Chair Freeman recalled that the Board has previously discussed opportunities to identify the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue Corridor on a temporary basis while it is being developed, and banners would be one of the least costly ways to accomplish this goal. She said she would not want to prevent banners along the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue Corridors, especially during the winter months when the flower baskets are not available. Again, Ms. White Chapin pointed out that the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue Corridor has been defined as a unique district in the downtown and banners are something the City could definitely consider in this location.

Ms. White Chapin explained that over the years, there has been a lot of discussion in the City regarding the use of banners. There are examples where banners have been used successfully in other communities, but there are also examples where they were poorly done. In order to be successful, the City would need to develop a consistent program of getting high quality banners and replacing them on a regular basis, which can be costly. In addition, she said the arts community has expressed concern about mixing banners with other strong elements like artwork and flowers. Much of their discussion was focused on the downtown. While banners might be appropriate on 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, there could be a potential conflict if the City encourages both art and banners at the same time.

Chair Freeman inquired what the City would use along 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue to attract people towards the new Performing Arts Center. Ms. White Chapin said the community is thinking more in terms of working with art and lighting elements along the corridor, even if they are temporary. However, this would not entirely preclude the use of something banner like. She said the Edmonds Alliance for Economic Development researched the option of a banner program for the City, but they concluded it was not something the community would support. Something fun, innovative and banner like could be used on a temporary basis to identify the corridor.

Board Member Works referred to the proposed Street Tree Plan and asked if private property owners would be required to maintain the trees that are placed within the public rights-of-way. If so, she asked if the property owners have a clear understanding of this policy. Ms. White Chapin explained that the City has always had a policy that required adjacent property owners to maintain street trees. The changes were intended just to clarify the policy. Mr. McIntosh advised that the City staff responds to reports of dangerous or problem trees that are located within the rights-of-way, but general pruning is typically the responsibility of the adjacent property owners. However, the City might create a different policy for the street trees located on 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, which would require the City to maintain the trees. Ms. White Chapin pointed out that the City already maintains most of the trees located in the downtown core rights-of-way.

Chair Freeman asked if adjacent property owners would be responsible for watering the street trees, as well. Ms. White Chapin answered that the Street Tree Plan typically recommends drought resistant trees because the City is not capable of irrigating all of the trees within the rights-of-way. However, in the residential areas, the street trees must be maintained by the adjacent property owners, who are often involved in planting the trees.

Board Member Guenther pointed out that not very many trees are planted within the rights-of-way in residential neighborhoods. The trees that are required for buffering at the time of development should not be confused with the trees the City plants in the rights-of-way. Mr. Chave clarified that, typically, when street trees are identified as part of the required frontage improvements for a new development in the downtown, the developer would be required to plant the trees and the City would maintain them. He summarized that the goal of the Street Tree Plan is to provide a consistent pattern of trees on the street. The plan provides guidance to individual developers.

Chair Freeman referred to Page 33, which identifies public restrooms as important for a friendly downtown. However, the accompanying asterisk points out that public restrooms can be expensive, difficult to site and require intensive maintenance. As an alternate, the plan suggests the City provide clear direction to the existing public/civic facilities at nearby parks and City buildings. She suggested that the language be changed to encourage the City to consider options for public restrooms in the downtown. The Board agreed that the following should be added to the end of the first sentence, "but they add significantly to the comfort of visitors in the downtown."

**BOARD MEMBER WORKS MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD THE DRAFT STREETScape PLAN TO THE CITY COUNCIL AS AMENDED, WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL. VICE CHAIR DEWHIRST SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**CONTINUED DELIBERATION ON 2006-2011 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (CIP)**

The Board reviewed the draft letter that was prepared by Chair Freeman and Vice Chair Dewhirst to explain the Board's position regarding the proposed 2006-2011 Capital Improvement Plan.

Board Member Young questioned the purpose of the proposed letter from the Board. Board Member Crim recalled that at the last meeting, the Board agreed to recommend denial of the proposed 2006-2011 CIP and to submit a letter explaining their reasons why. He said the letter is well written and points out a number of alternatives for the Council to consider.

Chair Freeman reminded the Board that a year ago, the Planning Board recommended denial of the 2005-2010 CIP, but the City Council ultimately decided to adopt it with one acknowledgement that the City doesn't have the necessary funding to meet all of the goals identified in the Comprehensive Plan. However, since that time, they have not taken any action to correct the problem. The proposed letter would provide a stronger recommendation about what the Board expects the City Council to do.

Board Member Young requested clarification regarding Paragraph 2. He suggested that some reference should be made to the fact that the CIP is not consistent with the goals identified in the Comprehensive Plan. Vice Chair Dewhirst explained that the goal of the letter is to emphasize the fact that there are serious problems, and interjecting the issue of the CIP being inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan might confuse the urgency of the situation. If the City Council does not respond to address the funding problems, the Board could recommend changes to the Comprehensive Plan.

Vice Chair Dewhirst pointed out that both Fund 112 and 116 are approaching a critical stage, but Fund 116 would be easier and less costly to fix. Chair Freeman said she recently spoke with the Public Works Director regarding the City's ability to transfer money from the General Fund to Fund 116 and asked if General Funds could also be transferred to Fund 112. Mr. Chave clarified that the Public Works Director intends to approach the City Council to outline the problems in Fund 116 and ask for additional funding from the General Fund. Mr. Gebert explained that while the 2007 CIP identifies a significant increase in Fund 116, it would require a transfer of funds from the General Fund, which has not been approved by the City Council. It is the Public Works Director's intention to discuss this request with the City Council during the next round of budget discussions.

Chair Freeman summarized that the proposed letter indicates that the Planning Board would not recommend approval of the draft CIP. Instead, they recommend the City Council look for long-term solutions to improving the situation before the document is approved. Mr. Gebert said staff is recommending the Planning Board forward the draft CIP to the City Council, with the appropriate recommendations as outlined in their letter.

After further discussion, the Commission agreed to the following changes:

- Paragraph 2 – Change “last approved CIP” to “most recently approved CIP.” Change “2006-2011 Plan” to “2006-2011 CIP.” Change second to last sentence to read, “We stress the urgent need for IMMEDIATE ACTION.”
- Paragraph 4 – Change second sentence to read, “At this time, the Planning Board is not looking for a permanent solution, but stop-gap measures, while the City is working on longer-term solutions.”
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Bullet – Change “fees” to “taxes.”
- 4<sup>th</sup> Bullet – Change to read, “Re-examine the policy governing the use of a portion of the real estate excise tax.”
- 5<sup>th</sup> Bullet – Change “Street” to “Avenue.”

Mr. Gebert advised that the City is allowed to increase utility taxes up to a maximum of 6 percent without a public vote. The level of utility tax currently charged is not up to 6 percent so there is a margin the City could still utilize. In addition, the

**APPROVED**

staff recently discovered that the storm utility does not have any tax charged to it. The City has the ability to charge the full 6 percent, and this is being considered as one possible option.

Mr. Gebert announced that the Economic Development Director was successful in obtaining a \$316,000 grant for enhancement of the Highway 99 International District. No matching funds would be required for the grant. After debating how to best show this funding in the CIP, the Finance Division has decided it would be best to set up a separate special project fund. This change would be made before the draft CIP is presented to the City Council.

**VICE CHAIR DEWHIRST MOVED THA THE BOARD FORWARD THE AMENDED DRAFT 3 CIP LETTER TO THE CITY COUNCIL AS THE BOARD'S RECOMMENDATION ON THE 2006-2011 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN. BOARD MEMBER YOUNG SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

Chair Freeman indicated that she would forward a copy of the updated letter text to staff so that it could be placed in memorandum format and forwarded to the City Council.

THE BOARD TOOK A BREAK AT 8:18 P.M. THEY RECONVENED THE MEETING AT 8:30 P.M.

### **REVIEW OF MPOR ZONE**

Mr. Chave referred the Board to the packet of materials that were provided a few weeks ago regarding the MPOR zone. He noted that the City Council recently turned down an application to apply the MPOR Zone to property located on Sunset Avenue. At that time, they established a moratorium for applying the zone until more specifics have been worked into the zoning language. He referred to the City Council minutes of February 7<sup>th</sup>, which contain the City Council's discussion and direction to the Board. The City Council reached a consensus to retain the transition language, but define it better. In addition, four City Council members supported the use of the underlying residential zoning standards in some way. They talked about using the 25 plus 5 height measurement rather than 25 feet above the average grade or street level. They also discussed the importance of determining what would be required to get the additional five feet of height. He summarized that the City Council is looking for a recommendation from the Planning Board regarding details that could be worked into the language.

Mr. Crim referred to the property on Sunset Avenue, which is an unusual piece of property. He inquired if the City has some type of provision that would have allowed the property owner to measure height in the typical manner, but allow relief for the unusual situation. Mr. Chave answered that people do apply for height variances due to topography. However, when reviewing variance applications, staff cannot consider economic issues. Height variances are very difficult to obtain because the criteria is strict. He pointed out that if the height of the building that was proposed on Sunset Avenue had been measured using the City's traditional method and setback requirements, the height of the building at the street level would have been ten feet lower than adjacent structures. If a residential setback of 20 feet had been required, the height at the street level would have been even lower.

Board Member Guenther pointed out that the proposed project on Sunset Avenue identified a larger setback on the side adjacent to residential properties and a commercial setback adjacent to the neighborhood business zone. Therefore, he felt the proposed project accomplished the concept of transition between the commercial and residential uses. Board Member Crim agreed and said his main concern with the proposal was that it identified a different way to measure height. He suggested a better approach would be to measure the height using the City's traditional method, but allow some type of variance to deal with unique situations. Board Member Guenther said another option would be to use the sidewalk as a base elevation to establish the height. This would make it easier to apply the concept of 25 plus 5 feet. Mr. Chave said this concept would have worked on the Sunset Avenue property if the setback from the street were 10 feet; but if the setback requirement were greater, the building would start sinking into the site.

The Board discussed the issue of access to difficult sites. It was pointed out that whatever is developed on the Sunset Avenue property would require underground parking. If a 20-foot setback were required as suggested by the City Council,

**APPROVED**

the building height would be 20 feet lower as viewed from the street. In addition, the slope of the access driveway would be too steep. Chair Freeman suggested that the Board make it clear to the City Council that a 20-foot setback would not work on this site.

Mr. Chave explained that there are different options for defining the setback requirements in the MPOR zone, such as midway between the setbacks of the adjoining properties. This type of standard would provide an objective definition. Chair Freeman suggested that the setback requirements in the MPOR zone be different, depending on what would be workable for the unique sites. Mr. Chave recalled that the Sunset Avenue proposal identified a total number of square feet that they absolutely wanted to get, and many of the design solutions were driven by this desire. Another developer could propose a workable design that is much different. He suggested that the MPOR zone could establish rules that make sense and then the Sunset Avenue property could be used as a hypothetical situation to see if they are reasonable. Allowing an open ended process for developers to argue what is workable would be problematic for the City to defend. The City Attorney has encouraged the City Council to adopt measurable standards for the MPOR zone as much as possible.

Mr. Chave recalled that one of the main problems with the Sunset Avenue proposal was that it combined a number of different lots. Many people were reacting to the stretched size of the building that seemed larger than what should be allowed on the site. The issue was not necessarily height, but the overall bulk of the building. He suggested that the Board create rules for setback and bulk that would deal with the unique situations. Chair Freeman suggested that perhaps opportunities for more view corridors could be considered. Mr. Chave said view corridors could be regulated by the side setback requirements. Another option for preventing long, bulky buildings would be to expand the setback requirements for combined lots. Using step backs in relation to setbacks would be another option for the Board to explore.

Board Member Young suggested the Board consider the option of determining the building height based on how much a building was stepped back and setback from the property lines. The building that was proposed for the Sunset Avenue property would have been no taller than buildings on either side, but it would have been much wider. Perhaps a step back should be required for any height over 25 feet.

Mr. Chave shared information that was presented to the City Council to illustrate options for implementing the concept of step backs and setbacks in the downtown. Implementing these options would require that the base height be established at 25 feet. The maximum height at the street would be set at 25 feet above grade or 30 feet above average grade, whichever is greater. Five feet of additional height would be allowed for step backs for all parts of the building exceeding the basic height established. Provisions would be provided to allow decorative cornices, parapets or other features to extend above the roof to allow for more attractive design but keep the buildings under the height limit.

Mr. Chave said it would be important for the Board to consider other possible incentives. One reason developers want to construct three-story buildings is related to the cost of underground parking. In order to get all of the required parking, they must put it under the building, and this drives up the cost of the project. Two stories of residential space would make projects more feasible. One option to resolve this problem would be to apply the rules for height consistently, but only require parking for the residential uses. Another option would be to waive the parking requirement for two-story buildings that provide other kinds of open space. For two-story buildings with a footprint of less than a certain size, the City could also consider the option of waiving all or part of the parking requirement. This would make it more affordable for developers to construct smaller buildings, which is something the community desires.

Board Member Guenther said he likes the staff's proposed approach for establishing elevation and base height. The important issue is to consider what the building would look like from the street, and people tend to like the appearance of two-story buildings.

Board Member Young pointed out that it is possible for businesses to be successful, even if the entrance to the building is located one or two steps below the street level. Board Member Guenther pointed out that a ramp would be required if an entrance is below the street level. Mr. Chave agreed that one or two steps down would be acceptable, but more steps could quickly reach the point where the space is less desirable.

Board Member Young agreed with Board Member Crim that the underlying zone could be used, as long as the City provides some policies that offer relief in unusual situations. Mr. Chave cautioned that they would still have to provide criteria. Board Member Crim added that the relief criteria could be applied only to the MPOR zone. Chair Freeman pointed out that the City of Seattle offers design departures as an incentive, and the concept is traditionally used to gain additional height or density. Mr. Chave cautioned that the design departure concept could be problematic for the City of Edmonds.

Mr. Chave said he would work up some examples of how the various concepts could be applied to the MPOR zone. The Board asked him to identify other potential sites in the City where the MPOR zone could be applied, as well.

### **REVIEW OF AGENDA FOR PLANNING BOARD RETREAT**

The Board reviewed the proposed retreat agenda that was prepared by Vice Chair Dewhirst and provided their ideas for additional topics. They agreed to add the following issues to the agenda:

- Invite the City Attorney to talk to the Board about the possible implications of Initiative 933.
- Review Chapter 20.40 of the ECDC, particularly as it relates to the Board's responsibilities as a Parks Board. Mr. McIntosh should be invited to discuss the Board's role in park related matters.

The Board agreed to start the retreat at 6:00 p.m., and Vice Chair Dewhirst was asked to finalize the agenda and forward it to the staff.

Board Member Young suggested it would be helpful to invite the City's Finance Director to a future meeting to review the City's budget process. He noted that the City does not budget for their Capital Improvement Plan. Board Member Crim pointed out that preparation of the budget is a highly political exercise, and it is obvious that the Board might see a lot of issues differently than the City Council. However, he questioned the appropriateness of the Board getting involved in the budget process. While the Board agreed that they should not get involved in the long-range budget planning process, they felt it would be helpful for the Finance Director to provide an explanation of how the budget is prepared and how the CIP relates to the budget. This presentation should be provided sometime before the Board starts their review of the 2007-2012 CIP next year. They agreed to place the issue on the extended agenda for discussion in January of 2007.

### **REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA**

Mr. Chave reported that a review of the adult entertainment provisions has been scheduled on the April 26<sup>th</sup> agenda.

### **PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS**

Chair Freeman asked that staff provide the Board Members with a clean copy of the illegible power point illustration on building heights that was presented at the last City Council Meeting by Mr. Bowman.

### **PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

None of the other Board Members provided comments during this part of the agenda.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:44 p.m.

**APPROVED**