

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

May 23, 2001

Chair John Dewhirst called the regular meeting of the Planning Board to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Public Safety Complex, 250 – 5th Avenue North.

PRESENT

John Dewhirst, Chair
Beverly Lindh, Vice Chair
Virginia Cassutt
Bruce Witenberg
Jim Crim
Cary Guenther

ABSENT

Joanne Langendorfer
Stan Monlux

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Duane Bowman, Development Services Dir.
Arvilla Ohlde, Parks and Rec. Manager
Kathleen Taylor, Planner
Dave Gebhardt, City Engineer
John Westphal, Edmonds Fire Marshall

Ms. Langendorfer was excused from the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION BY MR. CRIM, SECONDED BY MR. WITENBERG, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JUNE 28, 2000 WITH THE FOLLOWING CORRECTIONS:

1. PAGE 3, FIRST PARAGRAPH, INSERT THE WORD “TO” BETWEEN “PRESENT” AND “REVIEW.”
2. PAGE 3, FIFTH PARAGRAPH, FIFTH LINE, DELETE THE FIRST “TO.”
3. PAGE 4, SECOND PARAGRAPH FROM BOTTOM, THIRD LINE, CHANGE “POSSIBLE” TO “PROBLEM.”
4. PAGE 7, THIRD PARAGRAPH FROM BOTTOM, FOURTH LINE, INSERT THE WORD “SAID” BETWEEN “CHAVE” AND “THAT.”

MOTION CARRIED.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

The agenda was rearranged as follows:

- Item 6a—A public hearing on the future use of certain Woodway Meadows property received by the City from Snohomish County.
- Item 6b—A public hearing on Edmonds Memorial Cemetery Master Plan.
- Item 6c—A public hearing regarding the adoption of the Snohomish County Tomorrow Common Siting Process for Essential Public Facilities.
- Item 7a—Discussion regarding rights-of-way encroachment.
- Item 7b—Continued review of design guidelines and potential code amendments to implement the design guidelines.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

There was no one in the audience wishing to address the Board during this portion of the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING FUTURE USE OF CERTAIN WOODWAY MEADOWS PROPERTY RECEIVED BY THE CITY FROM THE COUNTY

Mr. Chave recalled that in September of 1999, the City Council adopted a temporary use classification for some property given to the City by the County. He explained that this was a right-of-way that the County found that they still owned when the rest of the area was annexed into the City. He referred to the memorandum from the City Engineer, Don Feine, summarizing the history of the property. He explained that the temporary resolution adopted by the Council accomplished the following:

- Allowed the previously established access from the right-of-way to continue.
- Established rights to use the right-of-way for access of utilities.
- Allowed the right-of-way to be used for emergency access.

Mr. Chave said that at the time the temporary resolution was passed, the Council referred the issue to the Planning Board to hold a public hearing and make a recommendation regarding the permanent use classification for the property. Staff is bringing this issue before the Board as part of the Comprehensive Plan amendment review because it could have an impact on the bike plan which was recently adopted and the walkway plan which the City is in the process of updating. In his memorandum, Mr. Feine has indicated that neither of these plans shows the right-of-way as being part of the bike or walkway systems. The property is not being considered for inclusion in the updated walkway plan, either. Mr. Chave said the Engineering Department has recommended that the temporary uses that were established by the Council in 1999 should be made permanent. He also noted the memorandum from the Edmonds Fire Marshall regarding the emergency access issue.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS OPENED. NO ONE IN THE AUDIENCE INDICATED A DESIRE TO ADDRESS THE BOARD REGARDING THIS ISSUE, AND THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Mr. Dewhirst referenced the City Council minutes in which this issue was discussed. One of the Council members suggested that if the emergency access were approved, the Town of Woodway would be able to remove the other two emergency access points.

John Westphal, Edmonds Fire Marshall, said the Council member's comment referenced an earlier discussion about why the emergency access could not be provided at the north and south ends of the property. He said the preferred option is to bisect the property by placing the emergency access at the center of the right-of-way.

Mr. Bowman noted that the City does have drainage utilities on the site, and the temporary use resolution does not make reference to this. He suggested that the permanent resolution include the provision that the property could be used for drainage improvements. Mr. Dewhirst said the minutes from the City Council meeting include comments from the neighbors regarding existing drainage problems. Staff indicated that drainage improvements had been made to take care of the immediate problems and there is a basin study underway at the present time to look at the bigger issues and come up with a permanent solution for the drainage problems in the area.

The Board indicated that they would like to accept the staff's recommendation. Mr. Chave said that there is no Comprehensive Plan action that the Board or Council would need to consider if the temporary resolution is made permanent since there would be no impact to the bike or walkway plans. He clarified that if the Board recommends that the Council accept the staff's recommendation it would:

- Authorize staff to draft a resolution for City Council approval that would establish a permanent use classification consistent with the temporary classification established by the Council in September of 1999.

APPROVED

- ❑ Authorize staff to initiate a street map amendment classifying the property as a right-of-way tying the use of the right-of-way to the uses established in the adopted permanent use resolution.

Mr. Dewhirst expressed that he would like to have this right-of-way considered in the future when the bike and walkway plans are considered. This could become a link in an area that doesn't have good access between Edmonds and Woodway. Dave Gebhardt, City Engineer, said this property would be considered when the Walkway Plan is considered, but it may not receive a high priority.

Mr. Bowman referred to the temporary resolution which references the Council's ability to change the uses allowed on the site. If they decide in the future that there is a possible use for the right-of-way, the Council could make a change, but a public process would be required.

MOTION BY MR. WITENBERG, SECONDED BY MR. CRIM, TO AUTHORIZE STAFF TO DRAFT A RESOLUTION FOR THE CITY COUNCIL TO APPROVE THAT WOULD:

- ❑ ESTABLISH A PERMANENT USE CLASSIFICATION CONSISTENT WITH THE TEMPORARY CLASSIFICATION ESTABLISHED BY THE COUNCIL IN SEPTEMBER OF 1999.
- ❑ INITIATE A STREET MAP AMENDMENT CLASSIFYING THE PROPERTY AS RIGHT-OF-WAY AND TYING THE USE OF THE RIGHT-OF-WAY TO THE USES ESTABLISHED IN THE ADOPTED PERMANENT USE RESOLUTION.
- ❑ INCLUDE A DRAINAGE EASEMENT ACCESS AS A UTILITY USE.

MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC HEARING ON EDMONDS MEMORIAL CEMETERY PLAN

Arvilla Ohlde, Parks and Recreation Director, introduced the Cemetery Board Members who were in attendance. She referenced some letters that were received from the public, which were included in the Board's packets. She also noted some other letters which were received after the packets were sent out from Kirby Warren and Ruby Deanne. Also a petition letter from Mr. and Mrs. Lubick was received regarding the existing gate. The Cemetery Board has discussed this issue and a response is forthcoming.

Ms. Ohlde provided a history of the cemetery, which has been in existence for nearly 100 years. In the 1980's the cemetery was purchased by a local businessman in Edmonds. Upon his death it was willed to the City. At that time the cemetery was in a deteriorating condition. The City Council created a Cemetery Board and gave them the management authority for the facility. They also funded the cost of annual maintenance and a full-time sexton. Today, the cemetery is beautiful under the Board's management. They are the best Board she has ever worked with and they make prudent, responsible decisions for the future of the cemetery. She described how the Board sets aside 10 percent of their revenue for a perpetual care fund, with the goal to someday use the interest to pay for the cost of a sexton. She also described the reclamation process that is currently underway to reclaim the lots that were purchased many years ago but have had no activity or contact since 1950. This process is estimated to take up to eight years. She said the Cemetery Board has also worked through the master plan process to include landscape improvements and other amenities to make the site more pleasant. The master plan also addresses a concept of developing a new columbarium in the northeast corner of the site for ash burials.

Cliff Wilworth, WCA Northwest, said that he is the master plan consultant for the cemetery project. He noted that cemetery master planning and design has been his specialty for the past ten years. He said that in reviewing the existing cemetery facilities, he found that the weakest point is the lack of cremation options. He noted that cremation has become a significant burial option with more than 60 percent of the burials in Washington State being ash burials. He said it is important for the Edmonds Cemetery Board to consider additional options to meet this demand. Mr. Wilworth also advised that creating new revenue generating features are critical for the cemetery to survive and help fund not only the new features, but the existing features within the cemetery.

APPROVED

Mr. Wilworth said that, currently, the cemetery has one primary driveway going north/south, and a secondary driveway going east/west. The primary access is a one-lane road and passing is difficult. The master plan includes a provision to widen the road and provide a turn loop at the intersection of the two driveways. It also proposes that the driveways be widened in places to allow people to pull off of the road and park.

Mr. Wilworth noted that the northeast corner of the property is the most unattractive area. The master plan recommend that particular things be done to enhance the desirability of this area. However, the plan leaves the design options open for the Cemetery Board to decide at a later date when construction is being seriously considered. The ultimate design will depend a great deal upon the demand for services and the desires of the community.

Mr. Dewhirst noted that in several of the letters from the neighbors they expressed concern about the openness from the street. He inquired if this openness is considered good or if more screening is necessary. Mr. Wilworth answered that this would depend upon the management and ownership of the cemetery. Cemeteries that are owned by large commercial companies usually prefer that their cemetery be visible. Other community owned and operated properties would prefer screening from the street. The community must make this decision. Mr. Dewhirst inquired if the police have expressed a preference for openness so that the area is easier to patrol. Mr. Wilworth said it depends on how prone the property has been to vandalism in the past. Generally, police like to have some view into the property. However, from his standpoint, he said he doesn't like screening off the property completely because cemeteries are beautiful when done well.

Ms. Ohlde reviewed some of the funding concepts, and noted that it is important to keep the economy in mind as they consider funding options. The Cemetery Board has indicated that the master plan implementation will take place over several years because they do not want to borrow money. They want to save enough money to pay for the new projects. They are also in the process of setting up a process for memorial donations of landscaping and other cemetery amenities.

Mr. Dewhirst inquired if the master plan consultant has developed a phasing process for implementation of projects. Ms. Ohlde advised that this discussion would be the next element of the process.

Don Ullom, 1515 – 8th Place South, said he has a full view of the cemetery from his property. He inquired if the trees that are depicted in the master plan are new trees or if they would replace existing trees. Mr. Wilworth answered that these would be new trees, and none of the existing trees would be moved. Mr. Ullom said the he, his wife and neighbors have reviewed the master plan and thoroughly enjoy the things that have taken place at the cemetery to make it more beautiful and generate more revenue. However, they do not care for the gate at the existing pedestrian entrance. He noted that this area is lower than the remaining property, and a lot of the access occurs at night when there is poor visibility from any of the streets. The current lighting does not provide much help. He said the teenagers use the site for a hangout at night, and the neighbors have seen a lot of vandalism over the past ten years when the area became more accessible with the gate. He said he does not see anything on the other side of the gate that would serve anyone coming to the cemetery to visit. If they assume that the people with loved ones in the cemetery do not use the gate, that leaves it to teenagers and transients. He said the neighbors would appreciate it if the Board would seriously consider closing the gate. They would like this area to be a wooded glen for the people buried at the cemetery and for the people who come to visit.

Dorothy Williamson said the plan presented seems to be acceptable to the neighbors and will help guide the volunteer Cemetery Board in future decisions. She also said that the cemetery is very well kept. The sexton has put his heart and soul into taking care of the facility. She noted that there will be no grand and glorious changes happen overnight. The projects will be done as money becomes available. She asked that the Commission review the master plan with the understanding that it is the future of the cemetery to ensure that it is always available for the citizens of Edmonds.

Cliff Edwards, Edmonds Cemetery Sexton, referred to the issues surrounding the gate. He explained that the reason the gate was put in was because the students at Woodway High School would cut through the cemetery on their way home. They ended up breaking the slats of the fence, and the Cemetery Board felt it would be better to provide a gate. Also, the Community Transit bus drops off people visiting the cemetery in this location. The police have also used the gate to access the park to get vandals that are in the cemetery. He concluded that the gate has been an asset to the cemetery visitors.

APPROVED

Trudy Wipfelder-Deanne, 22615 – 100th Avenue West, agreed that she has seen things happen in the cemetery that are generally caused by teenagers who are using drugs. They leave a mess for the neighbors to clean up. She thanked the Cemetery Board for cleaning up the cemetery and making it beautiful. She would like the cemetery to be further improved to become a garden of peace and comfort. She would like to see more trees, shrubs, benches and water so that people can enjoy their visits more. She concluded that while she can understand the need for the gate, she can also sympathize with the neighbors.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Ms. Cassutt said she does not see any reason to provide a gate for people to access the cemetery from the alley. She said that if she owned a business along the alley, she wouldn't want people walking behind her business in the late evening hours.

Mr. Crim felt that the gate issue should be addressed by the Cemetery Board after listening to the concerns of the neighbors. He said he does not feel it is within the purview of the Planning Board to make this decision.

Mr. Dewhirst said it seems like the gate issue is an important detail of the master plan and some type of solution should be worked out amongst the neighbors, the staff and the Cemetery Board. He said he would like the issue to be resolved before recommending final approval of the master plan.

Mr. Wilworth said he believes it is possible to work with the neighbors to resolve the issue during the next phase, which will refine and provide details to the master plan. He said that perhaps there are some security measures that could be done to make the gate safer for the surrounding neighborhoods. He agreed that a solution should be worked out with the City, the neighbors and the Cemetery Board.

Mr. Crim said he feels the Master Plan is well done, and he would hate to see it held up by the gate issue. Mr. Chave said there is time to address this issue before a recommendation needs to be sent to the City Council because the master plan would accompany the Comprehensive Plan amendments, which are a month or two from being concluded.

Ms. Ohlde said it is the Cemetery Board's intent to work out the operations issues and to address the public concerns. She suggested that if the gate issue is a key concern to the Planning Board, they could place a caveat in their recommendation that would require a resolution.

MOTION BY MR. CRIM, SECONDED BY MR. GUENTHER, TO RECOMMEND THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE THE MASTER PLAN AS PRESENTED.

Mr. Witenberg agreed that the master plan is good, but one of the purposes of a public hearing is to hear and address the public's concerns. He said it does not sound like there is anyone who doesn't want to seek a solution to the problem. Unfortunately, the purview of resolving the issue does not rest upon the Planning Board.

MR. WITENBERG MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION TO INCLUDE A REQUEST TO THE CEMETERY BOARD TO WORK WITH THE NEIGHBORS AND CITY STAFF (INCLUDING THE POLICE DEPARTMENT) TO SEE IF THEY CAN COME UP WITH A RESOLUTION TO THE GATE PROBLEM AS DESCRIBED. MR. CRIM ACCEPTED THE AMENDMENT. MOTION CARRIED.

PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING THE ADOPTION OF THE SNOHOMISH COUNTY TOMORROW COMMON SITING PROCESS FOR ESSENTIAL PUBLIC FACILITIES

Mr. Chave advised that the Growth Management Act (GMA) mandates that counties and their cities which plan under GMA must adopt a common siting process for the location of essential public facilities which are of a countywide or statewide nature. Many of these facilities may be difficult to site, and the proposal by Snohomish County Tomorrow is to provide a consultation and advisory forum for the sponsors of such facilities in order to assist in siting decisions. The process would provide for preapplication consultation in identifying potential sites and also offers a review option for sponsors after a local

APPROVED

land use decision has been completed. Mr. Chave clarified that the advisory review board does not have the authority to overturn a local decision. However, it does have the ability to make a determination on whether or not the sponsor's proposal was given due consideration according to the adopted criteria for essential public facilities and to recommend arbitration as an alternative to the normal local appeal process. He concluded that the City signed an interlocal agreement with Snohomish County agreeing to adopt legislation by September 1, 2002 which implements the common siting process and review criteria for Edmonds. He asked that the Board recommend that the City Council adopt the proposed common siting process for essential public facilities as part of the capital facilities element of the Comprehensive Plan.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

MOTION BY MR. CRIM, SECONDED BY MR. WITENBERG, TO RECOMMEND THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE THE PROPOSED COMMON SITING PROCESS FOR ESSENTIAL PUBLIC FACILITIES AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED.

THE BOARD TOOK A TEN-MINUTE BREAK AT 8:10 P.M. THEY RECONVENED AT 8:20 P.M.

RIGHT-OF-WAY ENCROACHMENT

Mr. Chave advised that the City Council has asked the Planning Board to evaluate the possibility of allowing encroachments into the right-of-way above the ground level, such as bay windows and building extensions. He noted that a public hearing before the Planning Board is not required because right-of-way encroachments are under the purview of the City Council only. However, the Council would like a recommendation from the Board.

Kathleen Taylor, planner, advised that the City Council is suggesting the possibility of allowing encroachment into the right-of-way in exchange for certain trade-offs. Possible tradeoffs could include awnings along 100 percent of the street frontage, additional landscaped areas beyond code requirements, extension of the sidewalk area, a more pronounced cornice or contrast of the facade.

Mr. Chave said that staff recommends that the percentage of the facade that encroaches into the right-of-way should be limited to 25 to 30 percent of the building frontage with a minimum clearance of 9 feet. They also recommend that the projections be limited to the second and third floors only and that the depth of the extension be limited to 24 inches.

Mr. Dewhirst pointed out that in the diagram identified as Attachment 1, the bay windows extend out about three feet. Ms. Taylor said that the City of Seattle allows extensions up to three feet, but they also have wider sidewalks. They have a specific code addressing right-of-way extensions, and they also allow encroachments on up to 50 percent of the building facade.

The Board discussed the limitations that should be placed on the encroachments into the right-of-way. They agreed that encroachments should be limited to the second or third story and that there must be at least a nine-foot clearance. They noted, however, that there are standards in place to ensure clearance.

Mr. Dewhirst inquired if it would be possible to combine an encroachment permit with some other process to expedite the permit process. If the City approves a site plan that includes an encroachment which meets the height and other requirements, Mr. Dewhirst inquired if it would be possible to bypass the encroachment permit process. Mr. Chave said that even if the encroachment was approved in the design process, other issues such as insurance need to be addressed as part of the encroachment permit process. However, he noted that once an encroachment permit is obtained, it is permanent and does not have to be renewed. Ms. Taylor added that an applicant could apply for the encroachment permit at the same time as the building permit and they can be addressed simultaneously. Mr. Chave said that it takes a week or less to receive an encroachment permit as long as all of the requirements are met. A building permit takes much longer. Ms. Taylor clarified that before an encroachment permit is issued, an applicant has already gone through the ADB process for review and approval of their project.

APPROVED

Mr. Chave clarified that the Council is seeking recommendation from the Board regarding the tradeoffs that should be considered in exchange for granting an encroachment to the right-of-way. They also would like a recommendation about what the standards should be. He said that in order for the City to allow an encroachment into the right-of-way, an applicant must demonstrate that a public benefit is being provided.

Mr. Dewhirst referred to the standards recommended by the staff and said he agrees with what has been proposed, but the language must be more specific. For example, they should address the standards that apply to alley right-of-ways. He agreed that encroachments should be limited to no more than 30 percent of the facade. He also suggested that the engineering standards related to clearance should be included in the standards. The Board agreed with Mr. Dewhirst's recommendations. They concluded that encroachments should be allowed for building projections, bay windows and decks as recommended by staff.

Ms. Taylor advised that the right-of-way encroachments would be limited to the BC zone where a property owner is allowed to build right up to the property line. If modulation is required as a tradeoff, there would be an opportunity for landscaping above what is required by the City. Mr. Chave added that the City Council has indicated that they would like to get the most they can in exchange for the right-of-way encroachment. They feel that giving away the use of the public right-of-way should result in a definable public benefit.

Mr. Witenberg inquired if the public benefit has to be provided on site or if it could be provided off site (i.e. public kiosk or direction signs). Mr. Chave said he is not sure how this could be included as one of the tradeoffs because the City does not have a public sign program.

Mr. Dewhirst pointed out that by allowing encroachments into the right-of-way the public benefit could be served by having varied types of facade designs, particularly in the downtown area. He suggested that this would be providing a benefit for the greater public good. He said that many of the tradeoffs listed are expensive, and he does not want to see so many onerous conditions that prevent developers from using the encroachment provision. He concluded that if right-of-way encroachments are allowed, the City would get more varied facade than they have right now.

The Board concurred that this is a way to obtain facade modulation, which is one of the goals of the design guidelines. They agreed that the exchange should not be so onerous that it discourages people from taking advantage of the allowance. They also agreed that the public benefit would be served by the fact that the facades would be more interesting. They asked that the staff forward a recommendation to the Council based on the Board's conclusions.

Ms. Taylor said she would forward the Board's recommendation to the City Council for a public hearing on June 15th.

CONTINUED REVIEW OF DESIGN GUIDELINES AND POTENTIAL CODE AMENDMENTS TO IMPLEMENT THE DESIGN GUIDELINES

Mr. Bullock referred the Board to the two site plans and elevations for two multi-family projects. He referred to the trial evaluation that he completed for each using the design guidelines matrix that was handed out to the Board on May 9th and the draft design guidelines. He said the purpose of this exercise is to evaluate how well the projects would have met the draft design guidelines.

Mr. Bullock particularly noted the following issues that need to be addressed further:

- ❑ **Entryway:** The proposed design guidelines would require that main entryways be emphasized with awnings and trellises, etc. Pedestrian access should also be considered further. However, he noted that the current code does not allow for projection into the setback area in order to emphasize the entrance.
- ❑ **Setbacks:** He recalled that the Board has discussed the option of allowing more flexibility in the setback area to provide more variety. He suggested that this could be better addressed by the bulk standards and the design guidelines could identify the types of uses that could be allowed to project into the setbacks.

APPROVED

Mr. Dewhirst said that the setback issue is one in which flexibility comes into play. One issue is related to what is allowed to encroach into the setbacks and the other is related to the variations allowed for the setback requirements, themselves. He said that setback issues are problematic because setbacks establish an expectation for adjacent property owners regarding how close development can be located to them.

Mr. Bullock responded that single-family development often has a fence located on the property line with lawn up to the edge of the fence. Because of the existing code, setbacks in multi-family zones are not used for prolonged circumstances such as lawn. He suggested that allowing encroachment into the setback is one way to encourage interesting building designs to disguise the blocky nature of multi-family development.

- **Required Open Space:** Mr. Bullock explained that the proposed design guidelines require small projects to provide 24 square feet of open space per unit, and most of the condos in the downtown have decks of about 50 to 100 square feet each. However, the problem comes in meeting the requirement that 50 percent of the open space be provided at grade. Mr. Dewhirst suggested that perhaps this is an example where the requirements are inappropriate. Mr. Chave pointed out that if this requirement was made to be more flexible, projects in the downtown would be able to meet the open space requirements. Mr. Bullock suggested that the terms “open space” and “usable open space” need to be clarified further.

Mr. Bullock said that none of the projects he reviewed would have had difficulty meeting the requirements identified in the proposed design guidelines. However, some changes would have been necessary. Mr. Dewhirst concluded that well-designed projects would have not a problem meeting the design guidelines as proposed.

Mr. Bullock said he would be reviewing some existing large commercial buildings next to see how well they would have met the design guideline requirements. He said he was not able to provide this information now because he is still waiting for files from the archives. He said he does not anticipate a lot of problems with the mixed-use buildings in the downtown area.

The Board discussed when the next public hearing on the draft design guidelines should be scheduled. Mr. Chave advised that if the Board wants to have a new draft design guidelines document and an outline of the code amendments prior to the public hearing, they should keep in mind the significant amount of staff time required to prepare the documents. Mr. Dewhirst noted that there are still a lot of issues related to the guidelines that need to be identified and addressed before the public hearing. Mr. Chave agreed that there are still some issues that need to be resolved and changes made to the draft document before it is presented for public hearing.

The Board agreed that they would attempt to address the unresolved issues related to the design guidelines at their next meeting in preparation for a public hearing on June 27, 2001.

CONTINUED REVIEW OF THE PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (PRD) ORDINANCE

Mr. Chave referred the Board to the late comments received from the City Attorney regarding the proposed PRD ordinance. He advised that the changes identified by the City Attorney have been made to the draft PRD ordinance, most of which are simple. He particularly noted the more significant changes to Section 20.35.050(A).

Mr. Bullock noted that the Board had also requested feedback from the City Attorney on whether or not staff could approve the final PRD applications that do not require street vacation. He said he has not received feedback to date on this issue. Once he receives this information, Mr. Bullock suggested that the Board would be ready for a final public hearing on the ordinance on June 13, 2001.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

APPROVED

The Board reviewed that the main topic at the next meeting will be the design guidelines. There will be a public hearing on the PRD regulations on June 13, as well. A public hearing on the design guidelines was tentatively scheduled for June 27, 2001, which will also be the public hearing date for the Port's Master Plan.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Mr. Dewhirst provided staff with a Planning Board Member Roster, including changes that need to be made. He asked that staff make the changes and provide copies of the updated document to each Board member.

Mr. Dewhirst reported that he and Ms. Lindh attended the Walkable Communities Workshop last Friday. It included presentations regarding elements of walkable communities and a field trip to the waterfront. The main issue that was discussed was how to make Edmonds more walkable from the downtown across the railroad tracks and along the waterfront. It was noted that the location of the tracks makes this connection difficult.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Ms. Lindh said that while on the tour, she was very impressed with Edmonds Main Street and south. She said she noticed things that she had never taken note of before. She said some of the ideas for controlling traffic were very interesting, and they also provided some interesting cross walk patterns that have been effective in other communities. She said that overall the workshop was very informative and enjoyable.

Mr. Chave reported that on Tuesday, May 22, 2001 the Council approved the parking ordinance and the definition of street ordinance as submitted by the Board.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:47 P.M.

APPROVED