

**CITY OF EDMONDS  
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

**November 9, 2016**

---

---

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

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

Philip Lovell, Chair  
Carreen Rubenkönig, Vice Chair  
Matthew Cheung  
Todd Cloutier  
Alicia Crank  
Nathan Monroe  
Daniel Robles  
Valerie Stewart  
Malia Clark, Student Representative

**STAFF PRESENT**

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager  
Carrie Hite, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director  
Jerry Bevington, Video Recorder  
Karin Noyes, Recorder

**READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**BOARD MEMBERS STEWART MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 26, 2016 BE APPROVED AS CORRECTED. VICE CHAIR RUBENKONIG SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA**

The agenda was accepted as presented.

**AUDIENCE COMMENTS**

No one in the audience indicated a desire to comment during this portion of the meeting.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON CIVIC PARK MASTER PLAN**

Chair Lovell reviewed the rules and procedures for the public hearing. He specifically noted that written comments submitted prior to the meeting were included in the packet for the hearing. They have been reviewed by the Board Members and included as part of the public record.

Ms. Hite announced that several members of the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) were present at the meeting: Council Member Dave Tietzel, Board Member Valerie Stewart, Dick Van Hollebeke and Alex Witenberg. She explained that the City staff and design team (Walker Macy) have conducted three in-person and three on-line open houses. At the last open house, the design team unveiled a hybrid plan that incorporated community feedback to date. In an effort to solicit additional public feedback, the hybrid plan is being presented for public hearing before the Planning Board, followed by the City Council. She reviewed that the project has gone through a robust and difficult public process. She recalled a statement made by Mayor Earling early in the process that “there is about 20 acres of need that they are trying to fit into an 8-acre downtown park.”

Ms. Hite reviewed that two options were presented at the 2<sup>nd</sup> in-person and on-line open houses, and to the Board at a previous meeting. Community input was split. Many people liked the activity level proposed in Option 2, but they preferred the aesthetics (meandering pathways, softer edges, etc.) of Option 1. The design team from Walker Macy did a great job of combining the desirable elements of each of the options into a hybrid plan. When the hybrid plan was presented at the 3<sup>rd</sup> open house on October 19<sup>th</sup>, community sentiment supported the general arrangement of spaces but expressed concern with the location of the skate park and its proximity to the neighboring condominiums. Additional critique suggested increasing the petanque area, moving stadium lighting to the perimeter of the field and looking at pedestrian safety along the alleys in further detail. She said staff attempted to respond to each of the public comments. To address some of the concerns, the design team has suggested a new location for the skate park. In addition, they will provide visuals to illustrate a densely-planted buffer between the park and alley edges, which will prevent children from crossing in non-designated areas.

Ms. Hite summarized that, following the public hearing, the design team and staff is hoping to get more direction from the Board as they prepare to present the hybrid plan to the City Council on November 22<sup>nd</sup> for another public hearing.

**Chris Jones, Principal and Landscape Architect with Walker Macy, Seattle**, advised that the master plan has been through a significant public outreach process, and the third and final in-person open house was held on October 19<sup>th</sup>, followed by an on-line open house. Each of the in-person open houses were well attended, and there was significant feedback from the on-line open houses, as well. He commented that the process put together by staff is probably the most significant public outreach process he has seen for a downtown signature park planning effort. While it is not possible to please everyone, he believes the proposed hybrid plan comes as close as possible with just a few minor tweaks. He reminded the Board that the goal is to create a downtown park that has something for everyone.

Mr. Jones reviewed that the 1<sup>st</sup> open house was used to talk about potential programs for the park, and no drawings or designs were presented. Two design alternatives were presented at the 2<sup>nd</sup> open houses that incorporated the community comments as much as possible. Option 1 was a more passive design that was termed the “Meadow Loop,” and Option 2 was a more active design that was termed “Activity Central.” Participants at the 2<sup>nd</sup> open house were divided into groups and invited to share their thoughts on the two alternatives. The outcome of the in-person open house was that people preferred the more passive scheme identified in Option 1. However, participants in the on-line open house indicated a preference for the more active Option 2. With Option 1, people really gravitated towards the signature elements, such as the free-flowing structure and layout, walking paths, water feature, plaza, open green spaces and lawn. Common reasons respondents preferred Option 2 included the view terraces, long walking and running paths, expanded boys and girls club, skate park, the focus on fields and athletic facilities, and the potential for large events. When combining the comments from the in-person and on-line open houses, the majority preferred Option 2. Most people liked the lawn terraces and felt the skate park should remain. They liked the curves in Option 1, but wanted a more active program like in Option 2. In addition, respondents indicated a desire for additional restrooms, benches and/or seating areas, lighting, additional covered athletic facility and market stage, American’s with Disabilities Act (ADA) accessibility, and a 400-meter track.

The proposed hybrid plan that was introduced at the 3<sup>rd</sup> open houses incorporates the things that people liked best about each of the options. It includes the top 10 activities that were identified at the 1<sup>st</sup> open houses: restrooms, petanque courts, jogging/walking paths, soccer, shade trees, skate park, playground, tennis courts, Boys and Girls Club, and a multi-use lawn. He noted that from a total list of 40 preferred activities, 36 were accommodated in the hybrid plan. The Hybrid Plan is organized similar to Option 1, but maximizes the recreational opportunities found in Option 2. He presented the hybrid plan and specifically noted the following features:

- There was a desire for wider buffers that allowed people to move around the park, to buffer the more active uses that are located towards the center of the park, and to create a civic active edge on the 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue side of the park.
- The plan includes pedestrian connections and a gracious sidewalk along 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. As proposed, there would be several entries into the park, with a strong east/west pedestrian connection on the vacated right-of-way (Sprague Street). This will allow people to easily moved through the park in an east/west direction. A 1/3-mile pedestrian jogging path would be provided for those who want to track the distance they walk or run.
- Community hubs (gathering spaces) are included, as well as an expansion of the existing Boys and Girls Club. A shade pavilion, restroom and storage facility would be located to the south of the Boys and Girls Club. An alternative would be to relocate the Boys and Girls Club facility to the northwest corner of the park.

- A multi-use lawn area would be located at the center of the park. Originally lights were proposed to be located at the center of the lawn area. However, in response to a citizen comment, the design team is now proposing that the lights be located around the perimeter of the lawn area.
- A playground area would be located on the eastern edge of the park.
- The skate park is currently shown on the design in the northeast corner, along with plantings and additional seating. The intent is to create more of a social atmosphere around the skate park.
- The west side of the park, along 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue, is identified as a market promenade, and the design team is suggesting that the sidewalk on either side of 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue would be flush with the roadway to give pedestrians the authority. While this concept will not be included as part of the master plan, it would help connect the park to the downtown and create a much friendlier space.
- Two tennis courts would be located in the northwest corner of the site, to the north of the existing Boys and Girls Club.
- To the south of the Boys and Girls Club, the design includes a water feature, with seating and tables and chairs. While the design team understands that water features are costly and one was just introduced at City Park, the water feature at Civic Park would be more subtle and/or artistic rather than a spray feature. The community has indicated that a water feature is an important element for this signature park.
- Petanque courts would be located in the southwest corner of the site, and trees and landscaping would be blended into the space to create a nice sequence and entry from the downtown.
- Second to the goal of making the park something for everyone in the community is making the park as flexible as possible. It is very important to create spaces that are flexible to accommodate changing needs into the future.
- The design incorporates a significant amount of utilities (power, water, video, telecom, etc.) There will be 10 stub outs for all of the services at various locations in the park.
- The park is designed to easily accommodate small to medium-sized events. The design can also accommodate larger events such as the Taste of Edmonds, 4<sup>th</sup> of July, and other markets and festivals. For example, the design team worked with the Chamber to accommodate the needs of the Taste of Edmonds. The Chamber has indicated it would be possible for them to be more efficient with the space, and there appears to be consensus that the proposed design can accommodate the event in a more compact configuration.

Mr. Jones advised that, at the 3<sup>rd</sup> open house, participants were invited to provide additional comments regarding the Hybrid Plan. Since that time, the design team has been working with staff and the PAC to respond to the community requests. To address concerns from condominium owners adjacent to the proposed skate park, the design team is now proposing that the skate park and picnic area locations be swapped. They are also proposing that the petanque courts be expanded to six, with plantings, seating and trees on the southwest corner of the site. In addition, if the Boys and Girls Club relocates to the northwest corner of the site, the multi-use courts could be relocated to a different area on the north side of the park. Regarding the public comments about pedestrian safety, primarily along the alleyways, he explained that most successful parks are as transparent as possible. Rather than placing a fence around the perimeter, plantings can be used to keep people from walking through certain areas. A buffer on the north and south sides of the park should help to mitigate the problems associated with safety. He provided an illustration of the type of planted buffer that the design team is recommending, noting that it would be a minimum of 14-feet wide.

Mr. Jones explained that, as proposed, the project would be done in phases. Phase A would be redevelopment of the active civic space along 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue (west side of park), and Phase B would include the more passive landscaped portion of the park. Phase C would involve street improvements along 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue as suggested earlier.

Chair Lovell opened the public portion of the hearing.

**Tom Benediktson, Edmonds**, said he lives directly north from where the skate park was originally proposed. He thanked the design team for responding to neighborhood input. He explained that the previous version of the Civic Park Master Plan would have placed the skating facility right outside his living room window. He appreciates the change in plan, which moves the skating facility to a position equidistant from the condominiums on Bell and Daley Streets. This change will alleviate the noise generated by the skaters.

Mr. Benediktson also read the following written statement from **Pat Woodell, Edmonds**, who lives on the north edge of Civic Park but was unable to attend the meeting:

*"I have read the packet that was prepared for this meeting, and I would like to compliment Walker Macy on the proposed changes in the design that is shown on Page 41. I ask that those making decisions about the final design, support this new proposal. I am excited about the new park and look forward to the coming changes. In my written submission to you, I stated my reasons for locating the skate park as far as possible from residential boundaries. Tonight's presentation showing revisions to the design, addresses the concerns of many who have worried about a skate park being so close to their balconies. The revised design shows sensitivity to these concerns.*

*I would also like to compliment the decision to locate the picnic area near our buildings in place of the skate park. A picnic area provides an excellent buffer from higher-use activities in the park. The elevations presented in the Planning Board packet show the potential for the park and all of the beautiful design elements we have to look forward to. I appreciate Carrie Hite and Walker Macy's hard work on the design and would like to thank them for addressing our concerns as neighbors of the park. Thank you for the opportunity to comment and for your consideration in supporting the skate park and picnic areas where they are located in the revised design."*

**Linda Malan, Edmonds**, indicated her support for Mr. Benediktson's comments and said she lives in the same condominium development. She very definitely wanted to confirm how important Ms. Hite has been in the process. She said she and her neighbors began expressing concerns before any planning was ever presented, knowing that this was going to impact them. She thanked Ms. Hite for her quick responses. She said she also lives adjacent to the parking lot that her development shares with the church. She said her concern has always been about safety. She has seen children dropped off for soccer practice, and they have to run across the alley to get to the park. There have been many close calls. She asked that the Board accept the changes to the Hybrid Plan that relocates to the skate park to a more central location.

**Lorna Moffit, Edmonds**, said she lives on the northwest end of the park. She complimented the overall design of the Civic Park, but said she has some major concerns about the northwest corner, which is where the four condominiums in her developmetn look out onto the park. She explained that, over the years, they have all enjoyed the active, positive view as they have watched children and adults of all ages participating in a variety of activities. They all chose to move to the condominiums largely because of this unique view. She further explained, that currently, the tennis courts and their tall fences are located across the alley in front of about 1/3 of their condominium property, and they all can enjoy some south and southeast views of the park's activities and beauty, along with the tennis courts. If the current Civic Park Master Plan is passed, the two tennis courts, with their tall fences, would be moved east and be located in front of their entire property. This would block their southeastern and southern views of the park. She provided pictures showing what they see now, as well as what the obstructed view would be if the tennis courts are moved east. She said the change would affect them on a daily basis, and she urged the board to put themselves in her place and imagine looking out to tall fences and hard surfaces. Hopefully, this will help them understand the concerns better, as well as a wish for a change in the plan. She proposed the following three options as a compromise to spread out the hard surfaces:

1. Switch the tennis courts and petanque area. The tennis courts located there would not affect the view of the police department to the west or the church property and small condo to the south.
2. Move the tennis courts back to their present location. While this would shorten the proposed 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue promenade, it would also bring back the type of view they now have.
3. The new multi-use court that would be located off of the alley and to the east of the tennis courts could be eliminated and replaced by the 2<sup>nd</sup> easternmost tennis court in front of their property. This would keep the wide promenade and give a much-appreciated natural opening for everyone to actually see and continue to enjoy the beauty of the park. This option could be a win-win for everyone. Over the years, we have all observed that there is much more activity on the two tennis courts than the two basketball/multi-use courts.

Ms. Moffit summarized that, when looking at the Civic Park design and the neighboring homeowners all around the outline, their condominium property is the only one that would be blocked from the view of the park by hard surfaces. She asked the Board to please work to make a change.

**Michelle Martin, Edmonds**, said she had the privilege of starting the Edmonds Petanque Club and it is an honor to serve as its president. She said the club is excited and pleased with the new design of the Civic Park, and they want to thank the City for the space the club has been given in the southwest corner of the park. She shared that the club's mission statement is to,

*“Introduce petanque to people of all ages, regardless of race or gender, to promote the game nationwide, to help establish Edmonds as a sport destination, and to raise money for charities.”* She advised that, since 2011, the club has reached out to young people, including French students from Marysville, Japanese students from Hekinan, Japan, summer programs with the Boys and Girls Club, and next year the French classes from Edmonds Woodway High School. The club is also involved with the Senior Centers from Shoreline and Edmonds, the Taste of Edmonds, and the 4<sup>th</sup> of July. She announced that the club was named the 2016 Edmonds Citizens of the Year.

Ms. Martin explained that club tournaments (League, Bastille Day Tournament, Platinum Players for over those over 80 years old, and the Edmonds Foodbank) bring players from all over the Northwest. With the Foodbank Tournament and the support of merchants and businesses in town, the club has given \$24,000 to the Edmonds Food Bank since 2011. The daily and weekly players and the tournaments also bring business to restaurants and shops in Edmonds. Petanque also has a great impact with the older and retired citizens of Edmonds, and it is a social and recreational experience cherished by many. The club currently has 83 members and has been successful because the City of Edmonds supported the construction of the courts. The club is a non-profit organization. A grant from the Hubbard Foundation and a donation from the McDevitt Family Foundation was used to finance the materials and start the summer program with the Boys and Girls Club. With the proposed new Petanque Grove, the City will have the best place for petanque in Washington State. She urged the Board to cooperate with the City staff to find a way to continue to have tournaments, raise money for a good cause, and attract a larger number of visitors to the City.

**Jack McHenry, Shoreline**, said he is an active member of the Edmonds Petanque Club and was present to share some thoughts about the Civic Park Master Plan. He explained that, since its founding, the club has reached out to the community as often as possible. Unfortunately, as fantastic as it is, the proposed design for the Petanque Grove will not allow for larger-format, community petanque events because the club will lose the use of the former soccer field. He asked the design team to consider modifications that allow the club’s community functions to continue. For example, the club sponsors a yearly Foodbank Tournament that has contributed \$24,000 to the Edmonds Foodbank, plans French and petanque instruction for Edmonds Woodway High School French Classes, and sponsors other tournaments that attract participants, as well as their families and friends, all of whom patronize Edmonds restaurants and shops while they are in town. With such activities, the club has contributed to the community beyond club members’ play. The ability to continue such events is an important part of the club’s mission and will depend on the ability to create temporary courts on a petanque-friendly surface.

Mr. McHenry expressed his belief that the petanque area in the southwest corner of the playfield can provide ample room to stage all such community activities if left in as open a fashion as possible. The club is not asking for additional space, but they hope designers will consider modifications to the Petanque Grove, itself. For example, he asked the Board to consider constructing six standard courts on the perimeter for regular club play, amending the current proposal to retain the central area of the Petanque Grove in an open fashion interspersed with deciduous shade trees, and surfacing the resulting open space with fast-draining, pervious, crushed granite so that additional, temporary courts can be formatted among the trees using easily removable string boundaries. This design would create a wet-weather-friendly open space with a pervious, crushed granite surface for the public to use for a variety of activities and an area where the club can line out additional playing courts as needed for special events. The resulting open space would allow wider community use of the Petanque Grove year round for activities such as the Taste of Edmonds and other festivals, or simply walking, reading, picnicking, game playing, and stroller exercises. This would be especially true when the larger lawn areas are wet and muddy.

On behalf of the club, Mr. McHenry reiterated the club’s appreciation for all the planning that has gone into the playfield project and especially for the inclusion of the Petanque Grove in the southwest corner, near the storage facilities and restrooms. With the features he suggested above, an open space would be created that would allow the club to continue its community activities in Edmonds. The proposed modifications will also open the Petanque Grove to wider use by all park visitors, particularly in inclement weather.

**Danene Warnock, Edmonds**, said she and her husband have been active members of the Edmonds Petanque Club since 2011. She voiced support for the recommendations put forward by Mr. McHenry for how it would be possible to meet the club’s outreach mission goals, as mentioned by Ms. Martin, within the boundaries of the space allocated for the Petanque Grove. With wet grass a frequent reality, a pervious, crushed granite surface would be a great alternative for activities that she sees taking place on today’s playfield. The option to avoid exercising or playing in wet shoes is appealing. What the

club envisions just inside the park's entrance is an open, fast-draining surface for people to utilize for a variety of activities that will also provide the necessary open space for additional courts on an as-needed basis.

Ms. Warnock said the club also envisions the grove as an attractive area, befitting its location next to the park's entrance. As a gardener and member of the Edmonds Garden Club, she certainly appreciates plants and plantings, but she has also found that open space has value of its own. This is especially true in an urban environment, where a spacious, uncluttered surrounding can be appropriate and welcoming in its unspecified potential. In this way, the grove will fill the same well-loved role as do plazas and squares around the world, with the occasional shade trees adding their own pleasant ambiance. An attractive, minimal, non-intrusively landscaped perimeter border would suit this space and maximize its available usable surface area, which is key to supporting the club's community-benefiting events.

Ms. Warnock reviewed that the community events produce positive results that could never have been anticipated. For example, at this year's Bastille Day Tournament, two visitors, after watching the interaction of the people and how the tournament was organized, approached Ms. Martin and asked not only to join the club, but about its other activities. Very impressed by what the club was doing and its positive effect on the City, one of them later sent a \$2,000 donation to help the club continue its work in the community.

In closing, Ms. Warnock said she appreciates the location and area allocated as the Petanque Grove, and she is excited about its potential. She also expressed appreciation in advance for the Board's understanding of how attention to specific design and layout elements of the space allocated for the Petanque Grove would allow the club to continue its community outreach, as well as provide an open, pleasant space for the community-at-large to enjoy.

**Tom Greifendorff, Edmonds**, said he lives on the Bell Street Alley, across from the petanque courts. He said he and his wife purchased their property because they enjoyed watching people play petanque. He suggested that the fairest way to address the suggestion to switch the petanque courts with the tennis courts is to consider that both were present when the residents purchased their homes. He felt it would be most fair to leave them where they are currently located. He voiced concern that, although there are "no parking" signs along the alley, people still park there, leaving little room for cars to get by and making it impossible for emergency vehicle access. This is an unsafe situation that needs to be addressed. Ms. Hite advised that the City is not planning to allow parking along the alley. Enforcement could be a matter of placing signs to indicate that parking is not allowed. This issue would be addressed and enforced by the Police Department, and she suggested that Mr. Greifendorff contact them about his concerns. Mr. Greifendorff commented that they are anticipated more people will be using the park when it is redeveloped, and there will likely be more problems with people parking in the alley. He would appreciate the City ensuring their homes are safe and accessible to emergency vehicles.

**Bill Wood, Edmonds**, said he also lives adjacent to Civic Park, and he urged the Board to not recommend approval of a master plan that does not include a fence along the northern boundary. It doesn't need to be a tall fence, as a three or four-foot fence would be more than adequate. The Board should be aware that the entire field is currently surrounded by fencing, with only two outlets on the north and east sides. This controls the flow of people to a single point where they can either enter or exit the field. The cars driving down the alley to the north of the field know there is only one location they need to look for people leaving the field. This is an important safety concern, yet a fence is not currently part of the design plan. Instead, it has been stated that a berm or landscaping would be used to minimize the risk of children darting out into the alley. For those who don't live adjacent to the park, it is difficult to understand the extent to which children run out into the alley, and there is currently a fence that keeps them away from traffic. It is not sufficient to just minimize opportunities for children to run out into the street, it must be prevented. Also, he felt that a fence would provide added security for people living along the alley from the risk of prowlers.

**Bill Moffit, Edmonds**, said he and his wife were pretty excited when the City purchased the property and started planning for the park. He agreed with Mr. Wood's comments about the need to have a fence or border other than just landscaping along the two alleys, not just for safety of pedestrians, but also for the residents who live adjacent to the park. He said he was surprised to learn that the tennis courts would be relocated. He agreed that the tennis courts were in their present location when he and his wife purchased their home, but he was surprised to learn that many of the most imposing aspects of the plan will be located on the north and west sides of the park. As proposed, the tennis courts would basically be in his front yard and tall fences would be required around them. He suggested that swapping the location of the tennis courts and petanque courts would be preferable to almost everyone. Mr. Jones agreed that fencing would be required around the tennis courts.

However, rather than a chain link fence with plastic slats, the City could use a more transparent material such as the netting that is used at driving ranges. While the fence would still be visible from adjacent properties, a more transparent material would provide a better visual quality than a chain link, slat fence. He emphasized that the fence material is a design detail that will be addressed as part of future work.

**Jim Welsh, Edmonds**, said he is the president of the Bell Street Homeowners Association, which has been quite active throughout the master plan process. He requested more information about the proposed new location of the skate park in relation to where it is currently located. Will it be located halfway through the field or more to the north of the field? Mr. Jones answered that the skate park would be located northeast of the existing skate park. Mr. Welsh asked if it would be located an equal distance from the north and south park boundaries, and Mr. Jones answered that it would be located just north of the center of the park. Mr. Welsh stressed the need to address safety along the alleyway, whether it is done via a fence or some other device. He complimented staff and the design team for doing a superior job of public outreach during the planning stages. He said he spoke at an earlier public open house about his desire that a large tree in the southeast section of the park be retained. He wanted to make sure it was included as part of the design. Mr. Jones said the intent is to retain this tree, but the determination will have to do with the final grading.

**Kathy Teitzel, Edmonds**, said she lives across from the northwest corner of the park and is concerned about the visual barrier that would be created if the tennis courts are moved as currently proposed. She suggested that the City either sacrifice the promenade on that part of the street so the tennis courts can remain where they are or sacrifice one of the tennis courts for more petanque courts. She said she looks out her window more often than people play tennis, and the two courts are rarely used at the same time. While she understands the need for tennis courts, perhaps just one would meet the needs of the community. She said she is very excited about the proposed improvements to the park, and the thought of looking at either a net or cyclone fence is not appealing. If the Boys and Girls Club is also relocated, it will create another visual barrier for the people living in her condominium development. Many of the noisy elements are proposed for that end of the park, but she is most concerned about the visual barriers.

**Gretchen Sewall, Edmonds**, said she lives in the condominium development across from the far northwest corner of the park. She said she enjoys the church parking lot and part of her condominium ownership is an easement to parking space in that lot. She said she watches kids come and go at the park because she lives and works there, and she purchased her home because she loves the park. She is concerned about safety given that no fences are being proposed. While she does not necessarily like fencing, in this situation it is warranted because there are so many kids going back and forth. She urged the City not to approve a plan until there is some degree of serious consideration given to fencing.

Ms. Sewall suggested it is time for the City to step back a bit and look at the opportunity from a citizen's perspective. This is one of the last times the public will have an opportunity to ask questions, get information and offer input before the plan becomes the incredible vision they are all hoping for. She voiced concern that the Board is being asked to sign off on the master plan when there are so many things that are fluid and so little detail has been provided. While she is neither a city planner nor a design professional, she has been a citizen of Edmonds for 25 years. She is waiting for a vision for the park to emerge. She suggested that perhaps the plan is a bit too greedy trying to accommodate 36 of the 40 things that people want into an 8-acre park. Perhaps they need to let go of some of them. She voiced concern that there is no central vision or signature associated with the proposed plan, and she is afraid they are letting an opportunity slip away. Before the plan is approved, she would like to see a more complete plan for lighting and information about project costs. She would also like more information about park access, as well as more information about the dimensions of the various park features. She is pleased that the design team is proposing an alternative location for the skate park. However, she indicated concern that other things may be changed without the public knowing about it and having an opportunity to comment. She concluded that she would like there to be a truly remarkable vision before the Board forwards the plan to the City Council for approval. It is essential that the Board continue to work with the design team and staff until everyone is excited about the proposed plan.

**Bryan Berry, Edmonds**, said he also lives adjacent to the northwest corner of the park, and he has enjoyed watching people use the park for the past 16 years. He voiced concern that all of the surface-covered activities are concentrated on the north side of the park. He suggested it would be nice if the multi-use court could be relocated to a different area of the park and if more greenery could be provided along the north side. He agreed with the previous speakers that a fence is needed on the north and south edges of the park to keep kids from running across the alleyways.

**Don O'Bryant, Edmonds**, said he lives directly across from the proposed east entrance of the park. He commented that when the park gets busy, it creates a dangerous situation. People cross where there are no crosswalks and there is no defined plan for drop off areas. Currently, people pull into his driveway to turn around. He expressed his belief that the traffic problems will continue to increase and something needs to be done to manage the flow of people in and out of the park with crosswalks, drop-off areas, etc. He said he loves the plan for the park, but he suggested that more emphasis could be put on pickle ball, which is becoming a popular sport. He recognized that the tennis courts could accommodate pickle ball, but the footprint of a pickle ball court is 1/3 the size of a tennis court. He suggested they research how popular this sport is compared to tennis and then adjust the plan accordingly.

**Alex Witenberg, Edmonds**, said he participates on the current PAC and was also a member of the original work group that helped design and locate the current skate park. He reviewed that the process started in the late 1990s when the City received seed money of several thousand dollars from the Edmonds Police Foundation. The skate park group formed and had its initial meeting in 2004, and the process continued over several months as the work group developed criteria for evaluating potential sites for the skate park. The process included an extensive public outreach program, and the ultimate conclusion was to locate the park at Civic Field. Several residents living adjacent to civic field voiced concern about the noise created by the skate park, and the concerns were mitigated by strategically locating the skate park within the park and by limiting its hours. The process continued until the park was fully designed, and it opened in the spring of 2007. Although not everyone left the public meetings happy, he is not sure what else could have been done to address their concerns.

Mr. Witenberg said he supports the proposed relocation of the skate park, but felt it was important for the Board to understand that a lot of work went into the siting and design of the current skate park, particularly the concept of modular components that could be moved to accommodate other uses of the area. He expressed concern that as the park redevelopment proceeds in phases, the important information that was gleaned from the original public process for the skate park will be lost and the element will be eliminated. While he recognized that there are some drawbacks associated with the skate park, it is a popular amenity. He reminded the Board that there was tremendous support for retaining the skate park at Civic Park, and further design of this element is important as the process continues.

Chair Lovell closed the public hearing.

Chair Lovell reminded the Board that the proposed master plan is intended to represent a pictorial description of what the public wants to put in the park. More detailed designs are yet to come.

Board Member Crank thanked the design team, the public and staff for their hard work. She said she supports public comment related to fencing and safety, parking restrictions and providing a drop-off area. She pointed out that current surface of the field can accommodate vehicle parking during large events to allow people to unload and load, etc. She asked how the City plans to mitigate this since she presumes that vehicular traffic will not be allowed on the new turf. Mr. Jones said he cannot answer at this time whether vehicles will be allowed or not because it is a City determination. However, previous projects he has designed have allowed vehicles to access and even park on the turf. There are strategies, such as putting down a layer of sand rather than dirt, which allows the area to easily be reseeded if damaged. It will be up to the City to decide if vehicular traffic will be allowed.

Board Member Crank said she finds it commendable that the proposed plan includes as many ideas from the public as possible. However, they are now at a finite point that there needs to be a cut off for changes. The City should strive for the complete vision for what the park is supposed to be rather than trying to create a park that has everything for everyone. She challenged the design team not to continue to try and block in everything. At some point, they need to stop and focus on a finite number of things. She does not necessarily think they need to do a water structure, which seems more of a want than a need. However, it is important to address the needs of the community as identified in the in-person and on-line open houses. She suggested that perhaps the difference in feedback between the on-line and in-person open houses is because most people who attended the in-person open houses live close to or adjacent to the park, and many who participated in the on-line open houses live elsewhere in the City. She felt that, as a whole, the community would support the plan once a final decision is made.

Board Member Cloutier agreed with the comments and concerns raised by the citizens, as well. He suggested that the design team consider safety aspects first and then fit in the other elements. He said he loves the new hybrid plan that addresses the

reservations brought up by the community. However, he stressed that the master plan is not intended to be a final design. It is intended to be a vision of what could be built within the scope of the plan. He suggested it would be helpful for the design team and staff to make this clear when the plan is presented at the City Council's public hearing.

Mr. Jones commented that Mr. Witenberg was a great addition to the PAC, and he values the input he provided. He has spoken eloquently to the importance of the public process. He clarified that the skate park is a placeholder and staff will engage the public in the conversation when the design work moves forward at a later date.

Board Member Monroe complimented the staff and design team on the great plan. He asked how they decided to include two tennis courts as opposed to just one. Mr. Jones said the number of tennis courts is not fixed in stone. He explained that the feedback they received is that tennis courts are popular and are being used on a regular basis. This informs the design team that they should include two tennis courts in the design unless directed to do otherwise. Ms. Hite added that the current tennis courts at Civic Park, as well as the tennis courts in the hybrid plan and tennis courts that exist elsewhere in the City, are all lined to be used for pickle ball courts, as well. She agreed that pickle ball is becoming a popular sport, and residents can check out portable nets at the recreation center to use on the courts. The Parks Maintenance Manager has indicated that the tennis courts are heavily used, and the intent is to maintain the same number as currently exists.

Board Member Monroe asked if it would be realistic to think the tennis courts could be used for larger events if there are nets around them. Mr. Jones answered affirmatively, explaining that the nets could be portable. Board Member Monroe asked how moving the skate park to the center of the park would impact the park's ability to accommodate large events. Mr. Jones agreed that the event diagram would have to be changed since the skate park would not be available for flexible use. Board Member Monroe asked if the design team and/or staff has raised this concern with the Chamber as to whether the proposed change would still work for the Taste of Edmonds. He asked if it would be better to swap the playground with the skate park. Mr. Jones pointed out that the current skate park went through an extensive public process to identify the correct site, and it has been successful for a number of years. The design team and staff felt it would be appropriate to relocate the skate park within close proximity of its existing site rather than opening a can of worms by proposing an entirely new location. Board Member Monroe voiced support for a water feature at the park, but not a spray pad.

Board Member Robles said he believes the proposed master plan will result in a wonderful asset for the community. Once the park is redeveloped, it will increase the value of everyone's properties regardless of why or where they purchased their homes and what their views are now. Compromise will be required, but having the park close by will be a tremendous asset. He said he does not live in the downtown, and he is very interested in the park's ability to serve people who live in other areas of the City. Providing parking space would be wonderful. He said he is also interested in some of the modern materials, such as the invisible net around the tennis courts. Mr. Jones clarified that the net would not be invisible, but it would be more transparent. Board Member Robles said he is interested in learning more about some of the alternatives for fencing. He noted that fences can make ADA access difficult. Perhaps selective fencing would be in order. He noted that fences can hide children as well as restrain children. He suggested the City consider more modern ways of creating blockage where needed. Mr. Jones agreed that safety is a big concern, as well as a liability for the City. However, once a fence is put up, it creates a barrier that also presents challenges. From a design perspective, if children get beyond the landscape barrier, there is usually a way to get across to rescue them. A fence would not allow this same flexibility. A person would have to go all the way to the end of the fence to get around to find child. Board Member Robles agreed that a fence along the entire north and south boundaries of the park would probably not be desirable.

Board Member Robles asked if the City has significant concerns about prowlers in the park and the surrounding neighborhoods given their close proximity to the Police Station. He said it seems like the neighborhood would be fairly safe. He concluded that he is happy with the rigorous public process and reminded the Board and public that they are talking about a master plan and not the final design for the park. He commented that the plan gets better every time he sees it.

Ms. Clark said she also likes the plan, and she believes her peers at the High School and Junior High will like it, as well, because it includes a wide variety of activities. She said she has taken tennis lessons at the tennis courts at Civic Park, and she also plays there on a regular basis. Both courts are frequently used. She asked how the proposed plan would impact the fire station, and Mr. Jones answered that the design of the park would not have any impact on circulation at the fire station. If the idea of the promenade ever moves forward, any booths associated with events would have to be situated west and/or south of the fire station. Ms. Clark said that she initially was not in support of having a fence on the north and south sides of

the park, but she is more interested in the idea after hearing about the safety concerns. She said she has seen kids running around in the alleys and a fence would provide additional safety.

Board Member Stewart said it was great to hear the public's comments and suggestions. She also said she appreciates the staff and design team's effort, and she has enjoyed serving on the PAC. She referred to the Edmonds Petanque Club's suggestion that the center area in the Petanque Grove have a crushed granite surface. She said it is good that the club is thinking creatively about how to expand the space when needed for tournaments. When it is not needed for tournaments, the surface could be used for other activities. If it could be incorporated to be aesthetically pleasing, she would support the proposal. Everyone seems to agree on the importance of creating flexible spaces, and she felt that the Petanque Grove should also be useable for all citizens for a variety of other activities.

With regard to the tennis courts, Board Member Stewart agreed that having two courts would be great, especially if pickle ball courts could fit right in. She asked if a basketball hoop could also be added along the side of at least one of the tennis courts to make the surface more versatile. She also asked if the plan includes a covered play area where people can shoot hoops, etc. Mr. Jones pointed out that a pickle ball court would also be located north of the Boys and Girls Club, and a basketball court is proposed in the northeast corner. Board Member Stewart asked if it would be possible to combine some of the uses that require a hard surface. Mr. Jones said they did consider this option but it is important to remember that the Boys and Girls Club currently has an indoor basketball court, so adding an additional outdoor covered basketball court would be duplicative. Ms. Hite added that, with the revised Hybrid Plan, the north sport court would be an optional court. If the Boys and Girls club expands over top of the multi-sport court, they can consider adding a basketball court on the sport court as needed.

Board Member Stewart noted that pickleball is also played on the tennis courts at Yost Park. She observed that pickleball creates a louder and more frequent noise than tennis. She hopes that the tennis courts won't be bothersome to the neighbors. Ms. Hite said people currently play pickleball at Civic Park, too; but not as frequently as at Yost Park.

Board Member Stewart suggested that instead of a fence for safety, perhaps some type of "prickly" landscaping could be used to keep kids from crossing from the park into the alley. She asked how high the landscaping would need to be to prevent balls from going over. She said it is important to think about safety first, but she is confident that staff can work with the design team to come up with a solution that is also aesthetically pleasing. She also referred to the concern that people living adjacent to the tennis courts would no longer be able to see into the park. She said that if she lived in close proximity to the park, she would also want to be able to see what is going on at the park. Again, she said she is confident that an aesthetically pleasing solution can be found.

Board Member Cheung asked how the strip of green to the right of the pickleball court would be used, and Mr. Jones answered that it is proposed to be lawn area. He explained that, in the hybrid plan, there would be a trail through the space and the surrounding area would be lawn. Board Member Cheung asked if picnic tables and benches are planned in the area near the water feature to provide seating. Mr. Jones answered that seat walls and trees would be located to provide a pleasant place for people sit, and they anticipate that the area around the water feature would be very active. Board Member Cheung asked what is being planned for the picnic area that would be located in the northeast corner of the park. Mr. Jones said the intent is to provide standard picnic tables. Board Member Cheung suggested that because it is important to have restrooms nearby, more people will likely use the seating and tables near the water feature. He suggested that tables be incorporated into the area surrounding the water feature and then the area in the northeast corner could be used for something else.

Board Member Cheung asked what material would be used to create the walkways through the park. Mr. Jones said the design team had originally identified the materials as unit pavers, but the estimated cost came in too high. The walkways could be constructed of poured, stamped, or colored concrete. Board Member Cheung asked if the walkways would be accessible to skateboards, and Mr. Jones answered that there would be an accessible route.

Board Member Cheung said he is concerned about whether a vegetative fence would be adequate to provide safety. On the other hand, aesthetics are important, too. He felt that a chain-link fence would make people feel like they are caged in. He noted that many parks have wooden log barriers that prevent children from bolting out into the street, but they don't really look like fences. He felt the intent is to slow people down without being too visually obstructive.

Vice Chair Rubenkönig recalled that the Board heard during the hearing that the petanque courts could be used during events and as a dry place for children to play during the winter months. She asked what other activities the courts could be used for. Ms. Hite said the courts could have movable features that would allow them to be used for other types of games and activities. She said she heard from the Edmonds Petanque Club that they would like the Petanque Grove to be redesigned to leave a big open space in the middle, which could be good for kids to play on. She said she would also be open to other creative ideas for how the area could be utilized, but it is not easy to come up with other multi-use options that would be feasible for the area.

Mr. Jones cautioned against creating an open field in the center of the Petanque Grove. He reminded the Board that the grove is located close to what he considers to be the front door of the downtown park. It needs to be crafted with a highly horticultural design. While he recognizes the needs of the club, it is important to balance this need with the need to have an attractive front door to the park. Leaving an expensive space with nothing in it and no shade would not be inviting to the ordinary user. He emphasized that the space needs to be designed to work for everybody and not just one group. The space needs to be crafted and elegant or it will feel empty and not feel like a front door to the downtown park.

**Dick Van Hollebeke, Edmonds**, said he is a member of the Edmonds Petanque Club. He said he has been in the landscape business for 20 years and has quite a bit of experience on visual impact and usage. He explained that the club's suggestion is to make the park as beautiful as possible at the entrance, but that doesn't mean it has to include 30 or 40 feet of landscaping. It could have a perimeter of landscaping and strategically placed trees that can coincide with being able to use the space for other activities without being a bare open space. A bare open space is not their vision, at all.

Vice Chair Rubenkönig said she likes what she is hearing about the tennis courts being used for pickleball and special events. She said she previously heard that the current skate park features are portable and can be relocated. However, when you talk about multi-purpose uses, it starts to pull away from the visionary plan. There must be a balancing act when considering the master plan. They should consider if the uses pull away from the grand plan of what the park can be for the City of Edmonds.

Vice Chair Rubenkönig asked why two tracks have been proposed around the field. Mr. Jones explained that one would be considered a track where people could measure the distance they walk or run and the other would be a pathway to provide circulation around the park. In addition, an east/west connection would be provided towards the northern side of the park. While there may be some duplication, he would not recommend combining the two. Vice Chair Rubenkönig agreed that it would not be a good idea to combine people walking with strollers, etc. with people who are running on the track.

A member of the audience asked if the City has taken into consideration the high-water level at the park. The ground at the park is very squishy, with a lot of pooling water. She asked if there has been any discussion about how the water can be drained better. Chair Lovell advised that issues related to drainage would be addressed during the design phase of the project.

Chair Lovell commented that the staff and design team have done a very nice job with the plan. He said he is unclear about comments that were received during the hearing about the need to create a vision for the park. He felt the proposed Hybrid Plan represents the desires of the majority of people who participated in the open houses. Once again, he reminded the public and the Board that the master plan is not intended to be a final design for the park. It is a program plan for use of the space and the activities and appurtenances that could be placed there. It is too early to talk about heights of trees, spacing of plantings, location of lights, etc. These issues will all be addressed as part of the final design, which will include another public process. He urged people who have concerns about the park to contact the Parks, Recreational and Cultural Services Director to volunteer to serve on the citizen's group that will be established to help with the final designs.

Chair Lovell asked if the alley that runs behind the condominiums on the north side of the park a public or private right-of-way. Ms. Hite answered that it is a public right-of-way. Chair Lovell summarized that, because it is a public right-of-way, anyone in the public can use it at any time, and it is up to the police to handle any problems that come up. Ms. Hite agreed that it would remain as a public right-of-way and enforcement would be provided by the Police Department.

Chair Lovell asked what would happen to the existing Boys and Girls Club Building if a new one is constructed in the northwest corner of the park. Ms. Hite explained that the City has been in discussions with the Boys and Girls Club about

what their programming will be at Civic Park. The current building is not a good space for them, and they would prefer to build a new facility. The master plan shows two alternatives. A new building could be constructed on the same site or in the northwest corner of the park. If the building is relocated to the northwest corner of the site, the tennis courts would likely be moved to where the existing building is currently located. The existing building would be removed if a new one is constructed.

Chair Lovell asked if bicycles would be allowed on the 1/3-mile track around the perimeter of the park, and Mr. Jones answered that it would be for pedestrians, only. If it becomes a problem, signage could be added to make the allowed uses clear.

Chair Lovell pointed out that a water feature was not included in the list of the top ten elements the public wanted to have at the park. Mr. Jones agreed but said it was identified as one of the top 20 elements the public wanted to have at the park. Chair Lovell said he likes the idea of having a water feature, but he is concerned that the plan tries to cram too many elements into the space. Mr. Jones said that, from his experience, one thing that makes a signature downtown park is an interactive water feature that is unique to the community it serves. It was a popular element that was included in both of the schemes that were presented at the second open house.

Chair Lovell asked how porous the 14-foot landscape buffer would be and if it would be possible to create a cut-through path by frequent use. Mr. Jones felt this problem could be addressed. He explained that it is important to direct people to specific locations to enter the park, and if they start creating additional access points along the northern edge of the park, adjacent residential homeowners may become concerned. Placing a landscape buffer along the northern edge would meet the code requirements and also direct people to specific entry points. He felt that creating a barrier via a fence would be a less safe option. With a landscape barrier, people would always have the option of cutting through if needed.

Chair Lovell asked if it would be possible to leave the skate park where it is and design around it. Ms. Hite answered that the existing skate park has required significant repairs and it is to the point that the original movable modules are now poured in place. She would recommend the City provide new components for the skate park rather than using the old ones that require a significant amount of maintenance. She recalled that there was significant public concern about the proposed location of the skate park in the original Hybrid Plan, and the design team has recommended that it be relocated to a more central location close to where it currently exists. She indicated that staff would engage the community in the process to help with future design of the skate park element.

Chair Lovell asked if staff and the design team would update the Hybrid Plan based on comments received at the public hearing and from the Board. Ms. Hite answered affirmatively and said it would be helpful for the Board to provide specific and clear direction. For example:

- She heard concern about fencing versus a landscape buffer. The design team has recommended against a fence, and the Board appears to support a landscape buffer as long as it does not allow access into the park. If a fence is considered, then more translucent materials should be used.
- There was some discussion about how many tennis courts there should be, and it appears that the Board supports the current proposal, which identifies two courts.
- There was also a recommendation from a citizen that the tennis courts be moved to a different location to improve the view for the adjacent condominium owners. It appears that the Board supports the tennis courts remaining in the location proposed in the plan as long as the fencing material allows some transparency for adjacent neighbors to see into the park.

Board Member Cloutier reminded the Board that the Master Plan is not intended to be a final design document. The Board should speak to the purpose of the barrier on the north and south edges of the park. Once its function has been made clear, the design team will be able to figure out the right approach and materials.

Mr. Jones explained that moving the tennis courts to the northeast corner could be an option, but it would block the view for a different set of homeowners. The southwest corner is the entry of the park from downtown, and they probably don't want a fenced edge in that location. If they are moved to the southeast corner, there will be concern that the tennis courts are taking away other opportunities for active recreation. He pointed out that they are in a location that has generally worked, and views

can be addressed as they move forward with final design. He emphasized that the City does not intend to put up a chain link fence with slats along the perimeter of the tennis courts as shown in the picture that was submitted during the hearing.

A member of the audience suggested that perhaps one tennis court could be eliminated from the plan, and a new tennis court could be constructed in the southwest corner of City Park. Chair Lovell responded that the plan has gone through an extensive public process to arrive at the two tennis courts that have been proposed. Concerns about view blockage have been raised, and the design team has indicated that is possible to address the concerns.

Another member of the audience explained that those who spoke about a fence along the northern edge of the park are simply interested in having a barrier incorporated into the plan to discourage people from leaving the park and entering directly onto the narrow alley. Chair Lovell said the design team understands the challenges in this location and will address safety and access issues as part of the final design, whether it be fencing or landscaping.

Board Member Cheung asked if the proposed picnic area could be reserved for group activities. Mr. Jones said the plan does not address this level of detail.

Board Member Robles asked if the master plan would identify parking for park users who do not live close to the park. Ms. Hite answered that there would be no parking on the park site. The public made it clear that they did not want any of the park space to be used for parking. However, there is parking on 6<sup>th</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> Avenues. The design team has proposed some parking upgrades for both of these streets, but the upgrades will not be part of the actual park development.

**UPON REVIEW OF THE PACKAGE SUBMITTED FOR THIS PUBLIC HEARING AND UPON HEARING AND READING THE PUBLIC COMMENTS PROVIDED, VICE CHAIR RUBENKONIG MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL OF THE MASTER PLAN OF THE CIVIC CENTER TO THE CITY COUNCIL, LETTING THE RECORD SPEAK TO THE COMMUNITY'S CONCERNS. HOWEVER, CERTAIN ISSUES WARRANT FURTHER ATTENTION SUCH AS:**

- **ADDRESS THE FUNCTIONALITY OF THE ALLEY BARRIER FOR SAFETY AND SECURITY.**
- **MAINTAIN THE MATURE TREE IN THE SOUTHEAST CORNER.**
- **INCREASE THE MULTI-PURPOSE ACTIVITY IF POSSIBLE WITHIN DESIGN CONSTRAINTS.**
- **KEEP THE VISION OF A SIGNATURE PARK.**
- **PROVIDE FUTURE DESIGNATED DROP-OFF AREAS ON 6<sup>TH</sup> AND 7<sup>TH</sup> AVENUES.**
- **INTRODUCE OTHER ELEMENTS INTO THE TENNIS COURTS.**

**BOARD MEMBER ROBLES SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

#### **PUBLIC HEARING ON 2016 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS**

Mr. Chave advised that only minor amendments have been proposed for the Comprehensive Plan in 2016. These include amendments to the Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan to recognize and incorporate the Marina Beach Master Plan, and an amendment to the Capital Facilities Element to add an implementation action. In addition, a couple of more substantial amendments are being developed relative to the Water Comprehensive Plan and Street Tree Plan. These will be ready for the Planning Board's consideration after the first of the year.

Vice Chair Rubenkönig pointed out that the list of City-owned parks needs to be updated to include Civic Park.

Chair Lovell opened the public hearing. There was no one in the audience to participate in the hearing, and the hearing was subsequently closed.

Board Member Monroe referred to the proposed amendment to the PROS Plan that would replace the existing language in Policy 4.H with the following: "*Ensure uses in environmentally sensitive areas are consistent with critical area regulations and the Shoreline Master Program.*" He asked how the proposed amendment would impact the dog park that is identified in the Marina Beach Master Plan. Ms. Hite explained that Policy 4.H was adopted prior to the Marina Beach Master Plan. She

**APPROVED**

reviewed that, based on community feedback, the dog park was included in the master plan. This decision made the master plan inconsistent with the current language in Policy 4.H, which reads, “Relocate incompatible uses from sensitive areas.”

**CHAIR LOVELL MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR THE 2016 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS AS PRESENTED. BOARD MEMBER MONROE SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA**

Chair Lovell reviewed that the Board’s November 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting has been cancelled. The agenda for their December 14<sup>th</sup> meeting will include a public hearing on the draft Highway 99 Area Plan and election of officers for 2017. The December 28<sup>th</sup> meeting has been cancelled.

**PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS**

Chair Lovell reported that he and Vice Chair Rubenkonig met with Mayor Earling, who indicated that the sign code may be coming back to the Board for additional review.

**PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

Vice Chair Rubenkonig asked staff to provide an update on the City Council’s decision to place a moratorium on the sign code. Mr. Chave said the City Council passed a resolution suspending enforcement of the pedestrian sign aspects of the sign code. They will form a task group to come up with some potential solutions to concerns that have been raised.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The Board meeting was adjourned at 9:55 p.m.

**APPROVED**