

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

March 24, 2004

Chair Young 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.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

James Young, Chair
Janice Freeman, Vice Chair
Jim Crim
Virginia Cassutt
John Dewhirst
Cary Guenther
Judith Works
Don Henderson

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Darrell Smith, Traffic Engineer
Dave Gebert, City Engineer
Arvilla Ohlde, Parks and Recreation Manager
Don Fiene, Assistant City Engineer
Karin Noyes, Recorder

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER CRIM MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 10, 2004 AS CORRECTED. BOARD MEMBER WORKS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

There were no changes made to the proposed agenda.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

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

PUBLIC HEARING ON CITY OF EDMONDS 2004-2009 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (CDC-04-24)

Mr. Fiene explained that the 2004-2009 Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) would be used as a long-range planning tool. It provides a spending blueprint to outline the City's capital resources showing how and when money would be spent on capital projects. The projects include improvement and replacement of the City-owned infrastructures and development of new facilities. He advised that the CIP is updated yearly as per the Growth Management Act requirement, and the update process has included input from six different City Departments.

Mr. Fiene advised that a spreadsheet was created for each of the 13 funds, and these must be approved each year by the City Council. The spreadsheets identify the project names and the years they would be done. It also identifies where the revenues for the project would come from. He advised that in conjunction with the update of the CIP, staff provides a description booklet which describes each project in detail. Each of the projects identified in the CIP now has a project description.

At the request of the One Percent for the Arts Coordinator, Mr. Fiene explained that City Ordinance 2667 was approved by the City Council to define a broad range of projects that are eligible for funding. This money is used for new art and maintenance of the City's existing art collection. Any project to construct or remodel a building that is paid for wholly or in part by the City of Edmonds would be eligible for this funding. However, streets, sidewalks, etc. are not eligible.

Mr. Fiene reviewed each of the funds as follows:

- **Fund 112** – This fund is used for transportation projects, including street overlays, road improvements and widening, signals, road stabilization projects, traffic calming projects, bicycle and pedestrian pathways, etc. He noted that before the passage of I-776 in November of 2002, there was more than \$766,000 in total revenue. However, the elimination of the vehicle registration fee has reduced this amount by 46 percent. This has resulted in heavy cuts in most of their transportation projects. He explained that the City's ability to obtain grant funding for projects in the future is also more limited because the necessary matching local funds are no longer available. In addition, the City's street overlay program is now on a 60-year cycle compared to the previous cycle of 30 years. He said he has researched the overlay programs of other jurisdictions in the area and found that several of them have other funding sources that allow them to provide an overlay program on a 20 to 30-year cycle. Mr. Fiene reviewed the specific cuts that were made as a result of the decrease in funding.

Mr. Fiene reported that the issue of funding was discussed at the last City Council retreat. At that time, the staff presented what they believe funding must be in order to provide an ideal transportation program. In doing this, staff assumed that the City would have to do a certain amount of roadway improvements and slope stabilization projects over the next 20 years. The City completed four projects of this type over the past six years. They also assumed that the ideal situation would be for the City to complete at least one walkway improvement project each year and about nine signal and intersection improvement projects. There are four roadway capacity improvement projects planned over the next 20 years, as well. They also assumed there would be a certain amount of other projects such as bikeway improvements, traffic calming, ADA curb ramps, lighting, etc.

Mr. Fiene said that using this information, staff was able to identify the per year budget that would be necessary to complete the projects identified. Staff added in the funding that would be needed for an overlay program on a 20, 30 and 40-year cycle. After subtracting grant funding, revenue from the local transportation tax, and the revenue from the proposed traffic impact fee staff was able to identify the total additional program funding needs. When this information was submitted to the City Council, they indicated that they would like the City to be on a 30-year overlay cycle. Staff concluded that in order to provide a program that includes a 30-year overlay program, they would need to have \$754,000 more per year. The City Council directed the staff to look for alternative funding sources that would allow the City to obtain the necessary funding for transportation projects as identified by staff.

- **Fund 113** – This fund is used for the multi-modal transportation center project that is intended to improve connections between the ferry terminal, buses, trains, vehicular traffic, pedestrians and bicyclists. This project would involve the relocation of the ferry terminal
- **Fund 116** – This fund is used for building maintenance and provides funding for repairs on various City buildings including the Anderson Center, City Hall, fire stations, the library, the public safety building, the public works buildings, etc. The funding for building maintenance comes from the general fund, but the amount was recently cut by 44 percent. This cut requires the City to defer building maintenance, which leads to overall deterioration and damage of the City's assets.
- **Fund 125** – This fund is used for parks, open space, recreation and beautification projects. This includes the development of new parks, trails, environmental protection, pool improvements, sports field improvements, waterfront improvements, etc.
- **Fund 126** – This fund is used for the acquisition of park lands.

- **Fund 412-100** – This fund is used for water projects. The goal of these projects is to improve water flow, replace deteriorated pipes and improve storage capacity.
- **Fund 412-200** – This fund is used for drainage projects. In 2002 the City approved a storm drainage plan as part of the Comprehensive Plan. This plan addressed capacity, maintenance problems and environmental concerns. He reviewed the proposed project that would reroute the creek under Petosa's Grocery. He recalled that the pipe up the street from the location failed last fall and the emergency solution was to put a new pipe over the existing box culvert on Fifth Avenue. Now they have an eight-foot waterfall in the pipe at Petosa's, which is not a good situation. In addition, the man hole east of the entrance to the store is 30-feet deep with a culvert going under Petosa's. Staff believes it makes sense to route the creek around rather than having the liability of going underneath the store.
- **Fund 412-300** – This fund is used for sewer projects. A sewer maintenance plan was approved in 2002 as part of the Comprehensive Plan. This plan addresses capacity, maintenance problems and environmental concerns. The major project planned for this fund is the integration of Lift Stations 7 and 8. Staff believes this would save maintenance costs in the future since both the stations are antiquated and replacement parts are hard to find.
- **Fund 412-400** – This fund is the engineering, wastewater treatment plant fund. The plan is to replace some flow meters each year and rehabilitate the sewer mains on a scheduled basis.

Mr. Fiene summarized that many transportation projects were cut or delayed as a result of the passage of I-776. The building maintenance fund has suffered, as well. However, the other funds appear to have sufficient resources to meet the minimum needs. He said staff would welcome any comments from the Board and the public regarding the CIP. He noted that a public hearing before the City Council is scheduled for April 6th. He asked that the Planning Board forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council for the CIP as presented by staff.

THERE WAS NO ONE IN THE AUDIENCE WHO EXPRESSED A DESIRE TO PROVIDE PUBLIC COMMENT DURING THE PUBLIC HEARING. THEREFORE, THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Board Member Dewhirst emphasized that for the past two years, the 116 and 112 Funds have had their funding placed in jeopardy. He said he sees the situation regarding Fund 112 being far outside the City's ability to resolve. This is the responsibility of the state. However, Fund 116 is a City problem. He questioned what ideas staff has to resolve the issue. He questioned if staff plans seek to obtain more grant funding.

Dave Gebert, City Engineer, explained that the City Council tasked the staff with the job of coming up with a proposal to solve the problems in the 112 and 116 Funds. The Public Works Director was specifically asked to address the issues related to Fund 116, and he is exploring the possibility of new revenue sources the City might generate such as quantifying franchise agreements, annexing the Esperance area, etc. The Public Works Director will be recommending that these new revenue sources be dedicated to the 116 Fund. For the 112 Fund, the Engineering Department would be looking at sources other than the general fund to provide funding for transportation projects. They are considering options such as a transportation street project levy. They are also considering the possibility of more bonds, but the City must have new revenues to pay for the bonds.

Board Member Young said he has reviewed the plan in detail. He suggested that it would be helpful for both the public and the Board if staff were to review the motor vehicle fuel tax distribution process. He questioned how this revenue is calculated and how reliable the calculations are. Darrell Smith, Traffic Engineer, explained that this revenue is calculated based on roadway miles, population, etc. It is important to understand that this tax source has been relatively flat for many years as a result of vehicles becoming more fuel efficient. Staff does not anticipate this would change in the near future. He advised that this funding source is not a solution to the problem because if the tax revenue increases, it will likely mean that there is more traffic on the roads, and this would require more road maintenance. He summarized that this tax revenue is calculated by the State, but it is also reviewed by the City's Finance Director.

APPROVED

Board Member Young pointed out that, at this time, the vehicle fuel tax is the only steady source of revenue to support all of the items identified in the 112 Fund. He said he is pleased to see that the proposal to institute a mitigation impact fee would be on line later in the year, and this could help the situation.

Board Member Young noted that in previous years, the City was able to obtain grant funding for a number of transportation projects. He asked that staff share their view of how difficult it would be for the City to obtain grant funding in the future if they do not have regular revenue outside of the motor vehicle fuel tax. Mr. Smith said it would be very challenging, if not impossible, for the City to obtain any grant funding with the current revenue situation. The City was able to obtain \$2.4 million in grant funding for the 220th Street Project from the Transportation Board. In addition, they received grant funding for this project from the Federal government. They also received grant funding for projects related to the Interurban Trail.

Mr. Smith explained that preparing grant applications takes a tremendous amount of staff time in order for the projects to be competitive against projects from cities that are able to hire professional grant writers. In addition, because the City has spent all of their local matching funds, they are unable to apply for grants since the majority require that the local governments provide matching funds. He noted that there is \$76 million in Federal grant funding available, but the City cannot go after any of this money because they do not have any matching funds. In April a grant opportunity will be available from the Transportation Safety Commission, which focuses on walkway projects. These will be small in nature. He said he would submit an application for this grant funding, even though he does not know at this time where the local matching funds would come from. A transportation improvement grant will also be available later this year, but staff does not anticipate going after these funds because the City must provide matching money. He concluded that the City has no funding available for local matching funds to enable them to pursue grant opportunities.

Board Member Young pointed out that the revenue allocated to the local agencies from the vehicle fuel tax will likely remain static and has nothing to do with the number of vehicles that use the roadways. The \$15 licensing fee that was assessed to each vehicle provided funding based on the number of vehicles using the roadway. However, this fee was revoked. He noted that approximately \$2 of this fee would have been provided to the City to use for matching local funds. He said it is important for the public to understand that the City is in a critical situation now. The fact that they are having to consider a 50-year overlay cycle when standard engineering practice recommends no more than a 20 to 25-year cycle is indicative of how serious the situation is.

Board Member Young asked staff to identify how much money is spent each year to repair streets that need to be overlaid. Mr. Smith said this work is funded by the 111 Fund, which he does not manage. However, he described the City's process for identifying where overlay projects should be done. He said the City is divided into seven zones. Each year the staff reviews each of the zones to identify the worst streets. They try to overlay as many of the streets in each zone as they have funding available, starting with the ones that need it the most.

Board Member Young pointed out that an adequate overlay program would end up saving the City money in the long run because the City would not have to spend so much money repairing roads. Mr. Smith agreed, and added that citizens would also save money on vehicle repairs.

Board Member Dewhirst noted that there are a lot of projects identified for 2004, but only a few for the years beyond that. Many of the projects identified for 2004 are being funded by grants that were obtained when the City still had resources available to provide matching funds. Once these funds are used up, there is no funding source to provide replacement money. He inquired if the City Council was made aware of this situation at their retreat. Mr. Smith answered that this situation was pointed out to the City Council at both the 2003 and 2004 retreats. It was also pointed out on numerous occasions before I-776 was approved as part of the process for adopting the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Board Member Dewhirst said that while the CIP Program has a lot of funding problems, many of the issues are beyond the City's ability to correct. He said he was glad to hear that the City Council has given the staff direction to think outside of the box to come up with alternative funding solutions. He said that, given the limited resources, the staff did a good job of going through the priorities and coming up with a decent mixture of projects. He said he would hope that next year the staff has a wider variety of revenue sources to experiment with.

BOARD MEMBER DEWHIRST MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD THE 2004-2009 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN (FILE NO. CDC-04-24) TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL. BOARD MEMBER CRIM SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

PUBLIC HEARING ON CITY OF EDMONDS CITY PARK SITE ACCESS AND CIRCULATION STUDY (CDC-04-21)

Arvilla Ohlde, Parks and Recreation Manager, explained that, as directed by the City Council, staff obtained the services of Pertee Engineering to complete a site access and circulation study for City Park. She emphasized that the focus of the study was on the issue of two-way versus one-way access through City Park. All other elements of the City Park Master Plan remain intact as approved and should not be part of the Board's discussion. She noted that when the study was originally presented to the Planning Board, there was some discussion related to the relocation of the park maintenance and public works facilities that are located within City Park. She advised that the City Council has made the determination that these facilities would remain in the park. Therefore, their relocation should not be a topic of discussion as part of the hearing.

Darrell Smith, Traffic Engineer, provided a picture to illustrate the existing access and circulation pattern at City Park. He noted that there are about 450 vehicles entering the park on an average day. They enter across Erben Drive on a one-way circulation pattern. Most circulate towards the large parking lot and exit onto Howell Street at Third Avenue. He noted that there are two maintenance facilities in the southwest quadrant of the park, and the maintenance vehicles also have access either through the park or on Pine Street. As a matter of perspective, Mr. Smith pointed out that there are 4,100 average trips per day on Third Avenue, which is nearly ten times the volume of traffic that enters the park on an average day.

Mr. Smith advised that the objectives and goals of the study were to provide efficient site access and circulation, improve vehicular and pedestrian safety, limit the impact to trees and vegetation, provide additional on-site parking, and identify the safest alternative for circulation and parking. The scope of the analysis included a review of the existing studies; the development of alternatives and options; the identification of evaluation criteria by focusing on transportation, site design and urban design; the evaluation and ranking of all alternatives; and providing recommendations and documentation. He noted that the public was invited to participate in the process of ranking the alternatives, and they indicated that safety and the impact to trees were the most important things to consider.

Mr. Smith said the following criteria were used to review transportation issues: vehicular and pedestrian conflicts, circulation and connectivity related to the location of the parking lots, driveway operations and safety, neighborhood impacts, future park uses and the flexibility of the access options, public works maintenance access and how it interacts with the park, special events traffic control, and air and noise impacts.

When reviewing urban design issues, Mr. Smith said the following criteria were used: maximize the parking capacity without creating large areas of impervious surface, maintain or improve the park site aesthetics, provide access for pedestrians, minimize the impacts to trees and vegetation, and consider future site uses and flexibility. He said the following criteria were considered when reviewing site design issues: provide emergency vehicular access, comply with City code requirements, minimize construction costs, provide stormwater treatment and retention, avoid utility conflicts, minimize the impacts to existing structures, and consider the impacts to the existing saltwater estuary.

Mr. Smith advised that the public participation process included two open house meetings. At the public meetings, the staff and consultant worked with the public to confirm the goals and selection criteria and brainstorm issues and solutions. They considered the public input when preparing the alternatives and options that were presented to the public for comment. He noted that the public comments relating to the alternatives and options were documented for the Board's review. The most frequently voiced comments included: save the trees, minimize paving and drainage costs, maintain the one-way traffic for safety regardless of which direction, provide two access points as desired by the Fire Department, keep the design simple, provide visitor/driver education or re-education, address the maintenance facility traffic, provide ADA accessibility, and leave the access as it currently exists. Mr. Smith reviewed that some citizens commented that having the access for the maintenance facility come through City Park provides security because Parks Department employees could constantly

APPROVED

monitor the park throughout the day. Others argued that allowing the maintenance vehicles access through City Park created noise and air pollution.

Sherman Goong, Project Manager, Pertee Engineering, said he was hired to conduct a circulation analysis for City Park. He advised that one of his first tasks was to recognize the issues that needed to be addressed. In order to do this, he reviewed the approved City Park Master Plan, the access and circulation studies completed previously by other consultants, and the public comments provided at the City Council meetings. From reviewing this information, he said he was able to identify the following development requisites, which then became goals they wanted to address when considering the various alternatives:

- Access Location Variation – Does the City want to keep the access in its existing location or make changes.
- Address Community Concerns – The citizens raised concerns related to safety, noise, accessibility and parking.
- Access and Circulation Efficiency – The access identified in the approved Master Plan would use Third Avenue as a single access point.
- Maintenance Facility and Operations – This was obviously a significant public concern. Some citizens are in favor of allowing the maintenance facility's access through City Park to continue, while others want a separate access for the maintenance vehicles.
- Flexibility of Park Improvements – If the roadway remains in its current location, the City would still be able to make all of the other improvements identified in the Master Plan.
- Minimize Costs – The public expressed that when considering any proposed changes to the access and circulation the City should try to minimize the costs.

As a result of the public comments and further research and review, Mr. Goong said four different alternatives were created, with various options associated with each. He reviewed each of the alternatives and options as follows:

- **Alternative A.1** would continue to use the existing one-way traffic circulation pattern.
- **Alternative A.2** would be the same as A.1 except the maintenance facility ingress would be provided through the park and the egress would be to Pine Street.
- **Alternative A.3** would be the same as A.1 except the maintenance facility access would be completely separate from the park, with the new access coming from Pine Street.
- **Alternative B.1** is the design identified in the City Park Master Plan. It would provide a two-way access road for all park users from the single driveway entrance/exit at the south driveway across from Erben Drive. Internal maintenance facility access would be provided. Based on the adopted Master Plan, all of the traffic would ingress and egress directly across from Erben Drive onto Third Avenue, which would require significant widening of the roadway and closure of a portion of the roadway through the park. People would be required to look both ways when leaving the parking lot since there would be two-way traffic.
- **Alternative B.2** would be the same as B.1 except the maintenance facility ingress would be from within the park and the egress would be to Pine Street only.
- **Alternative B.3** would be the same as B.1 except the maintenance facility access would be completely separate from the park access, with a new access from Pine Street.
- **Alternative C.1** would reverse the traffic circulation. Inbound traffic would access the park from Howell Street and exit at Erben Drive. This alternative would provide significant benefits with connectivity throughout the park. It would also eliminate much of the vehicular conflict at the intersections.
- **Alternative C.2** would be the same as C.1 except the maintenance facility ingress would come from within the park and the egress would be onto Pine Street.
- **Alternative C.3** would be the same as C.1 except the maintenance facility access would be completely separate from the park and would come from a new access on Pine Street.
- **Alternative D.1** would provide a two-way traffic circulation system, with both ingress and egress provided from Pine Street. No access would be provided from Third Avenue South.
- **Alternative D.2** would be similar to D.1 except the maintenance facility would have a separate access from Pine Street west of the park access. However, it is believed that this alternative might have an issue related to the proximity of the

APPROVED

State Highway and the limited access allowed. This option would also be costly to implement and the impact to trees could be significant.

- **Alternative D.3** would be similar to D.1 but would have an additional ingress only access from the existing driveway locations at Third Avenue South. Egress would be to Pine Street only.

Mr. Goong advised that as he evaluated the various alternatives he reviewed the concepts and criteria with the City staff to make sure all of the identified concerns were addressed. He then ranked the options based on the established criteria and the public input. From this process he was able to establish three options for more detailed analysis. Lastly, Mr. Goong said he documented his findings and prepared the recommendations that were presented in the report that is now before the Board for review.

Mr. Goong reviewed the three options for which further analysis was provided in the report as follows:

- **Alternative A.1** would leave the parking in its current locations. This has some benefits because there would be no impact to the trees and other vegetation that exists in the park. In addition, the public is familiar with the existing situation and it operates sufficiently at this time.
- **Alternative C.1** is similar to Alternative A.1 in terms of the amount of impervious surface and tree impacts, but it would reverse the direction of the traffic flow.
- **Alternative A.3/C.3** is a combination of the public input and the previous two options. The park maintenance facility would have a separate access.

Mr. Goong said his final recommendation is that **Alternative C.1** would be the best choice, and would provide the following benefits: implement reverse one-way circulation, reduce vehicle driveway conflicts, improve circulation efficiency and connectivity, retain narrow roadway, minimize impacts to trees and vegetation, address community concerns and minimize the implementation costs.

Mr. Goong explained that using the existing circulation pattern, people would pass by the secondary parking area before reaching the primary paved parking area. If the primary parking area were full, they would be required to exit the park and reenter in order to access the secondary parking lot. If the secondary lot were full, they would have to exit the park again and find parking along the street. He explained that if the traffic circulation were reversed as proposed in **Alternative C.1** people would pass the primary parking area first. If this parking area were full, they could continue on to the secondary parking area. If this space were full, as well, they could exit the park and find parking along the street. This would require a person to only access the park one time.

Mr. Goong said another objective of his review was to consider the safest design for the park access. He said the access and circulation design identified in the City Park Master Plan is a valid option, but the reverse circulation design would provide more benefits and would be more acceptable to the community. He noted that a more thorough estimate of the site design costs needs to be completed, and the City needs to decide whether or not the maintenance facility should continue to have access through City Park.

Mr. Goong recalled that when the study was presented to the Board at a previous meeting, the Board Members expressed specific concern about the impact each of the alternatives would have on trees in the park. He referred the Board to the matrix he provided to illustrate these impacts. He noted that no trees would have to be removed to accommodate one-way circulation regardless of the direction. However, if additional supplemental parking were provided, approximately two to seven trees would have to be removed. To accommodate the two-way traffic circulation pattern as identified in the master plan, about four to seven trees would have to be removed. To accommodate a separate maintenance access at Pine Street, about ten to twenty trees would have to be removed.

Mr. Goong said the Board also raised issues related to stormwater runoff. He provided a matrix to identify the amount of impervious surface that currently exists to accommodate the present circulation pattern, which is 108,900 square feet. He advised that if the City were to adopt the reversed one-way circulation pattern as recommended in the study, the amount of impervious surface would remain the same and stormwater runoff would be similar to what occurs now. If two-way

circulation were provided, the amount of impervious surface would increase to 133,750 square feet. If the southern parking area were paved, the amount of impervious surface would increase by 11,600 square feet.

Board Member Dewhirst inquired if the number of parking spaces would change between Alternative A.1 and C.1. Mr. Goong said the number of parking spaces would remain essentially the same. The existing parking space would be maintained in its current location, but the master plan indicates that it would be redesigned.

Board Member Dewhirst inquired if there is funding available to make the improvements identified in the report. Ms. Ohlde answered that, at this time, the Board is being asked to make a recommendation regarding the circulation plan, and not funding for the project. She noted that there is \$380,000 set aside for the implementation of various elements of the City Park Master Plan. Board Member Dewhirst noted that the circulation and parking plan could be implemented in phases. The roadway deficiencies could be addressed first and then the parking lot could be paved later.

Board Member Young inquired if the Board is being asked to analyze the proposed parking plans in addition to the alternatives for circulation and access. He said it appears that the decision to formalize the primary parking lot has already been made. Mr. Chave said his understanding is that the Board is only being asked to consider the issue of access and circulation at this time.

Board Member Young asked if all of the stormwater runoff from the park would drain to the same place or if the runoff from the north driveway would drain to the swale that is located to the west and then into the creek that runs to the marsh. He noted that the report references a storm drain to the south, but nothing is identified for the north end. Mr. Goong advised that he did not perform the drainage and stormwater runoff study, but his understanding is that everything would drain towards the northwest corner of the park. Mr. Smith added that there is a biofiltration swale centrally located on the west side of the park and the majority of the stormwater runoff would go into that facility and across SR-104 into the estuary. Ms. Ohlde clarified that when the impervious surface was put on the north parking lot, a drainage swale was created for that purpose. The excess runoff goes north to the wetland area on the east side. After extensive filtration it goes through the drain and into the marsh on SR-104.

Roger Oliver, 1031 Second Avenue South, said he lives immediately south of the subject property. He referred the Board to the current park entrance at Erben Drive, which would be used as an exit if the consultant's recommendation to reverse the circulation is approved. He noted that in order to provide adequate sight distance for cars turning to the left, at least one of the on-street parking spaces would have to be eliminated. However, if the exit point remains in its current location, there is much better sight distance and no on-street parking spaces would have to be eliminated. He said the current circulation pattern has worked for many years, and reversing the pattern now could invite problems. If the circulation is reversed, the location of the exit would be on a significant hill that ends at the sidewalk and visibility would be poor. The existing exit point is flat.

Mr. Oliver pointed out that, at this time, the park does not meet the ADA requirements for accessibility. The only grade that would be proper for wheelchair access would be a pedestrian and wheelchair access on Pine Street at Second Avenue. In addition, Mr. Oliver noted that while there are numerous ADA parking stalls, only two meet the ADA requirements for signage. Therefore, the City would not be able to ticket violators. Mr. Oliver concluded his remarks by asking that the Board recommend that the circulation at City Park remain in its current configuration. He agreed that the parking lot should be improved.

Madeline Roth, 543 – Third Avenue South, said she lives across the street from the park. She said she uses the park a lot with her grandchildren. She said she believes the two-way road would be a bad idea from a safety standpoint for children. The one-way road, as is, would be adequate. However, if the City wants to reverse the direction of the circulation, she would not have a problem with that, either. She would like the parking to remain as it is.

Ms. Roth said that making a two-way road would necessitate the removal of trees that are part of the beauty of the park. Putting down more impervious surface for more roadway would further complicate the drainage problems at the park. She noted that if you walk through the park towards the gazebo just west and south, you end up getting your feet wet. She suggested that the City should try and solve this problem instead of exacerbating it by creating more impervious surface. She

recalled that a previous speaker spoke about the necessity of providing access for the Fire Department vehicles. She suggested that the Pine Street access that is used by the park maintenance staff could be used for emergency Fire Department and Police Department access, as well. She emphasized that she would prefer to see the circulation at City Park stay as it is.

Lucien Schmit, 545 – Third Avenue South, said the consultant has indicated that the two-way access, as proposed in the current City Park Master Plan, is a viable and safe alternative. He said he can accept this comment, but they are not looking for just safety. They are looking for the safest possible alternative. It is clear from the study and from visiting the park that the two-way circulation plan is a disaster from a safety point of view. Mr. Schmit said that, although many of his friends and neighbors feel differently, he suggested that they consider the experiment of reversing the road in support of the consultant's report. This can be done as an experiment because there is very little cost involved. If it does not work out, the circulation can be reversed back with very little impact.

Mr. Schmit cautioned against getting so hung up on which way the circulation should go that they end up reverting back to plans for a two-way circulation pattern. He asked that the Planning Board make it clear in their recommendation to the City Council that the other viable options do not include the two-way road. The options should only include variations of the one-way road circulation. He asked that the Planning Board remove this option once and for all. He said he does see the benefit of reversing the flow of traffic at least as an experiment because it would eliminate many of the impacts for the neighbors to the north. In addition, he said that from an engineering point of view, it is clear that keeping and improving the existing parking lot is the best option.

Roger Hertrich, 1020 Puget Drive, said that although he does not live near the park, he visits frequently. He expressed his opinion that the City Council's decision to hire a consultant to complete an access and circulation study was an excellent choice. He said he likes the work that was done by the consultant because he appears to have covered all of the issues related to the roadway. He has a clear understanding of the costs and has arrived at a very practical solution for the problem. A single lane in either direction still gives the feeling of a being in a natural environment. Any wider roadway would appear too urban. The one-way road provides an excellent natural setting. If they are concerned about the need for more parking, they should remember that many people who use the park during the heavily used periods walk to the park.

Mr. Hertrich said he finds the access and the overflow parking lot unique in Alternative C.1. Once a park visitor realizes that the main parking lot is full, they can still proceed to the secondary parking lot to find a space to park without having to leave the park. He said it is appropriate that the secondary parking area be placed near the exit for the park. He also agreed with the Police and Fire Department's request to have an entrance.

Mr. Hertrich stated that a two-lane configuration would be too busy. He asked that the Board recommend that the City Park Master Plan be changed to indicate a single lane for circulation. He asked that the Board recommend that the City Council adopt the consultant's recommendation as a trial. If there are problems, the direction can be reversed back to the way it is now, and the cost would be minimal. He said that if the present entrance is used as an exit, the sight distance could be improved by changing the slope of the landing to accommodate a single vehicle at a level that is closer to street level.

Regarding the issue of ADA accessibility, Mr. Hertrich suggested that the City needs to provide a level pathway for wheelchairs to get in and out of the park. The circulation pattern being considered at this time would not address this situation, but it probably should be considered as part of the park master plan. He concluded his remarks by stating that either Alternative A.1 or Alternative C.1 could be appropriate. He suggested that the Board recommend that the City Council give Alternative C.1 a try to see if it works. The main thing is to change the master plan to identify a single lane of traffic.

Carol Hahn, 1031 Second Avenue South, agreed with the comments made by Mr. Schmit and Mr. Hertrich that the City should remove the two-way road option from the City Park Master Plan permanently. She said she favors the circulation the way it is now. She referred to the traffic study that was part of the consultant's report. She noted that the majority of the cars exiting the park turn left, and there is currently good sight distance. The same would not be true if the exit were moved to Erben Drive. In addition, park visitors who are unable to find a parking spot within the park would have to circulate around to get to the on-street parking, and this would require two left turns to get back into the park. However, she agreed that this concern is less important than getting the two-way circulation plan out of the master plan.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Board Member Dewhirst requested clarification regarding sight distance if the circulation of traffic were reversed. Mr. Goong said that because the citizens raised this issue previously, the sight distance issue was evaluated as part of the study. In order to get adequate sight distance, one on-street parking space might have to be eliminated along the curb. If cars maintain the posted speed limit, the sight distance would be adequate with the removal of just one parking space. At this time, there are no restrictions for on-street parking in this location. In addition, the condominiums have created a blocked sight distance with their driveway. However, as far as conflicting vehicle turning movements, a car exiting at Erben Drive would only have three directions to look as opposed to four at Howell Street. He noted that accident data from 1998 to 2000 indicates that there were three accidents at the Howell Street intersection.

Mr. Goong explained that there is only about two percent difference in the grade for each of the two access and entrance points. This could be improved to level a car out as it approaches the intersection, but the study has concluded that the site distance would be adequate in its current configuration.

Board Member Freeman inquired if the City would be able to provide handicap access if the entrance and exit were leveled off. Mr. Goong said that would not be possible since the roadway profile would only be raised at the entrance and exit points. The grade down to the park would still be unchanged.

BOARD MEMBER CRIM MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD THE CITY PARK SITE ACCESS AND CIRCULATION STUDY (FILE NUMBER CDC-04-21) TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH THE RECOMMENDATION THAT THEY ADOPT ALTERNATIVE C.1 AS PROPOSED. BOARD MEMBER WORKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

BOARD MEMBER HENDERSON ASKED THAT THE MOTION BE AMENDED TO INCLUDE A RECOMMENDATION THAT THE MASTER PLAN BE AMENDED TO DELETE THE TWO-WAY STREET CONCEPT PERMANENTLY. BOARD MEMBERS CRIM AND WORKS ACCEPTED THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

THE BOARD TOOK A BREAK FROM 8:40 P.M. TO 8:47 P.M.

PUBLIC HEARING ON REZONE REQUEST FOR PROPERTY AT 23904 EDMONDS WAY (FILE NUMBER R-03-189)

Mr. Chave presented the staff report. He explained that the application was submitted by Priscilla and Thurmon Reynolds and is a request to rezone their property located at 23904 Edmonds Way from RS-8 to Community Business (BC). He provided a map of the subject property, which is currently occupied by an automotive repair garage. The applicant also submitted photographs and statements to address the criteria and why they feel the zone is appropriate.

Mr. Chave advised that the Comprehensive Plan identifies a mixture of uses for Edmonds Way, including residential and small-scale commercial zones such as neighborhood business, planned business and community business. The subject property is located in an area that is predominantly zoned as multi-family. However, along the corridor there are some BC and BN zoned properties, as well. Generally, these are small-scale commercial uses mixed in with multi-family uses. He said the staff would prefer that the property be rezoned to neighborhood business or planned business because both are small-scale commercial zoning classifications that are located in other areas along the corridor. But community business zoning is also present along the corridor and is generally considered consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Chave further explained that the subject property is small in scale so it is not possible to construct a large commercial building on the site even if it is zoned BC. That is one reason that staff is recommending that BC zoning be approved. The existing use has been on the site for a number of years and the applicant has indicated that they don't have any plans to change the use at this time. The BC zone is the only zone that would allow the use. He explained that while the use is allowed to continue with the existing zoning as a non-conforming use, if the City decided to pursue amortization of

APPROVED

commercial uses in residential zones, this property would be a prime location for that to occur. If this were to happen, the existing use would no longer be allowed on the property. The same would be true if the property were rezoned to any of the other commercial uses besides BC. Mr. Chave summarized his comments by stating that he does not believe that the subject property would be suitable for multi-family or single-family residential development. Staff believes it is appropriate for the Board to consider changing the zoning to some type of small-scale commercial zone.

Board Member Henderson referred to the letter the Board received from Gay Westmoreland in which she expressed her concern that if the property were rezoned to BC, the property owner would be allowed to construct a much larger commercial building that would increase the noise and traffic along Edmonds Way. However, Mr. Chave's remarks indicate that this would not be possible.

Mr. Chave explained that the difference between the planned business, community business and neighborhood business zones is related to height. The BC zone allows a building up to 30 feet in height with a modified roof, whereas the other two business zones limit the height to 25 feet. However, he said it is important to note that multi-family residential zones allow building height up to 30 feet also, so the BC zoning would not allow for any taller structure than what would be allowed with multi-family zoning. He also noted that because the subject property is surrounded by residential uses, a 15-foot setback would be required, and this would be true for all of the commercial zones.

Priscilla Reynolds, 23904 Edmonds Way, the applicant, said she and her husband own the subject property, which has been used as an auto shop since the 1950's. The building is historical in nature because it was built out of cement brick, which is no longer made. The building is a nice size for the existing use because it is small enough that there is not a huge overhead. She emphasized that the existing use does not generate a lot of traffic, and probably much less than if the property were developed as apartments.

Ms. Reynolds referred to letters that were written by citizens in support of the rezone. She explained that she and her husband have no plans to change anything on the site. She noted that the building was moved in 1973 when SR-104 was widened, but the property was never zoned to match the use. She said the current two-way turn lane was placed in front of their property, making it safe to go either direction. She suggested that all of the traffic noise in the area comes from SR-104, which is very busy and noisy.

Mr. Reynolds explained that the reason they submitted an application to rezone their property is so that the use would be made conforming instead of non-conforming. She said they have always tried to be a good neighbor, and she would like the Board to approve the request as proposed. Again, she said they have no plans to change the building at any time, and any changes would have to meet all of the City code requirements. There is a natural buffer along the back of the property because the property slopes up. On the other side where the Cimmaron Condominiums are located there is another buffer, and SR-104 and 240th Streets are located on the other sides. She advised that the property located behind the subject property is for sale at this time. She concluded her remarks by pointing out that the property has excellent access and is unsuitable for any kind of residential uses. It is most suitable for what it is being used for at this time.

Gay Westmoreland, 86292 – 240th Street Southwest, said she lives in the Cimmaron Complex that is located directly south of the subject property. She said that when she purchased her unit, she checked with the County and they assured her that the building could stay as a non-conforming use. She said she is concerned that if the zoning is changed, a much larger building could be constructed on the site. She disagreed with the applicant that they do not generate noise. She said she hears noise often in the evening after 5 p.m. and sometimes as late as 10:00 p.m. Sometimes she has to shut her windows and sliding door because it is so noisy. She said she feels the subject property is more suitable for residential zoning to match the surrounding lots abutting the property. If not, it should be rezoned to some lower level of commercial zoning.

Ms. Reynolds said she checked the zoning all the way from downtown Edmonds up to their property. There are two other automotive shops in Edmonds. Edmonds Automotive is located in a BC zone with residential uses surrounding it. City Transmission is located on property that is zoned BN. The Texaco and Chevron also provide auto repair, and they are located in BC zones. There is a mixture of multi-family, retail and commercial all along the corridor. While residential zones are important, she said it is also important to provide community business zones to serve the people living in the area. She stated that their shop is located in a safe place for people to drop off their cars and walk home.

Board Member Dewhirst recalled that the City has placed a sign at the corner of SR-104 and 240th Street indicating that some type of action is being proposed. Mr. Chave said this sign is advertising an application for a conditional use permit for the expansion of the Korean Church that is located between 238th and 240th Streets.

Board Member Works inquired about the types of businesses that are allowed in the BC zones. Mr. Chave said the types of businesses allowed in a BC zone are the types you would find in the downtown area. They consist mostly of retail, but the zone does allow a few other uses that are not allowed in the neighborhood and planned business zones. Auto repair is one that would not be allowed in the other zones. The BC zone places restrictions on outdoor storage. In addition, no work is allowed to occur outside of the building unless a conditional use permit is obtained. There are also restrictions on the hours of operation.

Board Member Freeman inquired if it is fair to say that the only difference between the BC and the BN zones is the height limit, which is 30 feet versus 25 feet. Mr. Chave explained that the setback requirements would be the same for both zones, but an additional five feet in height would be allowed in the BC zone. A lot of the other restrictions of these zones are similar, but the BC zone also allows a little bit more of a variety of uses. However, the BC zone is still geared towards a retail environment. The BC zones in the downtown are in close proximity to the residential zones.

Board Member Young clarified that the reason the applicant is requesting a rezone for the property is so that they can replace the building if significant damage were to occur. Mr. Chave advised that the non-conforming chapter of the code states that if a non-conforming use ceases for a period of greater than six months, the new use would have to conform with the requirements of the zone. He added that if the property remains as RS-8 zoning, the property owner could also get into trouble if the City decides to pursue amortization of commercial uses in residential zones. If the owner was to discontinue the non-conforming use and put the property up for sale and the site remained vacant for more than six months, the new owner would not be able to reinstitute the use. The same would be true if the property were zoned neighborhood business or planned business.

Board Member Henderson recalled the applicant's mention of property behind the subject property being for sale. He questioned about the zoning of this property. Mr. Chave said that directly west of the subject property is single-family zoning. North and south of the subject property is multi-family residential zoning.

Board Member Freeman noted that the applicant indicated an embankment somewhere close to the property line. Ms. Cassutt recalled that the applicant advised that there is an embankment on both sides of the subject property, and this forms a type of natural barrier.

BOARD MEMBER CASSUTT MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD FILE NUMBER R-03-189 TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER FREEMAN SECONDED THE MOTION.

Board Member Dewhirst said he can understand the applicant's position, but he is concerned about the precedent this rezone would set for this portion of SR-104. He said he was looking at the area and was very concerned about the amount of large vacant land that is underutilized. If the rezone is granted, a property owner from across the street could ask for the same zoning and the Board would be in a difficult position if they were to deny the request. Board Member Cassutt suggested that maybe the Board would not want to deny other rezone requests in this area. She recalled that the Board has discussed the properties located further to the west and agreed that changes need to be made.

Board Member Dewhirst questioned if it would be more appropriate for the Board and staff to study this area in a manner similar to the Westgate Study that was done previously. This would give the Board a better understanding of what is going on in the area. He said he would anticipate this area getting a lot of attention in the next several years because it has good access and is close to Highway 99 and Interstate 5. While he understands that it would probably not be appropriate for the Board to postpone their recommendation until after a study has been completed, he would feel more comfortable in making the recommendation if a study of the area was done.

APPROVED

Board Member Cassutt said she does not feel it would be appropriate to make the applicant wait for a study to be completed. She reminded the Board that they have a full schedule for the remainder of the year and a study of this area would not be possible until at least next year.

Mr. Chave advised that staff is planning for the Board to review the area on the east side of Edmonds Way as part of the Comprehensive Plan review. On the west side, the pattern seems to be fairly well established. But on the east side there is a mixture of uses and the streets are becoming busy arterial roads between Highway 99 and 238th Street. He said staff has no plans to revisit the corridor, especially on the west side where the uses appear to be fairly well established.

Mr. Chave said staff is recommending the Board approve the request to rezone the property because they feel the use on the subject property is well established and does not lend itself as a precedent for the surrounding properties. Board Member Crim added that the property appears to be an island that is separated from the properties that surround it.

Board Member Young said that if the Board is going to recommend approval of the application, they should provide some indication as to how the request is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. He referred to Item C.1.c of the staff report, and suggested that the language in this section could provide this connection. He said it should be noted that the request appears to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan because the designation of the Edmonds Way Corridor encourages a combination of commercial and residential zones. The proposed rezone would accommodate this type of mixture. The testimony from the applicant indicates that these types of mixed uses are working successfully up and down the Edmonds Way Corridor.

BOARD MEMBER CRIM MOVED THAT THE MOTION BE AMENDED TO ADD THE LANGUAGE SUGGESTED BY BOARD MEMBER YOUNG TO INDICATE THAT THE REZONE WOULD PROVIDE FOR A MIXTURE OF USES ALONG THE EDMONDS WAY CORRIDOR. BOARD MEMBERS CASSUTT AND FREEMAN AGREED TO AMEND THEIR MOTION.

BOARD MEMBER YOUNG RESTATED THE AMENDED MOTION AS FOLLOWS:

BOARD MEMBER CASSUTT MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD FILE NUMBER R-03-189 TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL TO REZONE THE SUBJECT PROPERTY FROM RS-8 TO BC BECAUSE IT IS CONSISTENT WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN FOR THE EDMONDS WAY CORRIDOR.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Chave advised that the application would go before the City Council as a Planning Board recommendation. The City Council would conduct a closed record review. The applicant and the public would have the ability to speak before the Council at that time, but they would not be allowed to introduce any new facts or testimony that hasn't already been discussed. He advised that notice would be sent out for the City Council review, which will likely be scheduled on April 20th.

UPDATE OF CRITICAL AREAS STUDY SCOPE OF WORK AND PROPOSED COORDINATION WITH COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

Mr. Chave reported that on March 23rd, the City Council approved the consultant contract with EDAW Inc. for the critical areas update and Comprehensive Plan support. He referred the Board to the schedule that was provided which integrates the consultant's schedule with the Planning Board's calendar to identify key dates and meetings for the rest of the year. He particularly noted the following meetings:

- The consultant would meet with the Planning Board in mid June to discuss and review the existing critical areas regulations and provide some options for best available science for the Board to consider in their review.
- Towards the latter part of July, the consultant would meet with the Board to talk about specific code updates for the critical areas ordinance, itself.

APPROVED

- Public workshops would be held before the consultant meets with the Board in June. At or near the end of May there will be a significant public workshop where outside agencies from the State, the Region and private interest groups will be invited to participate. This will allow an opportunity for them to provide information on various aspects of the critical areas, best available science, etc.

Mr. Chave advised that staff intends to target people living along the streams and invite them to come to a workshop and learn what they can do voluntarily. The staff will also help them understand what the critical areas regulations are all about. Anyone who wants to follow the process will be encouraged to participate. He said the City's website will be greatly expanded to allow people to track the process. Staff will also make an effort to encourage the local newspapers to follow the process. There will be a significant public effort that will occur no later than late May or early June.

Board Member Crim inquired if the consultant would provide information about what changes would be necessary to the City's Critical Areas Ordinance in order for it meet best available science practices. Mr. Chave answered affirmatively. He noted that by the end of July, the Board should have a solid draft of the critical areas ordinance that will be close to public hearing format. The public hearing would wait until after the SEPA process has been completed, so they won't occur until probably October or early November. Staff anticipates the adoption of the new critical areas ordinance by the end of November or first of December.

Mr. Chave explained that it is important for the Board to coordinate the critical areas ordinance review with the Downtown/Waterfront Plan review and the Highway 99 study. He noted that after the retreat that is scheduled for April 7th, the Board would have a good feel about the direction they will go with both the Downtown/Waterfront Plan and the Highway 99 Plan so that they can be advertised as part of the critical areas ordinance public meetings.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

Board Member Young requested that Mr. Chave provide feedback regarding a letter the Board received from Mr. Donald H. Drew. Mr. Chave recalled that Mr. Drew was one of the proponents of the rezone near Sunset and Main that was recommended for approval by the Planning Board. The City Council turned down the Board's recommendation. While the request was ultimately denied, Mr. Chave said he advised Mr. Drew that he could write a letter to the Planning Board to see if they would be interested in considering the issue again as part of their work on the Downtown/Waterfront Plan. Mr. Chave suggested that it might be helpful for staff to provide a copy of the City Council minutes from when they made their decision to deny the rezone request. The Board could then consider opportunities for addressing this situation as part of their Downtown/Waterfront Plan review.

Mr. Chave referred the Board to the decision that was released by the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board on March 22, 2004. He explained that last September Finis Tupper filed an appeal on the City's adoption of the PRD Ordinance. Roger Hertrich participated in the proceedings along with Mr. Tupper. The Hearings Board dismissed the appeal with prejudice. However, one of the unintended consequences of this appeal (bottom of Page 9 of the document) is that the City now has the attention of the Hearings Board and anyone who reads their decision. The Hearings Board is now very in tune with the problem the City has with large lot zoning. They put the City on notice that they should be careful and show their work because on its face, the large lot zoning does not meet the Growth Management Act requirements. No matter what the City does with these lots, a red flag has been raised that this is a location of concern. People will be watching what the City does and there is a greater potential that the City's actions will be challenged.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Mr. Chave said he is still working to prepare an updated extended agenda to identify the Comprehensive Plan and Critical Areas Ordinance review dates. He noted that the Board's retreat is scheduled for April 7th. He asked that the Board members contact him as soon as possible with any requests for information they might have for that meeting.

APPROVED

Mr. Chave reported that the staff has been searching for as much information as possible to use in the Comprehensive Plan and Critical Areas Ordinance update process. They identified a source that could provide them with a Citywide colored aerial photograph for \$800. This map would overlay the existing GIS maps. Staff is trying to obtain similar coverage to identify topographic features. Staff believes this information is necessary in order for them to have a clear understanding of where the steep slopes are located. They are considering the option of asking the City Council to provide funding. While it is expensive, it appears to be the only way to obtain the accurate information.

The Board briefly discussed the agenda for the retreat on April 7th. They agreed that the Highway 99 Consultant should be given ample time to make his presentation. Following that, each of the Board Committees would report their findings and observations. The Board agreed that each of the presentations would take time, and there would probably not be enough time to schedule a great deal of other issues on the agenda. Mr. Chave said it would be important for the Board to also decide how they want to proceed with the public process for the Downtown/Waterfront Plan that is scheduled to be presented to the public by the end of May. He said he would also like to present the visual survey that staff used when the original Comprehensive Plan was created so that the Board can provide feedback before it is presented to the public in May.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Board Member Young said he received a brief summary of the Highway 99 Study that was prepared by the consultant, Makers. He said the response to the summary was pretty good from both the residents and a certain number of businesses along Highway 99. But he questioned how much substance it would provide for the Board to use when making recommendations related to Highway 99. He said the report keeps identifying the problems over and over again without addressing what is and is not happening on Highway 99. He said there would be an opportunity for the Board to give some direction as to where they want to go with the information. He noted that Mauri Moore is very interested in listening to the Board's ideas for Highway 99. He said he would forward any information he receives about the issue to the Board members.

Mr. Chave advised that the full report from the Highway 99 consultant would be provided to the Board prior to their retreat. In addition, the consultant would provide a more detailed presentation to the Board at their retreat. He also reported that the City Council authorized money for the City to hire a market research company to review the Highway 99 Plan. Their task will be to review the recommendations from Makers and give some sense of economic reality. The market review would include the mixed-use area the Board discussed last year and make some critical evaluations as to whether or not the 50-foot height limit would make sense, etc. He said staff believes the market study will be a critical component of the Board's analysis for Highway 99. It will help the Board identify actions the City can take to implement the elements identified in the study.

Board Member Young said he received a request from the City Council President asking that the Board consider an amendment to the non-conforming section of the code as it relates to historic structures. Mr. Chave explained that the recommended changes would be simple. He noted that the non-conforming building section of the code has a provision for historic buildings that are identified on the State and National Registers. But there is no mention of this provision being applicable to structures that are identified on the new Edmonds Register of Historic Places. The Historic Preservation Commission is asking the Board to consider an amendment that would add the Edmonds Register to the list. This would allow an exception for historical buildings to be restored if damaged substantially. The Board agreed to move forward with this change, and they directed the staff to advertise the proposed amendment for a public hearing as soon as possible.

Board Member Young reported that the City Council President has inquired when the Board would like to hold a joint meeting with the City Council. He also questioned what issues the Board would like to discuss. The Board agreed that this issue could be discussed at the retreat on April 7th.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

The Board made food assignments for the dinner that would be held as part of the Board retreat.

APPROVED

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:50 P.M.

APPROVED