

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

June 27, 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
Bruce Witenberg
Jim Crim
Stan Monlux
Cary Guenther

ABSENT

Joanne Langendorfer
Virginia Cassutt

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Karin Noyes, Recorder

Both Ms. Cassutt and Ms. Langendorfer were excused from the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION BY MS. LINDH, SECONDED BY MR. CRIM, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JUNE 13, 2001 AS SUBMITTED. MOTION CARRIED, WITH MR. WITENBERG ABSTAINING.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

A discussion regarding the creation of a new zoning district for the Hospital Activity Node was added to the agenda as Item 8a.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Roger Hertrich, 1020 Puget Drive, said that he finds it interesting that the Board is reviewing the Port's Master Plan, but there has been no master plan proposed for the UNOCAL site to date. He noted that the ADB recently reviewed a project for a 182-unit multi-family complex on the site where the oil tanks are currently located. The ADB decided that it is too early in the process for them to make a decision on the proposed design. He also recalled that at the last City Council Meeting, the Council suggested that a public hearing be held regarding the UNOCAL site. Mr. Hertrich asked that the Planning Board be proactive and begin the process of reviewing the UNOCAL site with a Master Plan as the goal. He said that the environmental agency that controls the cleanup of the site would identify a level of cleanup consistent with the zoning of the site and the uses that would be allowed. If the City does not designate a standard for clean up, the level of clean up will be left to the environmental agency and the City will be locked into certain uses for the site. He concluded that it is important for the City to obtain public input as to what the property should be used for as soon as possible so the City can identify a zone for the property and the proper clean up can be done.

PUBLIC HEARING ON DESIGN GUIDELINES AND POTENTIAL CODE AMENDMENTS TO IMPLEMENT THE DESIGN GUIDELINES (FILE NO. CDC-2000-153)

Mr. Chave recalled that the Board has held previous hearings on the design guidelines, along with quite a few work sessions. He advised that tonight's hearing is related to the latest update of the draft design guidelines. The Board intends to accept public comments and make adjustments to the guidelines. Next, they will consider the code amendments required to implement the guidelines, and this process will also include a public hearing. The Board will then make a recommendation to the City Council, who will also hold a public hearing. He advised that Phase 2 of the process will be related to the review process. The Board will hold a public hearing regarding this issue, also, and make a recommendation to the Council. He recalled that the Council's direction is that the design review process be placed at the beginning of a project review and that the process be streamlined and made more predictable. Mr. Chave summarized that the end result of the entire process will be a new set of design guidelines, code amendments to implement the guidelines and a new design review process.

Mr. Chave advised that this public hearing is related to the design guidelines, themselves. The code amendments will not be addressed until the next public hearing. He advised that the Board is seeking concrete suggestions from the public rather than blanket statements regarding the document.

Paul Mar, Board Member of the Edmonds Chamber of Commerce, and representative for the Edmonds Stakeholders' Group, reminded the Board that he previously spoke to them regarding this issue in March. On behalf of the stakeholders, Mr. Mar commended the Board and staff on their efforts to work with the group regarding their concerns. He reminded the Board that the group's goal to "*Enhance the economic development and urban aesthetic environment of the City by providing flexibility and incentives in the design guidelines.*" He said that from the onset, the stakeholders' group has emphasized the importance of design guideline flexibility in its feedback to the Planning Board, and they believe that the Board has embraced this concept to a certain degree. However, the Board's differentiation of the words "should" and "shall" still causes the group a great deal of concern. He noted that the Board has recommended that where the word "shall" is used, no departure would be granted. He said the group finds this to be overly prescriptive from an economic development viewpoint. He noted that the word "shall" is used at least 75 times in the document. The group suggests that a quick way to address their concern would be to change every "shall" to "should." However, they realize that this is not likely to happen. Therefore, they recommend that City staff review how the word "shall" is used and perhaps substitute another word where appropriate.

Mr. Mar recalled that the group previously presented 26 topics of concern to the Board, and 15 of them have been addressed to their satisfaction. The group believes that the changes have greatly improved the value of the design guidelines, but they believe that there are still a number of topics that are unresolved. He introduced Tony Shapiro, who was present to present these topics for the Board's consideration.

Tony Shapiro, 600 Main Street, said that his perception of the proposed design guidelines is that they will be utilized heavily in the design process. They will also have an impact on the approval process. He noted that Edmonds is competing with other communities for development, and they should be interested in attracting development. He applauded the City and Board for working towards creating a format for the development process, but he said he is concerned that the guidelines could mandate that the Hearing Examiner essentially require that an application comply with all of the "shall" items. He said it is his hope that the Board would look more at performance standards instead of the prescriptive aspects identified in the document.

Mr. Shapiro reviewed each of the stakeholders' items of concern as follows:

- ❑ **Item 3 (Page 2)—200-Food Radius for Site Information:** The intent of the criteria is for the staff to get a good perspective of the property. As written, applicants would be required to increase their data gathering by 400 percent. This is very time consuming and onerous, and he questioned whether the added value of this information to the City is commensurate with the additional cost incurred by the applicant.
- ❑ **Item 5 (Pages 8-11)—Buffers:** The stakeholders recommend that the heading on Page 8 should be changed from "Buffers" to "Landscape Buffers" since this would be better design-related terminology and differentiate from the current code usage. This would lean towards a less onerous interpretation of separation.

APPROVED

- ❑ **Item 8 (Page 17)—Garage Setback Entry:** While the garage setback requirements have been reduced somewhat, it is obvious that the major intent of this section is to not allow any garage entries off of the main arterials in the downtown area. He agreed that because of the numerous alleys in the City, it is not good to have garage entries off of main streets. However, in situations where there is no alternative, the proposed language will encourage large driveways. From a safety standpoint, the group suggests that the engineering criteria be applied in these situations.
- ❑ **Item 9 (Page 18)—Number of Garage Entries:** The group feels that placing a limit on the number of garage entries on arterials is onerous. They suggest that this section not stipulate that only one entry is allowed because there may be situations where more than one entry might be appropriate. The City shouldn't dampen the enthusiasm for developers to invest in the downtown.
- ❑ **Item 10 (Page 20)—Trash/Utility Storage Location:** The group feels that to stipulate that dumpsters cannot be placed in certain locations can be very onerous. These structures should be strongly discouraged from being placed in the setbacks, but the guidelines can express this without having to use a firm "shall" term.
- ❑ **Item 12 (Pages 22-23)—Open Space Requirements:** The group feels that the requirement that 50 percent of the open space be provided at grade is too restrictive. He noted that it is difficult to foresee all of the different conditions that a site may encounter. Saying that 50 percent of the open space must be provided at grade means that individual decks cannot be counted. He said that with the cost of property in Edmonds going up, it is not economically feasible to require that a such a great amount of space be set aside for non-revenue producing components. This dampens the investors' opportunities and can have an adverse affect with very little gain. He also suggested that the City could open liability issues by requiring such open space to be at ground level and accessible to the public.
- ❑ **Item 23 (Page 44)—Window Variety:** The staff has pointed out that most buildings in the City would fully comply with this section of the guidelines. After further review and explanation, the group now concurs that any decent design would have adequate window types to meet the requirements. Therefore, the group questions why this section even needs to be part of the design guidelines. Another option would be to rewrite this section so that this is a guideline instead of a requirement.

Mr. Shapiro expressed his concern that the guidelines do not appear to be guidelines. He said that in many regards, they could have a limiting influence on the creative process of building design.

Mr. Mar referred to **Item 16** and advised that the stakeholders strongly recommend that the City increase building heights in the BC zone to accommodate better building designs that do not adversely impact views. He asked that the Board consider this option in the future.

Mr. Mar concluded by stating that the design guidelines are a very important step to the design review process and the Council has recommended that the design review process be streamlined. They have also recommended that the ADB be an advisory body to help applicants at the beginning of the design process. He asked that the Planning Board not lose site of these goals.

Bruce Nickelson, 9829 Cherry Street, referenced **Item 16** and explained that he just completed a two-story office building on Fourth Avenue. The height inside the brand new building is less than the ceiling heights in homes because of the height limitations placed on the development by the City. He said it is virtually impossible to construct commercial buildings with a standard ceiling height of 8 feet in the City given the existing height limitations. He said he will not build another building in Edmonds because of the costs associated with putting together a feasible design. He said that many other builders feel the same way. He said he is a long-time resident of the City of Edmonds and he is concerned about the amount of taxes generated by downtown developments. The City needs to generate revenue over and above real estate tax revenue in order to be financially stable. He said he strongly supports a reconsideration of the height provisions. A nominal increase in the height limits would allow decent structures to be developed. He concluded that until this issue is addressed, the two remaining large pieces of property in Edmonds cannot successfully be developed using the current limitations.

APPROVED

Brian Goodnight said that he is a builder in Edmonds, also. He questioned why the City will not consider lifting the height restrictions in non-view areas. He said that a lot of the housing in Edmonds looks the same because of the height limitations. He suggested that the City needs to rewrite the code to allow for more creative rooflines in residential zones by taking the topography and location of the zone into consideration. If the height restrictions are changed to allow a certain portion of a building to go up to 35 feet in height, it would allow more design variety for future development. The City will never get the “village feeling” that everyone seems to want until the height limits are changed.

Steve Waite, 111 Elm Street, referred to Pages 44 and 45 of the document which relate to windows and building wall materials. He concurred with staff that any decent design would have a variety of windows. However, the chart that was provided seems to be onerous. He noted that in the upper right hand corner there are sketches of windows that are correct in proportion. He said they identify specific elements for window treatment but then the rest of the document is light on window treatment. He noted that in the illustration in the lower right hand corner of Page 45 the windows are challenging in proportion and there is no treatment around them. He suggested that finistration of the entire façade should be illustrated better—particularly in regard to windows.

In regard to building materials, Mr. Waite noted that the guidelines require that one to three materials be used, depending on the size of the building. He noted that good buildings can be designed with one material if all of the elements such as window treatment, cornices, etc. are used effectively. He illustrated his point by noting the new Windermere Building compared to the historic Carnegie Library Building. He suggested that the building materials requirements seem to be restrictive.

Roger Hertrich, 1020 Puget Drive, pointed out that the drawing on the cover of the document illustrates a three-story building with a pitched roof on a flat piece of ground. He suggested that the illustration is misleading because it is impossible to build a three-story building on flat ground given the existing height restrictions. He also noted this same concern on Pages 17, 20 and 22. He asked that the drawings be corrected so that applicants are not misled.

Regarding the height limit, Mr. Hertrich recalled that several years ago, three-story structures were allowed in the BC zones. This was changed in more recent years. He noted that the real estate market does not just include the downtown area. It includes all of the private homes that are bought and sold in the City of Edmonds. He suggested that people not only move to Edmonds for the view, but also for the “small town” feel that is created by one and two-story buildings. He realizes that property owners want to develop their properties to the greatest height possible, but the present architecture in the downtown area contributes more to the whole of Edmonds than would a row of three-story buildings. He said he does not see how the “small town character” could be the same if property owners are allowed to build three-story buildings in Edmonds. He suggested that the height requirements need to be fair for the citizens who live in Edmonds as well as for the developers.

Mr. Hertrich referred to Page 4 and said that while this section refers to the mitigation of minor impacts, there are no examples of what a minor impact would be. He suggested that unless the degree of impact is known, the City cannot determine the amount of mitigation that should be required. He suggested that examples of this concept would be helpful.

Next, Mr. Hertrich referred to Page 9 related to buffers. He said that at this time there is a height restriction of six feet for fences in the City. If the City feels that it is important to limit the height of a fence, then they should not require a developer to put in a solid ten-foot high barrier as a buffer. Perhaps this should be identified as the preferred buffer if it can be proven that the view from adjacent properties would not be impacted. He emphasized that it is important to consider the people who already live in the area.

Mr. Hertrich recalled a previous Board discussion when the Board decided to delete the entire section related to the waterfront starting on Page 16. Mr. Chave agreed that this was supposed to have been removed from the document.

Mr. Hertrich recalled a recent proposal that was presented to the City Council that included balconies protruding out into the right-of-way in the BC zone. The Council supported the concept of extended balconies into the right-of-way, but they clearly stated that this type of “gift” should require the applicant to provide something that would benefit the public in return. They also emphasized that view corridors and view blockage should be an important element of this concept. Mr. Hertrich pointed out that a lot of people have purchased or built homes in Edmonds under the present building height requirements.

Their building envelope was determined based upon what could be built on the adjacent properties. If the City allows buildings to be built at a greater height, it could seriously impact the original plans of the surrounding property owners. He asked that the Board seriously consider including the current code language related to this issue that would require Planning Board review of any modulation or height adjustments that would have an impact to adjacent property owners.

Doug Dewar, 110 James Street, agreed with Mr. Hertrich in that if the City allows a greater height, they need to protect the existing view corridors. The stakeholders have indicated that they would like the height limits to be changed as long as there is no impact to the existing view or what people expected when they purchased their property. He agreed that the City should not allow a developer to take away a view that someone expects they have. However, in a lot of cases, a 30-foot structure would not have any greater impact to the view corridor than would a 25-foot structure.

Regarding the ambiance that is created by one and two-story structures, Mr. Dewar suggested that like it or not, a lot of single family residential houses are being redeveloped into two and three-story buildings, depending upon the topography. The stakeholders would like the ability to redevelop as attractively as possible and bring as much economic enhancement to the area as possible. He recalled that the Hyatt Palma Study included a survey of both citizens of Edmonds and visitors. Both indicated that they would like to have more services provided. This cannot happen unless a higher density is allowed in the downtown. He said the guidelines and codes should encourage attractive and economically feasible buildings to improve the economic activity and enhance the tax base for the City. Unfortunately, this cannot be done with the existing code requirements. He concluded by stating that the Edmonds Alliance for Economic Development is working on a project to quantify what new development can provide to the City in tax dollars and other benefits. This will identify the differences between two and three-story buildings.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Mr. Dewhurst advised that from the beginning of the review process the Board has determined that they would not deal with the height issue as part of the design guidelines. He suggested that the Alliance should approach the City Council and the Mayor with a request to set up a special study group to research the issue further. He said he agrees with much that has been said regarding height, but the Board has chosen to separate the two issues because they felt the need to complete their review of the design guidelines and make a recommendation to the City Council in a timely manner. They recognized that the height issue would add a considerable amount of time to the process. He pointed out that the Board will be undertaking a review of the possibility of creating special zoning districts for areas near and along Highway 99. Hopefully, this discussion will include concepts for increasing the height limits.

Mr. Chave clarified that the Board is planning to have a detailed discussion about tonight's comments at the next meeting. Mr. Dewhurst agreed that the Board was hoping to receive concrete suggestions regarding the draft document. They will hold a detailed discussion of the issue at their next meeting on July 11. Hopefully, the Board will be able to complete their review of the draft design guidelines so that they can begin to work on the code revisions necessary for implementation. Mr. Chave said staff anticipates that they will be ready to make a presentation regarding the code amendments at the next meeting, as well.

THE BOARD TOOK A TEN-MINUTE BREAK AT 8:00 P.M. THEY RECONVENED AT 8:10 P.M.

Mr. Witenberg recalled that there has been significant public testimony regarding the terms "should" and "shall" and whether the document's title, "DESIGN GUIDELINES" implies that they are not necessarily requirements. He said he is somewhat confused on this issue. He said he would like further clarification from the City Attorney at the next meeting regarding the interrelationship of the design guidelines and the code amendments that will be considered at the next meeting. He questioned whether the guidelines or the code would govern the development of property.

PUBLIC HEARING ON PORT OF EDMONDS MASTER PLAN (FILE NO. CDC-2001-58)

Mr. Chave reminded the Board that the Port recently presented their draft master plan to the Board for preliminary review. The document has now been submitted in its final form for public hearing and inclusion in the City's Comprehensive Plan.

APPROVED

He noted that the City already has several master plans included in their Comprehensive Plan (i.e. several parks, Stevens Hospital, Edmonds Woodway High School). In the past the Port's master plan was also included in the Comprehensive Plan but was removed at the Port's request while they developed a new plan.

Mr. Chave explained that the Port staff is prepared to present their final master plan to the Board for review. He advised that the Board has less control and discretion when reviewing the Port's master plan because as a government agency, the Port has been granted their own authority by the State. The Board can deal with land use issues that impact the City and also make sure that there is consistency between the proposed master plan and the City's policies and code. He emphasized that the Port's master plan process included extensive public input. He concluded that the Board's responsibility is to evaluate the document relative to its consistency with other elements of the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Witenberg asked staff to address the consequences of either adopting or not adopting the proposed master plan as an element of the City's Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Chave answered that there are several benefits to the City if the master plan is adopted into the Comprehensive Plan. First, it provides an opportunity to review the Port's plans to make sure that they are consistent with the City codes and requirements. Also, if the master plan is approved and the impacts are addressed, the specific projects identified in the plan should go smoother because the general consistency check has already been done.

Bill Toskey, Port of Edmonds Executive Director, acknowledged the attendance of Port Commissioners Reid and Faires. He also introduced Chris Keuss, who would present the details of the actual master plan later on. Next, he provided a brief background on the master plan process. He explained that the Port is required by State law to have an updated master plan to guide their capital development programs and insure that the Port is accomplishing its mission in accordance with State law. He recalled that the Port completed a master plan in 1995, just prior to the collapse of the marina on December 29, 1996. However, the marina collapse accelerated the implementation of the master plan into an 18-month period. At that time, the Commission determined that another master plan was necessary.

Mr. Toskey advised that for the past few years the Port has been working on a new master plan. In addition to the master plan, a strategic plan was also created to identify the Port's mission and goals. This entire process included numerous opportunities for public involvement, and he outlined all of the opportunities that were provided for public participation. He advised that the Commission recently approved the final draft of the master plan and is now seeking approval from the City for the document to be included in the City's Comprehensive Plan. Once the document is approved, the Port will begin implementation by completing one or two projects per year. It is anticipated that it will take between three and five years to implement the entire master plan. He noted that the first construction project will be the north parking lot, and the design process has already been started.

Mr. Toskey advised that the Port has completed a SEPA checklist and the comment period closed yesterday. He said no significant comments were received, but there is still 30 more days for appeals to be filed. He concluded that the City staff would be advised of any comments that are received.

Chris Keuss, Port of Edmonds Deputy Director, reviewed the details of the plan. He noted that future development is constrained to the upland areas. He advised that Miller/Hull has been hired as the Port's architectural firm, and they are working with the Port staff and Commission to develop various phases of the master plan. He particularly noted the following:

- The master plan includes a review and enhancement of the Port entrance area at Dayton.
- The north parking lot project will be the first project to be implemented. This will provide additional parking spaces to accommodate development in other areas in the future.
- The north boardwalk area will be expanded to fulfill the Port's mission to provide more public amenities. This could include cut outs into the water and signage.
- In the location of the current administration building and to the immediate north will be a complex of two or three buildings. The Port does not have a concrete design for these structures, but they do know that the functions included in the buildings will likely include an arts center, a small conference meeting room, the Edmonds Yacht Club and other marine related offices or business space.
- Across the street will be some buildings for marine related service, repair and retail uses.

APPROVED

- ❑ To the south, on the waterside of Admiral Way, is Anthony's Restaurant, which will remain in its same location. Anthony's has expressed an interest in rebuilding the facility on the same site and one concept is to provide a plaza area on the waterside of that building. The parking area nearby would be eliminated to provide the public plaza area.
- ❑ The stack storage facility would be expanded to the north with parking remaining on the waterside. The Port has made a commitment to the City to provide parking for Marina Beach Park, but this parking will likely be moved to the other side of the street. The Port will ensure that parking for the park will remain.

Mr. Monlux referred to the appendices that were referenced in the master plan. Mr. Keuss advised that all of this information is available upon request. He said that many are recaps of meetings and sessions with the consultant as the Commission and Port staff worked through the master plan process.

Mr. Dewhirst inquired how many total parking spaces are available currently and how many are proposed as part of the master plan. Mr. Keuss answered that there are currently 820 parking spaces on Port property. With the new configuration there would be about 780 to 790, which is still well over the City's code requirements for parking according to the uses that have been identified. Mr. Chave inquired if the 790 spaces would include the supplemental spaces that will be reserved for the park visitors. He also inquired if the park demand for parking spaces was included in the Port's calculation for code requirements. Mr. Toskey answered that the Port agreed to provide parking to the City of Edmonds for Marina Beach Park visitors as a friendly gesture and not as a code requirement. He concluded that even if they do not count the supplemental park parking spaces, the Port would still have enough parking space to meet the code requirements.

Mr. Dewhirst expressed concern about the lack of a turn around space for vehicles in the south end. Correcting this problem would require a design agreement between the Port and the City. Mr. Keuss advised that there is a way to provide a turn around space at the park, but it would require that a road be cut through the edge of the park on the water side.

Roger Hertrich, 1020 Puget Drive, inquired if the height of the stack storage area is identified in the master plan. He also inquired if the arts center would be considered a water oriented use as required by the City's waterfront plan. He inquired how many cars would be generated by the arts facility use. He suggested that the arts facility is a nice idea, but it is not an appropriate use for the waterfront. Mr. Hertrich inquired if the Port has any plans for the property that they purchased from the telephone company. Mr. Hertrich also referred to Page 13 of the document, which lists "guiding principals for relationship with other sites." Lastly, he inquired if the Port has any plans to expand further into the water or to do anything with the existing ferry dock. He concluded that all in all, the Port did a good job of coming forward with information to the public.

Tony Shapiro, 600 Main Street, applauded the Port for their effort on the master plan. He said it is a difficult site. However, he agreed that a turn around component is crucial to the successful development of the southern Port property. He said his overall observation is that there is no focus to the site. He said that Anthony's tends to be the focal point and perhaps a turn around in this area could create the focus that might be lacking in the entire plan. He requested an additional explanation as to the plans for drop off and parking for tenants.

David Peterson, Executive Director, Edmonds Alliance for Economic Development, 121 Fifth Avenue North, said that in his many years of planning, he has not ever seen a process done more thoroughly than the Port's master plan. The community involvement was excellent, and the resulting plan is well balanced and outstanding. It balances the needs of the Port, the public, the tenants, the arts community, etc. He said he overwhelmingly endorses the document.

Mr. Toskey offered a response to each of the questions raised by the Board and the public. He advised that the entire stack storage area is zoned as commercial waterfront and has a 30-foot height limit. The Port intends to comply with the City's height regulations. Regarding the traffic associated with an arts center, Mr. Toskey advised that the Port staff made some assumptions in terms of code requirements for parking. But at this time, no one knows how successful the arts center would be in generating activity. The Port intends to meet all of the code requirements for the facility. He noted that construction of an arts facility would require both a shoreline and building permit. There will be some people who will question whether or not the arts facility belongs on the waterfront, and these issues can be addressed as part of the shoreline permit review. Mr. Dewhirst said his recollection is that the State has approved art uses as appropriate shoreline uses.

APPROVED

Mr. Toskey said the small portion of waterfront property that the Port purchased from the telephone company is not contiguous to the rest of the Port property. Because there is no direct access to the property, it has not been identified in the master plan. The Port is willing to cooperate with the City of Edmonds and Town of Woodway as to future development on the site.

Regarding the issue of restricting off-site vehicle access through the Port property, Mr. Toskey explained that the Port will work with other government entities to try and enhance the flow of traffic by reducing the amount of traffic going to dead end places and divert it to where there is a greater capacity to handle increased traffic. The Port is not waiting for these other agencies to create detailed plans, but when they do create their plans, the Port intends to work with them to solve the traffic problems.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Mr. Dewhirst said that emergency service has always been an issue. He inquired if there is a point at which redevelopment is significant enough to warrant the Port's consideration of the option of placing emergency equipment on the Port side of the railroad tracks. Mr. Toskey said that the Port Commission has given this issue a lot of consideration. The Commission chose not to include emergency equipment storage in the master plan at this time. They feel that the existing situation meets all of the emergency access requirements. He noted that the Port already provides water safety equipment for the City to use at no cost. They do not have ambulance or fire equipment on the water side of the tracks, and if both of the railroad crossings were blocked, the equipment would not be able to get across to the water side. However, the Commission feels that the risk is minimal.

Mr. Chave explained that the City Council would not take final action on this issue until the Board has completed their review of all of the Comprehensive Plan amendments and forwarded their recommendation to the Council. He said the Board could conclude this issue by making a recommendation tonight, but the issue would not be immediately forwarded to the Council. It would be combined with all of the other issues and sent forward as one package. The Board also has the option of postponing their recommendation until their review of all of the amendments has been completed. He noted that the Port is free to go ahead with the implementation of their plan prior to the Council's approval to include the master plan as part of the Comprehensive Plan. The Board agreed that they would prefer to make a recommendation related to the master plan now, recognizing that all amendments to the Comprehensive Plan would be considered by the Council at one time.

Mr. Dewhirst said the Port has done a good job with their master plan. He said he attended some of their public meetings. He acknowledged that the Port property is a difficult site to develop, and the Port has done a decent job of keeping as much of the vehicular circulation and parking off of the waterfront. There is a nice barrier for pedestrian access throughout the Port property, also. He said the Port also did a good job of clustering the buildings, both new and old, to create nodes. He agreed that there does not seem to be any particular focus point, but suggested that the real focus is the waterfront. He said his only concern is the lack of turn around in the south end.

Ms. Lindh said that when she goes down to the waterfront to walk on the boardwalk, she parks in the old Safeway parking lot and starts her walk from there. She said she is looking forward to the arts and activity center that is proposed in the Port's master plan. There are many people who walk on the boardwalk, and the proposed facilities could make the walk even more attractive. She agreed that the main focal point of the Port property is the waterfront.

MOTION BY MR. MONLUX, SECONDED BY MR. WITENBERG, TO FORWARD THE PORT OF EDMONDS MASTER PLAN TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL.

Mr. Witenberg commended the Port for the scope of the process they engaged in to develop the plan. There was substantial community involvement, and considerable thought and input went into the development. He said he has the same concern about the turn around situation at the south end of the Port's property, and he would encourage the Port and City to cooperate in that regard. He also said he hopes that before there is some catastrophe to force the issue, the Port will consider locating some type of emergency equipment on the Port side of the railroad tracks.

APPROVED

MOTION CARRIED. UNANIMOUSLY.

NEW ZONING DISTRICT FOR THE HOSPITAL ACTIVITY NODE

Mr. Dewhirst recalled that he recently met with Mayor Haakenson and the Chair of the Architectural Design Board (ADB). At that time, the Mayor brought up the issue of needing to create a new zoning district for the UNOCAL site. Mr. Dewhirst said that he suggested that the UNOCAL site is probably not the right place to experiment with the concept of new zoning districts because of its proximity to the waterfront. He suggested that the hospital activity node would be a better place to experiment with this concept. As part of this process they could consider increased height and density for this area as an experiment to gauge the public's reaction to the concept.

Mr. Dewhirst advised that in speaking with Mr. Chave earlier, he found that staff is also receiving the same kind of pressure to start the special zone process and consider possible increases to the height and density in some areas. Mr. Dewhirst suggested that the Board provide ideas and comments to staff regarding this issue.

Mr. Monlux inquired about the current height restrictions in the hospital zone. Mr. Chave answered that they are identical to the height restrictions everywhere else in the City except for the hospital, itself, which was identified and approved as part of the hospital master plan. He noted that the Edmonds/Woodway High School master plan also allows for a little bit higher building for a portion of the development. He pointed out that the hospital/medical area is dominated by multi-family zoning, and the only reason there are so many medical offices in that area is because this zone allows them as a conditional use. Over the years the development in the area has become a mixture of uses, which does not correspond with the intent of the current zoning designation.

Mr. Chave recalled that the Board has previously discussed that if there is one area in the City where greater heights should be allowed, it is the properties that are in close proximity to Highway 99, which includes the hospital/medical area. He said that when the Board discussed the Highway 99 priorities with the City Council, staff recommended that developing special zoning and administratively applying the regulations is one way to encourage future development and activity in the area. If crafted in a certain way, it might be possible to create a new zoning district for the Highway 99 area that could be used in other areas of the City where appropriate such as at the UNOCAL site where mixed-use zoning could be applied.

Mr. Chave said another option would be to create a master plan zone that could be applied to specific areas. He suggested that many of the issues that were discussed as part of the PRD review process could be applied to a Board discussion regarding Master Plan zones. Also, he noted that the design guidelines would provide a method for transitioning between the greater and lesser heights and densities. Mr. Dewhirst asked about what inquiries the City gets from people wanting to build around the hospital area. Mr. Chave answered that most of the inquiries are related to the height and density allowed in that zone.

The Board agreed that the timing is right for them to consider this issue further in an attempt to create a mixed-use zoning district for the hospital/medical area. Mr. Dewhirst challenged the Board members to read the chapter in the Comprehensive Plan that deals with the hospital/medical area and refresh their minds about the different kinds of uses that are allowed in the multi-family and community business zones. Mr. Chave said his vision is that staff would propose language to create a type of zone that would allow for both multi-family and some commercial development.

Mr. Chave clarified that the intent of creating a special zoning district for the hospital/medical area is that this new zoning district could be applied to other areas in the City as part of a master plan process. He emphasized that it is not the City's intent to rezone the UNOCAL site using the special zoning district. Mr. Dewhirst clarified that the Board's intent is to consider the hospital/medical area and Highway 99 at this point. They are not considering a rezone for the UNOCAL site.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

APPROVED

Mr. Chave advised that staff would put together a new extended agenda based upon tonight's discussion and provide a copy in each of the Board members' boxes. The Board reviewed that the July 11 agenda will include a continued discussion on design guidelines and code amendments. At that time, the Board will also decide when the next meeting regarding the design guidelines and code amendments will be. There will also be a brief discussion regarding the issue of a hospital special use zone.

Mr. Chave suggested that since the Board has had some public questions regarding the UNOCAL site and the Council is looking at a hearing on this site, perhaps the Board would like staff to invite Stephen Clifton to a future meeting to provide an update. The Board agreed that this would be appropriate. Mr. Dewhirst requested that staff also provide information related to the ADB's review of the residential proposal that was submitted for the UNOCAL site. Mr. Chave advised that this was a particular applicant asking for a preliminary review of a concept they had for the property. The Board is allowed to provide this type of preliminary conceptual review without predisposing the City to any future actions regarding the site. The proponents of the project know that they would need some kind of rezone and a full ADB review, as well as other approvals. Any type of development that is not consistent with the existing zoning for the site would require a substantial public review process.

Mr. Witenberg suggested that it would be helpful to clearly understand the boundaries of the UNOCAL property and what agencies and entities are involved. Mr. Chave said that Mr. Clifton could provide this information. Mr. Witenberg said he would like to have more information as to the City's role in the process, as well as how the Brightwater Project fits in. Mr. Chave clarified that the comments regarding the industrial level of cleanup are related to the lower portion of the UNOCAL site that is slated to become a multi-modal facility. It is not related to the upland portion of the property. Mr. Monlux said he would like to have more information about the Brightwater Project and what the public involvement process will be.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Mr. Dewhirst provided no comments during this portion of the meeting.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no Board member comments during this portion of the meeting.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:20 P.M.

APPROVED