The meeting was called to order at 3:00 PM.

ATENDANCE: Roger Gage, Gail Fleming, Sue Walsh Dominique Emerson, Paul Goldfinger, Aaron Simpson
Staff: Jeff Arango, Cheryl Knighton

Motion by Roger to approve the January 7th minutes with changes, second – Gail, approved.

Code Amendments

Land Use Table
Jeff made minor changes as discussed at last meeting, which included a legend at the end. Everyone agreed that it looked good.

Zoning District Standards

Height Modification
Jeff did a slide show of scenarios showing different building heights and building types for the downtown business district. Discussion on the impact they could have on the residential homes, views and Seawall Park. Sue pointed out that the City is not really prepared at this time to give builders other options, and that this would be a beginning point when the City is approached by builders to construct multi story buildings on the water front. Roger asked about the possible hazards of fire danger with three story buildings and is the fire department prepared to handle such. Jeff said he thought they could because Freeland has multi story buildings. Paul likes the idea because it gives everyone more options. Aaron asked if height restrictions could be mitigated. Yes, but there are tradeoffs. Who’s view and why. What is the impact?

The concession of the group was to wait until a developer approached the city before making a decision.

Landscaping and Tree Retention

City Forester, Tree Removal, and Heritage trees were all discussed. Discussion on clarification on single family homes verses large wooded parcels and what does “clear” mean. Does single family residence need more definition? Some discussion on language in the “intent” section. It seems that there a conflict with the wording between the entire section and 9D. Paul mentioned that there are several residents that are not happy with the ordinance.

Barbara Seitle of 410 Edgecliff spoke in favor of limiting restrictions on SFR. Significant trees should be regulated. Thinks the ordinance should read if a significant tree is removed it needs to be replaced.
Aaron thinks that the Planning Official can make the decision after hearing and examining the application and hearing the reason for the removal. He would also be hearing advice from the “Forester” or the Arborist”.

Marianne Edain spoke on Mitigation ratio. She suggested to have Jeff correct the “flow” of the ordinance and bring it back to the board.

The group needs to give Jeff some direction on how they want single family home and duplexes be defined. What is the definition of a significant tree?

Dominique asked if the “City Forester” would be advertised to the public. Jeff explained it would and that he/she would be appointed by the Mayor and approved by the council.

Marianne had some language corrections she would like Jeff to fix. She will email them to him. She thinks this ordinance is a good start and possibly an advisory board would be good to have.

Some discussion on clarifying landscaping verses tree removal in general.

Motion: To Direct the Planning Official to clarify the significant tree regulation and to apply it to the single family/multi family residence. Aaron. All in favor. Approved.

It was decided that this item should be revisited after Jeff cleans up the language and brought back to the board before approving.

Things to talk about at next meeting will be enforcement and cost.

**Design Review Board Overview Presentation**
Tabled at this time. Will revisit at next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 4:45PM