

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

June 9, 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
Steve Bullock, Senior Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER DEWHIRST MOVED THAT THE BOARD APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MAY 12, 2004 AS CORRECTED. BOARD MEMBER CASSUTT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, WITH BOARD MEMBERS CRIM AND WORKS ABSTAINING.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

There were no changes made to the proposed agenda.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Chair Young reminded the public in attendance that all public correspondence to the Planning Board Members should come through the City staff. He cautioned that direct contact with individual Board Members regarding quasi-judicial matters could place them in situations that are in conflict with the Open Meetings Act and the Appearance of Fairness Doctrine.

Don Krieman, 24006 – 95th Place West, thanked the Board and staff for conducting a very successful open house at their last meeting in May. It was informative and a lot of information was provided to the public. Mr. Krieman reported that he recently downloaded a copy of the Comprehensive Plan from the City's Website. He described his experience in reading through the document, and said he had the most difficulty interpreting the design guidelines chapter because it is so complicated. In the process of reading this chapter, he realized that he had to think about what the City was trying to accomplish. Once he figured this out, it became easier for him to understand. He distributed a copy of the comments he prepared as he reviewed the document. The comments are simple in nature, but would accomplish a specific goal. He emphasized that his suggestions are just ideas for the Board to consider.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING ON FILE NUMBER R-04-7 TO CONSIDER A REZONE REQUEST BY WARREN LAFON TO REZONE THE PROPERTY AT 546 PARADISE LANE FROM SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (RS-6) TO MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL (RM-2.4)

Chair Young referred the Board to the correspondence that was received from the applicant regarding their request to continue the public hearing to the June 23rd Planning Board Meeting.

Mr. Bullock explained that the applicant submitted some new plans that were intended to resolve some of the issues raised by the staff in their original staff report. However, after further talking with City staff, the applicant is requesting more time to respond to the City's continued concerns. That is the basis for their request for a continuation. It is at the Board's pleasure to choose how they want to proceed with the application.

Chair Young noted that members of the public were present to provide comments regarding the application. He questioned if these individuals should be allowed to speak at this time or if they should be asked to reserve their comments for the continued public hearing. Mr. Bullock explained that it is common to allow members of the audience to provide comments regarding an application before it is continued to a future meeting. No one speaking now would lose their ability to provide comments when the public hearing is continued in the future. He noted that staff did try to mail notice of the continuation request to everyone living near the subject property.

Board Member Henderson noted that the consultant, EDAW, is scheduled to review issues and options for the critical areas update at the Board's next meeting of June 23rd. Because this presentation is expected to be lengthy, perhaps the rezone application should be continued to a meeting in July.

Board Member Dewhirst noted that the applicant was not present in the audience to provide comments regarding the continuation of the hearing, even though they knew that the Board had the option of conducting the hearing now. He suggested that the Board move forward with the public hearing as scheduled on the agenda.

Mr. Chave said staff advised the applicant to attend the meeting. However, in order to be fair, the Board probably should hear from the applicant before making a recommendation. He explained that the applicant is in the process of amending the application in an attempt to address some of the concerns that were raised by the staff, the neighbors, etc. He suggested that because there are members of the public in attendance to participate in the hearing, the Board should open the public hearing, allow them to speak, and then continue the hearing to a future date. The Board agreed this would be the best course of action. He emphasized that anyone who testifies or signs up on the sign up sheet now would be mailed a staff report for the application prior to the continued public hearing.

Michael Connolly, 1350 – 6th Place South, said he has lived in his home for the past 15 years. As a resident of the area, he is intimate with the nature of Paradise Lane and has a number of concerns about the proposed contract rezone application. He noted that the application proposes to widen Paradise Lane significantly. Right now, it is a narrow road, and it is hard to understand how the road could be widened to 60 feet. He said the neighborhood is concerned about the traffic going onto Edmonds Way from Paradise Lane since Edmonds Way curves in this location and vehicles have already accelerated to at least 40 miles per hour. He advised that at the corner of Paradise Lane and Edmonds Way is an island where trees, signs, a bus stop, etc. are currently located. All of these things make it difficult to turn onto Paradise Lane from Edmonds Way now because of the speed of the traffic and the difficult sight distance. The proposed contract rezone would allow the situation to get even worse. He questioned the safety of the children who live in the neighborhood.

If the road is widened as proposed, Mr. Connolly pointed out that it would be constructed right up to the door of the structures located along Paradise Lane, particularly the bank. In addition, the proposal would allow a developer to remove a significant number, if not all, of the trees that are located on the subject property. These trees currently serve as a buffer between the single-family residential homes and Edmonds Way. The removal of these trees would also have a negative impact on surface water runoff and drainage.

Mr. Connolly summarized that his main concerns are related to safety and traffic flow. There are a number of children living and playing in the neighborhood, and the increased traffic would make this a dangerous situation.

APPROVED

Bruce Lambrecht, 1355 – 6th Place South, said he has lived in his current home for the past five years. He said he would first like to review a letter that was written by Diane Ellis, his neighbor who was unable to attend the meeting. In her letter she expressed her concern that an RM-2.4 zoning designation would not be compatible with the neighborhood. Mr. Lambrecht pointed out that the neighbor whose house abuts onto Paradise Lane has four children. Across the street from his home is a vacant lot where the children like to play, but this requires them to cross the street. He pointed out that Paradise Lane is not a full sized road. It is a small lane with not even enough room for cars to pass each other without one pulling over to let the other by. The magnitude of the proposed project is significant, and he cannot imagine how width of Paradise Lane could be increased to 60 feet.

Mr. Lambrecht said Ms. Ellis mentioned in her letter her concern about the amount of dirt the applicant is proposing to remove from the site to accommodate the underground parking area. They estimate that this removal would require about 500 dump truck loads of dirt to be removed, and this large number of trucks accessing the site through the neighborhood will present a danger to the children who play in the area. Mr. Lambrecht pointed out that the project would go from corner to corner on the property and it is not likely that any of the existing trees would be saved, even though they currently act as a buffer between the single-family residential homes and Edmonds Way.

Mr. Lambrecht advised that Ms. Ellis also expressed concern in her letter about what the change would do the stream environment. She noted recent problems that have occurred when waste products enter the stream during construction. She also expressed her concern about the applicant being allowed to clear cut the property because a stream runs through it. She stated that she believes Paradise Lane is 16 feet wide right now, and the proposal would change it to 60 feet. She suggested that the Board measure this right-of-way carefully before making a decision.

Mr. Lambrecht explained that from his house, he would have to look through a few homes in order to actually see the difference. The proposed development would not have a direct and immediate impact on him, but many of the people moving into the neighborhood have children who walk up Paradise Lane to catch the bus. He suggested that the Board Members drive by the area to see the current situation.

Michael Penna, 1370 – 6th Place South, said his most important concerns are related to traffic. The contract rezone would impact the safety of his kids in a horrible way. He noted that across Paradise Lane from where he lives is a vacant lot where his kids spend a lot of time. This puts them in danger when walking across the street, and a new multi-family development would make the situation more dangerous since Paradise Lane would provide the only entrance. The situation is already dangerous, and people routinely run the stop sign and go way too fast through the area.

Mr. Penna said that, in addition to his concerns about his family's safety, he is also concerned about the general geometry of the intersection where Paradise Lane comes off of Edmonds Way. The ferry traffic routinely backs up across this intersection, and they often hear screeching tires and near misses because of the limited sight distance as you pull out of Paradise Lane. Widening this road without increasing the capacity at the intersection would be asking for trouble. He urged the Board members to drive by the subject property. He pointed out that there are no multi-family developments in the area, and this would be the first. The development would require the removal of a beautiful stand of trees that provide the only buffer between the single-family residential neighborhood and Edmonds Way.

Board Member Henderson pointed out that there is an existing condominium development at the end of Paradise Lane. He asked if this development created any problems for the single-family neighborhood. Mr. Penna agreed that there is an existing multi-family unit at the corner of Paradise Lane that was built prior to his family moving into their home twelve years ago. There have not been any problems associated with the development over the past twelve years. However, the development of additional multi-family units would increase the traffic load significantly, and the lane is only 16 feet wide right now.

Dorothy Jennings, 806 – 7th Avenue South, said she does not live close to the subject property, but was born in the house located at 546 – 6th Place South 79½ years ago. She lived in this house when the State cut through the present Edmonds Way road. She said she sympathizes with the people who live in this area because she understands the problems that exist with congestion and traffic danger. Paradise Lane and Edmonds Way is a bad corner. She said the house she lived in was

built in 1921 by her parents, and she hates to see it be torn down. It is an old, well-built, beautiful home. Ms. Jennings said she walks by the house every ten days or so just to see the beautiful trees. She would hate to see them be removed to make room for the new development. She said it seems like much of the beauty of Edmonds has disappeared and she hates to see it continue to happen, particularly in single-family residential areas. Allowing multi-family development in the heart of the City is one thing, but not in a beautiful, treed area. She said she understands that the property owners could make more money if the rezone were approved and that the City cannot stop progress, but she hates to see one more beautiful area of Edmonds spoiled.

Tom Reynolds, Spinacker Condominium President, said he was present to speak on behalf of the condominium owners. He said he contacted the City in an attempt to obtain plans for the proposed new development, but was unable to get them. He said the City's lack of notice and information is a significant concern to the condominium association. Anyone who lives close to Edmonds Way knows that the noise is tremendous because people are accelerating to get up the hill rather than going the speed limit of 35 miles per hour. The trees act as an exceptional buffer to block out this noise.

Mr. Reynolds pointed out that the condominium doesn't create a significant amount of traffic because people tend to have only one car. However, the ferry traffic often requires them to take the back roads to get out of their neighborhood because Edmonds Way is blocked off. He said it does not make sense to make Paradise Lane as wide as Edmonds Way since a lot of children, senior citizens and other pedestrians use this road on a regular basis.

Mr. Reynolds said the condominium association is also concerned about the amount of dirt that would have to be removed. This would require the removal of all of the large trees on the site. The removal of this dirt would create a lot of noise and dust for the neighbors. He said the bank has been told that their customers would have to park in the rear of the building once construction starts.

Mr. Bullock encouraged the public to contact him and he would make whatever drawings and information the City has on the project available to them for review. He apologized if obtaining information about the project has been difficult. He said that at this time, there are not a lot of plans in the file. This is not a design review application where a final set of plans are being considered. The plans for this proposal are more conceptual in nature. He said he has a number of different items the public can look at related to the project such as aerial photographs, the Comprehensive Plan and zoning maps. He said he is willing to walk through these items with any citizen who comes to his office and explain why the applicant is making the proposal and why the City is willing to consider it.

Mr. Bullock clarified that the actual right-of-way for Paradise Lane is 60 feet wide. Any City map will show the individual properties with a 60-foot wide right-of-way space in between. That does not imply at all that the entire right-of-way would be turned into a 60-foot wide street. The right-of-way is 60 feet wide, and that is what the City has control of. All of the utilities associated with development along the street would be placed within this right-of-way. He explained that Paradise Lane would be developed to standard based on the number of units or lots that use it for access. Currently, Paradise Lane is considered to be substandard in its width and would need to be widened, but it would not be widened to 60 feet. It is likely the street would be widened to accommodate two lanes of traffic and possibly some parking along the lane and a sidewalk. Whatever else remains in the public right-of-way would be used for the placement of utility services.

Mr. Bullock explained that the City has had a Comprehensive Plan on record for a long time. One of the first Comprehensive Plans was adopted in the early 70's and it already showed the Westgate Edmonds Corridor area with commercial along the corridor and a band of multi-family residential along the commercial corridor. The subject property has been identified for either commercial or multi-family land use since at least the early 70's, but the zoning has not been changed to be consistent with the land use designation. When the City updated their Comprehensive Plan in the 90's, it still identified the Paradise Lane island as primarily commercial or multi-family residential with a few lots identified as single-family residential. The City is obligated to follow the Comprehensive Plan and judge all rezone requests based on the land use designation. In this case, the property has been identified in the Comprehensive Plan as multi-family residential, so the zoning should be multi-family residential, as well. He noted that the City Council adopted the existing Comprehensive Plan in 1995. Since that time, they have reaffirmed annually that the land use designation for the subject property should be multi-family residential. At this time, there has been no Comprehensive Plan amendment proposal that would change this land use designation.

Mr. Bullock said that as the City has considered the situation that exists for the properties that front along Edmonds Way, they have determined that the properties could not likely be developed as desirable single-family lots. These properties are not desirable locations for single-family residential homes.

Mr. Bullock encouraged the public in attendance to sign their name on the sign up sheet so that staff can forward a staff report to them on the Friday prior to the continued hearing. In addition, staff should have the applicant's final proposal a week or two before the hearing date, and he would be happy to talk with any individual citizens prior to the public hearing about the proposed plans.

Chair Young clarified that the issue before the Board for consideration is related to the appropriateness of multi-family residential zoning on the subject property versus single-family residential zoning. The actual development designs fall under the purview of the Architectural Design Board as far as what is developed on the site and how. He suggested that as part of the staff report, the City's traffic engineer would address issues and concerns related to traffic generation, sight distance, etc. The engineering department would also provide information related to any stream that exists on the subject property.

Mr. Bullock agreed and added that any stream that exists on the site would fall under the purview of the City's Critical Areas Ordinance. While he is aware of the location of Willow Creek, he is unaware of any stream or creek that is located on the subject property. If a citizen has information that would suggest otherwise, they should contact the City regarding its location.

Mr. Bullock advised that the engineering department has acknowledged traffic concerns with Paradise Lane, specifically how it access onto and off of Edmonds Way. But this is a City problem and not something created by the potential rezone. It is an existing situation and will never be the sole responsibility of a developer on this property to resolve. There may be some requirement that the developer pay their share of the improvements, but that is a separate issue from the contract rezone application that is being considered at this time. No one should expect what happens on this property to fix all of the problems that exist at Paradise Lane and Edmonds Way. The traffic engineer reviewed a traffic study that was submitted by the applicant. While they acknowledge that Paradise Lane would be impacted, the conclusion is that the impact would not be enough to change the level of service that has been identified for that street.

Board Member Freeman asked how many single-family homes could be constructed on the subject property if the contract rezone were not approved by the City. Mr. Bullock answered that the subject property is just more than 24,000 square feet in size, and four single-family homes could be built on the site. If the property were rezoned to RM-3, eight units would be allowed. If rezoned to RM-2.4, twelve units could be constructed.

Board Member Dewhirst noted that noise has been mentioned several times by the citizens. He questioned what the SEPA review said about this issue. He asked that staff provide this information at the continued public hearing. In addition, he asked that staff outline the SEPA issues and identify what type of mitigation has been proposed for each. He also asked that the traffic engineer provide background related to the intersection at Paradise Lane and Edmonds Way to include an accident history, sight distance, etc. He inquired about any City plans to improve the traffic situation in this area. He noted that one of the criteria the Board must consider when evaluating an application for a rezone is the impact the proposal would have to the public's health, safety and welfare. While the intersection is not substandard now, if they add 120 additional trips per day, this may have a significant impact that would take the road from a local street to an arterial at a corner where there are high speeds. This could present a significant problem. Even six additional houses on the property could result in a difficult situation. He noted that the State conditions require that if an intersection is substandard and the City does not have any money in their capital improvement budget to resolve the situation, they will need to change their land use designation to accommodate the lower road standard.

Board Member Young agreed with Board Member Dewhirst. He pointed out that if the street is already substandard and additional traffic is added, people living in the neighborhood would begin to find their own alternative access routes through other residential streets.

APPROVED

Michael Connelly noted that Paradise Lane intersects with Edmonds Way, which is a State Highway known as SR-104. He questioned if the State Department of Transportation had been asked to comment on the proposed project. He questioned what their view would be of a proposal that would have additional traffic accessing onto SR-104. Mr. Connelly also requested that the City staff seek feedback from the Police Department Traffic Division regarding the impacts the proposed rezone would have on the existing traffic situation. Board Member Young advised that these issues would be addressed as part of the continued public hearing at a later date.

BOARD MEMBER HENDERSON MOVED THAT THE BOARD CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING ON FILE NUMBER R-04-7 TO JULY 28, 2004. BOARD MEMBER FREEMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 5-2, WITH BOARD MEMBERS CRIM AND DEWHIRST VOTING IN OPPOSITION.

DISCUSSION OF PLAN AMENDMENTS AND OPTIONS FOR PUBLIC TO CONSIDER DURING OPEN HOUSE IN AUGUST

Mr. Chave reviewed the extended agenda with the Board. He noted that on June 23rd, the consultant, EDAW, would provide a presentation on their review of the critical areas best available science. This will likely take a substantial amount of time. He also pointed out that staff is proposing to hold an open house on concepts and ideas for the Downtown/Waterfront Plan Update. If the Board wants to hold this open house, staff recommends that it be scheduled from 5:00 to 6:30 p.m. prior to the Board's regular meeting of July 14th. The Board agreed to hold the open house as suggested by staff.

Mr. Chave said staff anticipates that the areas that will generate the most public interest includes the area north of downtown between the arts center and the area in and around the fountain. Staff has a good idea of what the Board envisions for the area heading towards the arts center. However, they need to provide more details regarding their visions for the area around the fountain. He said one option for this area would be to propose a requirement that would allow a building height of 25 feet. If a developer wants to go higher up to 32 or 33 feet, they would have to step back anything above the first story. This would maintain the facades, open space, etc. around the fountain while at the same time allow a property owner to get a third story on a structure. Some public benefit would be gained through stepbacks and open areas but benefits would be provided to the property owner to ensure that they can get a third floor. The only concern with this option would be if the additional three feet would be a significant item of concern for the public.

Board Member Works inquired if any of the buildings in or around the fountain are listed on the Edmonds Register of Historic Places. Mr. Chave answered that the only building that has been listed on the Register is the Carnegie Library/Museum. However, other buildings in this area have the ability to make application for inclusion on the Register. The Board noted that several of the buildings in this area already have a second story that is used for residential purposes.

The Board agreed to proceed with this concept and see what feedback they get from the public. Mr. Chave said the first floor would have to be of adequate height to support commercial uses. Staff will ask designers to come up with the maximum ceiling height that would be required for the first floor.

Board Member Crim asked how much setback should be required for the second and third floors. Mr. Chave suggested that the setback should be between five and ten feet. The Board agreed to propose a setback of ten feet for the public hearing. Mr. Chave said this would provide an opportunity for balconies overlooking the streetscape.

Board Member Dewhirst suggested that another option would be to eliminate the street parking in this area so the sidewalks could be widened. Mr. Chave said one public benefit that could be offered is the expansion of the sidewalks back into the properties. As an alternative to the ten-foot setback requirement, the City could reduce the setback to five feet if the first floor of the structure is setback also. This would give opportunities for indentations for tables, chairs, etc.

Board Member Freeman suggested that the elimination of street parking would be a difficult concept to sell to the public right now. This could be considered at a future time if necessary. Mr. Chave agreed.

APPROVED

Board Member Dewhirst pointed out that the sidewalk along Fourth Avenue between the downtown and the new Arts Center should be widened to create a promenade. Perhaps parking could be allowed on one side of the street, and a wider sidewalk on the other. Unless there is a real push to improve the walkway along this street, and not just with street furniture and flowers, they will not accomplish their goal of making the street more pedestrian friendly. Board Member Cassutt agreed. Mr. Chave said that improving the pedestrian feel along this street has promise. Decreasing the automobile activity would also improve the situation. Board Member Dewhirst felt the concept of making Fourth Avenue more pedestrian friendly should be included in the description now so that the public is not surprised after the hearing. The remainder of the Board agreed.

Mr. Chave said that when trying to encourage a different flavor of design for development in a particular area, design criteria could be created that applies to specific areas only. Another option would be to do a type of planned development. For example, the zoning could allow a mini master plan for a particular project. The developer could work with the design guidelines but still do something unique for the property. A master plan project would go through more scrutiny than a typical development would. The minimum design standards could be set, but a master plan could also be required. Board Member Cassutt agreed that this is the concept the subcommittee had in mind for this area. They wanted to have a neighborhood design regulation just for that street. Board Member Crim agreed this would be appropriate for the area between Main Street and the Arts Center, which is a well-designed area and additional design guidelines could easily be added.

Mr. Chave said that in order to apply the master plan concept, the City would have to provide a developer with a list of options the City is looking for while allowing more flexibility if a master plan is used. However, the disadvantage of this option is it can be less predictable for the developer.

Board Member Crim suggested that staff add some master plan language to the Downtown/Waterfront Plan that would apply specifically to the area along Fourth Avenue between Main Street and the Arts Center. However, the language should also make it clear that other combinations that provide the feel they are looking for could also be presented to the Architectural Design Board for consideration.

Mr. Chave pointed out that the Board doesn't have to make a final decision on this issue now. If they do decide to include a master plan requirement for this area, they would need to develop criteria for evaluation. He suggested that the Board advertise the concept of requiring a master plan for single developments for the public hearing.

Board Member Dewhirst said he has worked in jurisdictions where the concept of single lot master plans has not worked. He suggested that it would be better for the City to create a master plan for the whole area. A developer could then present a site plan and justify it based on the master plan requirements. He said the most important thing to consider is how a particular proposal fits into the street. A developer might present an award winning master plan, but when it is considered in the context of the streetscape it may or may not work. He said streetscape is very important in this area, as well as in the area around the fountain. Mr. Chave clarified that the master plan concept versus putting specific requirements in the code has more to do with how much flexibility the City wants to allow. If the properties are small and there is not a lot of opportunity for flexibility and the City is very specific in what they are looking for, there is no point in requiring a master plan.

Board Member Dewhirst said the current situation is a collection of small lots within an established area. Board Member Cassutt agreed and said she doesn't foresee a lot of change occurring with the buildings around the fountain in the near future. The changes would likely occur on the arms extending out and along Fourth Avenue towards the Arts Center. She said the important thing is to get the vision across to the Architectural Design Board.

Board Member Dewhirst reminded the Board that the Regional Investment District funding proposal is not going to be on the fall ballot for approval. Part of the funding that would have been provided by this program was \$155 million for the relocation of the ferry terminal. He said that while there has been a lot of work on the Edmonds Crossing Project, he questioned whether it would actually occur during the life of the plan. Therefore, he suggested that the City come up with some alternatives. There are things they can do in the near future to better connect the downtown to the waterfront with the ferry staging lanes in their current location. Mr. Chave reminded Board Member Dewhirst that the Downtown/Waterfront Plan proposes two phases to identify what should take place both before and after the ferry terminal is relocated. He said the

question is when the ferry would be relocated. The delay in the RTID vote doesn't change what the City wants to do, but it does impact the timing. If all of the funding sources go away, the project might not be possible, but they are no where near that point yet. In addition, the final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the Edmonds Crossing Project would be adopted this summer offering more opportunities for funding. Mr. Chave suggested that perhaps some changes could be made in the Downtown/Waterfront Plan regarding when the move takes place, but the plan should still include the City's goal to relocate the ferry terminal. He suggested that the Board invite Stephen Clifton, the City's lead for the Edmonds Crossing Project, to provide written comments to the Board detailing what he thinks the RTID vote means for the project.

Board Member Dewhirst agreed that perhaps it would not be appropriate to consider alternative uses for the lower yard yet, but they should consider options for connecting the downtown with the waterfront with the situation as it exists today. He noted that the Burlington Northern Santa Fe Railroad has received money from Sound Transit to run a second track through Edmonds. This will result in making the traffic even more difficult. Therefore, it is important to be realistic and make sure the plan has credibility.

Board Member Cassutt suggested that staff contact other cities like Redmond or Kirkland to find out how their regulations guide the development of their downtown areas. She noted that Redmond recently made changes to their regulations as they apply to the Old Downtown Redmond area. Mr. Chave agreed to find this information for the Board's review.

Board Member Works referred to the area across the street from the Arts Center that is identified on the map with a question mark. She asked what staff is proposing for this area. Mr. Chave answered that at the public hearing, staff plans to ask if the public would be interested in some kind of low-rise residential uses that would be more flexible than a standard single-family residential zone. Uses such as office and bed and breakfast businesses could locate in this area and be compatible with the single-family uses.

Mr. Chave said no specific comments were received at the open house regarding the Downtown/Waterfront Plan. Most of the comments received were related to the critical areas issue. That is why staff recommended a special open house on July 14th to solicit public comment regarding the Downtown/Waterfront Plan.

Board Member Crim referred to the "General Principles" section on Page 2 of the draft Downtown/Waterfront Plan. He suggested that this section be changed to make some type of reference to 4th Avenue being pedestrian friendly. Mr. Chave agreed and noted that the second bullet hits on this topic, but it is not specifically related to 4th Avenue. The Board agreed that it is important to make it clear that development along this street should be pedestrian friendly.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

Mr. Chave referred the Board to the brief paper from the State regarding urban densities. This brief paper provides the State's perspective on the issue. Board Member Freeman said this was helpful and should be provided to the public, as well. Mr. Chave said this paper would be added to the City's website so the public could access it.

Mr. Chave reminded the Board that on June 23rd, EDAW, the City's consultant for the critical areas review, would be providing the same presentation that they plan to present to the City Council the night before. He advised that a public hearing has also been scheduled on the June 23rd agenda regarding the proposed code amendments dealing with residential uses in the first floor space of buildings located in the community business zone. Staff plans to record this presentation on DVD.

The Board discussed the possibility of canceling the last meeting in August.

Board Member Cassutt suggested that Board Member Young meet with Mayor Haakenson to find out what the City Council is doing with the Design Guidelines. Board Member Freeman said that she and Chair Young have had this discussion with the Mayor, and he indicated that the City Council would not take up their review of the draft Design Guidelines until fall.

Board Member Dewhirst said that in a sidebar conversation with a City Council Member, he learned that the City Council would be entertaining a presentation on the possibility of forming a study group to study the option of increasing the height limit in the downtown. Mr. Chave said this is scheduled on the City Council's agenda for July 20th, but it is related to the interaction between height and number of floors allowed and not necessarily an overall increase in height. A number of experts will be available to discuss economic design, etc. as it relates to commercial buildings in the downtown area. It is intended to be an education discussion session.

Don Krieman added that City Council Member Marin advised that on July 20th, the City Council would discuss this topic, and they would likely refer it to the Planning Board for further discussion.

Board Member Works said that she recently contacted the American Planning Association to have her materials sent to her via email. However, she was told that they have no record of her membership in the organization. She asked that staff check into the matter. Mr. Chave agreed to take care of this issue.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Young provided no additional comments during this portion of the meeting.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Guenther reported that he attended the Meadowdale Landslide Meeting that was recently held by the City. The City presented a good draft regulation, but there were some arbitrary things included, and these were what the neighborhood was most critical about. The City staff has decided to take more time to rewrite the regulations. He noted that there were a lot of people in attendance at the meeting. Board Member Henderson said that is typical of the Meadowdale neighborhood.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:57 P.M.

APPROVED