

## PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

### October 27, 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 – 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North.

#### **BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

James Young, Chair  
Janice Freeman, Vice Chair  
Jim Crim

Virginia Cassutt  
John Dewhirst  
Cary Guenther  
Judith Works

#### **BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT**

Don Henderson

#### **STAFF PRESENT**

Duane Bowman, Development Services Director  
Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager  
Jennifer Gerend, Economic Development  
Director  
Dan Clements, Finance Director  
Karin Noyes, Recorder

Board Member Henderson was excused from the meeting.

#### **READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

BOARD MEMBER CRIM MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 6, 2004 AND OCTOBER 13, 2004 AS CORRECTED. BOARD MEMBER FREEMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, WITH BOARD MEMBER DEWHIRST ABSTAINING FROM VOTING ON THE OCTOBER 6<sup>TH</sup> MINUTES.

#### **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 address the Board during this portion of the meeting.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING ON AMEMDMENTS TO THE EDMONDS COMPREHENSIVE PLAN: DOWNTOWN WATERFRONT PLAN**

Mr. Chave advised that the Planning Board has been working on an update of the City's Downtown Waterfront Plan for the past several months. As part of this work, the Planning Board has been interested in identifying different "districts" for the downtown area, recognizing that not all of downtown Edmonds functions in the same way. He displayed a map showing the existing business commercial (BC) zone in downtown Edmonds. He also provided a map identifying the various districts that have been identified by the Board for public review.

Mr. Chave pointed out that when developing its ideas, the Board reviewed information from a number of sources. A number of citizens have addressed the subject during public workshops and open houses, and individuals and groups have submitted letters and comments during public meetings. The Board also reviewed the background information on the subject, including a report from a consultant hired to examine the economics of downtown development, information on historical downtown development trends in Edmonds, information on what makes development “pedestrian scale,” and what the implications would be of requiring a 12-foot first floor ceiling height. He noted that all of this material is available to the public via the City’s website.

Mr. Chave displayed graphs showing the historic trends of new commercial development verses new residential development for the downtown since 1980. This data indicates that in the late 1980’s the amount of new commercial floor area was substantially higher than new residential floor area. However, this situation changed throughout the 1990’s to a point where there was more new residential floor area than new commercial floor area. For the past six or seven years the two have been nearly parallel.

Mr. Chave explained that the City adopted a Comprehensive Plan in 1995 that encouraged mixed-use development in the downtown area, with the idea that it would be desirable to have people live in the downtown to take advantage of the shopping and transit opportunities that are available and to help make the downtown a vibrant area. He noted that when the BC zone was established 20 years ago, the intent was that it allow for a mixture of uses. However, until six or seven years ago, this had not occurred.

Mr. Chave pointed out that the BC zone allows for lot-line-to-lot-line development. Therefore, a two-story building would, theoretically, have a floor-to-area ratio of 2:1. A three-story building would have a floor-to-area ratio of 3:1. He reviewed that floor-to-area ratio climbed in the 1990’s after a sharp fall in the early 1980’s. In recent years, there has been an increase in the average floor-to-area ratio in the downtown area. Most projects that have been developed since 1998 have a floor-to-area ratio of 2:1 or higher.

Mr. Chave advised that after reviewing the trend data and the existing zoning, the Board felt strongly that the time had come to take a closer look at the BC zoned area. Again, he explained that the Board has proposed a plan that would divide the BC zone into several different districts, recognizing, for example, that the character of Main Street is different than the area near the Frances Anderson Center or the ferry terminal. With the current plans for a multi-modal center in Edmonds, the Board felt the City should consider redevelopment opportunities for the old Safeway site and the Harbor Square site. The hope is that these properties could be redeveloped to take advantage of the economic situation of both properties rather than developing the properties piecemeal.

Mr. Chave said the Board has discussed the concept of “pedestrian scale” development on numerous occasions. He referred to a study that was conducted by the State of Oregon, which provided helpful information to the City. He displayed a diagram from the study that illustrated a 60-foot right-of-way. He explained that the study found that, in general, people consider pedestrian scale to be a ratio of building height to right-of-way available. The study identifies acceptable ratios to be somewhere between one foot of building height for every two to three feet of right-of-way. The low end of building height for a 60-foot right-of-way would be 20 feet, and the high end would be 30 feet. The Oregon State study made the point that, generally, a downtown area is expected to have 60 to 80 foot rights-of-way. Right now, the City’s right-of-way width in the downtown is about 60 feet and the height limit is 30 feet, which matches closely with the diagram provided in the study.

Mr. Chave advised that as the Board discussed building designed, the concern was voiced that in order to create a three-story structure, recent developers have really pushing the envelop by squashing the first floor to an undesirable height for commercial space or by putting the first floor below grade, which is not conducive to pedestrian access. The Board explored the option of requiring a minimum 12-foot ceiling height and still allow for two additional floors of building space above. However, this would require an increase in the height limit to at least 33 feet. The Board decided that it is important to maintain the pedestrian scale of the downtown area, and one idea that would accomplish this goal would be require buildings to be set back from the street one foot for every additional foot of building height. For example, if a building were set back three feet, it would be allowed a height of 33 feet. This would result in a 66-foot right-of-way and the pedestrian ratio would still stay within the range identified in the Oregon State Study.

Mr. Chave reported that the City hired Heartland LLC, a real estate analysis firm, to study redevelopment options for the downtown area. They were not charged with making a recommendation, but were asked to study the scenarios the Board was considering such as stepping back upper stories, setting buildings back from the street, a minimum first floor building height, etc. He noted that the full report is available to the public via the City's website or by coming into the Planning Department Office. He reviewed that the market analysis identified the following findings:

- Condominium sales drive the financial performance of mixed-use projects. New mixed-use developments in the downtown area need to have two floors of residential space in order for a project to be financially feasible. A two-story building simply isn't feasible in the existing Edmonds market.
- Values, both sales and rentals, associated with ground floor commercial uses are less significant. The study found that a mixed-use project would still be financially feasible even if the commercial space on the first floor were not leased out. This could lead to situations where developers are not so concerned about the success of the commercial space.
- Eliminating the ability to construct a third floor would make mixed-use development unfeasible. The two stories of residential above commercial space are what make the mixed-use projects economically viable.
- Upper level step backs or setbacks from the street would have a slight negative impact on the return for a project, but would not impact the overall feasibility of a mixed-use project significantly.
- Maintenance and minor renovation by existing owners of high-quality retail structures provides a better return than redevelopment. The return on existing high-quality structures is so strong that even a three-story project would not be able to compete with the income coming in from these properties. It would also be difficult for someone to purchase property and compete against these current developments. That is why there has been no inclination for property owners to redevelop their one-story buildings that are located in the core downtown area.
- Acquisition and reuse of existing structures is feasible, but less likely to occur given redevelopment values.
- New single-story retail construction cannot compete with mixed-use redevelopment.

Mr. Chave reported that the Heartland Study concluded that it would be difficult to redevelop the Harbor Square and Old Safeway sites under the current zoning standards. There might be more opportunities for redevelopment of these sites if a developer were allowed to average the height on the site. This would enable them to develop to a greater height in one area where views would not be impacted in exchange for a lower height in another area. Allowing a higher level for the residential portions of a mixed-use project on these sites would make redevelopment more economically viable. The property could be developed at a lower height for retail uses where there are issues associated with view blockage.

Mr. Chave advised that, in general, the Board is considering the creation of a different zoning districts for the downtown. In the fountain area, the proposal on the table is to leave the height limit at 30 feet and require a 12-foot minimum ceiling height for the first floor. This would limit the number of stories for buildings in this area to two. The Board is also considering a requirement that the upper story be stepped back. The Board's intent is to maintain the unique characteristics of the area around the fountain. However, the existing market conditions and the available data indicate that if no changes are made to these areas, the developers will continue to build commercial spaces that are not viable in order to develop the more feasible residential units on the upper two floors. The Board has discussed that in the downtown core business area between Fifth Avenue and Main Street, it is important to consider the concept of allowing additional height in exchange for additional setback. However, the Board recommends that the height limit be no greater than 33 feet. The Board has also discussed the possibility of limiting this area to retail uses and other uses that are supportive of the retail environment. Those properties that are located away from the retail corridor would not be restricted to retail uses, but the height limit should be no more than 33 feet, and the minimum ceiling height should be 12 feet.

Mr. Chave reported that the Board has considered the creation of a new zone for Fourth Avenue to the Arts Center. In this area there would be more setback requirements so buildings would not be developed lot-line-to-lot-line. The height limit

would be set at a maximum of 33 feet. The southern portion of Fifth Avenue was called out in the proposal as an area where auto-oriented uses could be allowed. He referred to a few properties located along Sunset Avenue and noted that there is a proposal on the table that would allow a planned residential office use, which is not the same as the uses that are typically allowed in the BC zone. The height limit from the street level would be 25 feet, and the zone would recognize the properties' unique situation of being located between the railroad tracks and Sunset Avenue. The Board felt this area would be appropriate for a limited type of office/residential use as long as setbacks and view corridors could be maintained. Again, he said the height limit would be 25 feet, which is the same as the height limit for residential zones.

Mr. Chave introduced Dan Clements, the City's Finance Director, who was presented to discuss the fiscal impact the proposed changes could have on the City's economic health.

Mr. Clements advised that Mr. Chave asked him to conduct some modeling to show the ramifications for potential increases in property tax and sales tax if certain types of redevelopment were to occur in the downtown area. He reported that in the downtown area there are about 140 underdeveloped parcels, which means buildings that are developed at 1½ story or less. The land total for these properties is about 1.1 million square feet, and the current valuation is about \$60.4 million. If all of the retail spaces were built out, the City's sales tax revenue would increase by about 74 percent, or about \$270,000 annually. He explained that these figures were obtained by applying tax generated in a comparable downtown area and subtracting the tax coming from existing developed parcels. He said he did not conduct any reality testing on whether or not there is a demand for additional retail services. In addition, his figures are based on total build out.

Mr. Clements reported that if built out, the property taxes for the subject area would increase just over 100 percent. The increase in valuation would be about \$64.5 million, which would result in about \$197,000 in additional revenue to the City annually from property taxes. This figure was calculated by assuming all of the 1 and 1½ story buildings would be redeveloped into 2½ to 3 story buildings, with development costs at about \$200 per square foot. He concluded that at build out, the property tax and sales tax that would be generated by the proposed changes would be about \$468,000 annually, but this is assuming there is sufficient market to support retail activities.

Mr. Chave emphasized that the proposal being considered by the Board is a draft, and the Board has not settled on a formal recommendation yet. The Board intends to accept public comment and then discuss the issue again at their next meeting before making a decision.

Chair Young asked how much of the overall general fund revenue is accounted for by property tax versus sales tax. Mr. Clements answered that property tax provides significantly more revenue to the City than sales tax. About \$11 million in property taxes are collected on an annual basis, and only \$4 million to \$5 million is collected through the sales tax. He explained that the City's property tax revenue growth is limited to one percent per year plus new construction. But if the economy is robust, the sales tax revenues grow three to five percent annually.

Board Member Dewhirst inquired about what would happen if the State were to create a sales tax equalization concept. Mr. Clements said there are a few proposals before the legislature related to the concept of sales tax source. With this concept, sales tax revenue would go to the point of sale. Purchases that are made via the internet would be credited to the jurisdiction where the purchaser lives. This type of proposal could result in \$300,000 to \$500,000 of additional sales tax revenue for the City annually, and this portion of sales tax is growing about 20 percent each year.

**Chris Fleck** said he is a business owner, property owner, citizen and taxpayer in the City of Edmonds and a member of the Chamber of Commerce. He said he feels some of the alternatives that have been proposed are misguided, discriminatory and probably illegal. He said he owns a building in the area that has been identified as the downtown retail core, and if the proposed changes were made, he would no longer be able to use his own building for his service business since only retail uses would be allowed. He suggested that requiring landlords in this area to rent only to retail compatible businesses is inappropriate. The commercial uses allowed on these properties should be determined by the market conditions. He said he owns a building that is located about 100 feet from the fountain, yet it remains empty. This indicates that there is no shortage of retail space in the downtown area. There is not a bidding war going on between retail and service businesses, but he said he wished there were.

**APPROVED**

Mr. Fleck said he believes he should be entitled to rent his property to anyone who has a legal business and let the market forces decide what businesses go where. If only retail uses are allowed to rent space in the area surrounding the fountain, Edmonds could end up a ghost town in the future. He noted that the current proposal would prohibit him from building a structure up to 33 feet in height that would have commercial space on the bottom with a minimum ceiling height of 12 feet and two floors of residential on the top, yet this would be allowed to occur just a few lots from his property. He suggested that the proposal was created with the intent of appeasing people who do not want to raise the heights. The proposal is a method of allowing developers to put up large structures while preserving the quaintness. Mr. Fleck said he believes that forcing a 12-foot minimum ceiling height while limiting the overall height to 30 feet would prohibit feasible redevelopment.

Mr. Fleck advised that a Supreme Court decision has been issued that says if a City takes away a use from a property owner, they must compensate for that taking. He suggested that the City is trying to take away his rights while offering to give more rights to his neighbors that are located just a few blocks away. He said his business is located on Fifth Avenue in a street level storefront with good exposure, signage and parking. Under the proposed guidelines, he would not be able to live in his building and use it for his service-oriented business. He questioned why the retail businesses should have more rights than service providers. If he chooses to pay the higher rent associated with this location, he should be able to locate a service business in the area. He noted that during the eight years he has operated a business in the area, many retail business have come and gone; yet he is still contributing to the economic vitality of the City. He asked that the Board encourage economic vitality in the whole City and not just one segment.

Mr. Fleck said a concern has been raised that allowing service businesses in the downtown retail core would keep people from walking from one side to the other. He suggested that limiting the area to retail uses only is not legal and discriminates against some businesses for the benefit of others. He said he has 500 tax clients and if his business were to move from its current location, the downtown would miss all of the business they receive from his clients.

Mr. Fleck questioned why the proposal identifies real estate offices as compatible with retail uses. He suggested that the only reason for doing this is to avoid ticking these business owners off. He pointed out that 75 percent of the Chamber of Commerce Members are service providers as opposed to retail business owners. The proposed plan would discriminate against ¾ of the businesses in the City. He suggested that a truly vital downtown is somewhere people can come and take care of all their needs in one area. In addition, the market needs and property owners should decide what the uses will be. Retail compatible uses should include any business that brings people to the area. People who patronize the service business are more likely to shop in the downtown because they have a reason to come to the area in the first place. He questioned why people should have to drive to another area to see a service provider just because the City adopts a plan that is designed to push the service businesses out of the downtown.

Lastly, Mr. Fleck referred to the 14<sup>th</sup> Amendment of the Constitution and suggested that the City's proposal would violate this amendment because it would deny him the same rights as his neighbor.

Board Member Freeman explained that she was one of the Board Members who supported the inclusion of realtor offices as retail-oriented businesses. She said people tend to enjoy being able to walk by these offices and see the properties that are being offered for sale. She emphasized that the Board's proposal to include realtor offices as a retail compatible use had nothing to do with realtors lobbying the Board.

**Bob Gregg, 16550 – 76<sup>th</sup> Avenue West**, said he is a resident, property owner and developer in the City of Edmonds. He commended the Planning Board for their process of updating the Comprehensive Plan and for seeking input from property owners, developers and private citizens. He also commended them for their willingness to seek independent, third party corroboration to separate opinion from fact and wishful thinking from economic reality. He said the Board was right to ask what ceiling heights best promote and support retail uses, and he agrees that 12 feet is a reasonable height for retail space. He suggested that Mr. Fleck's concerns regarding uses allowed are legitimate, but they could be addressed through the use process as opposed to the zoning process. A use variance option would be appropriate, but the City does not make provisions for this concept.

Mr. Gregg said the Board was right to ask what kinds of buildings could be built with a retail ground floor. As an experienced developer, he said he agrees with Heartland's quantitative financial analysis that is conclusive that three-story buildings are the minimum size for feasible development in the current BC zone.

Mr. Gregg commented that the Board was also right to ask what height a three-story building with a 12-foot ground floor needs to be. He said that considering the additional desire that the store front entries be at street grade, these requirements add between five and six feet to what has been built under the current 30-foot height code. He emphasized his belief, therefore, that a 33-foot building height would still not be sufficient to allow for the desired development. He suggested that the City obtain the services of a professional engineer to identify what the minimum height requirement would be in order to provide street level floor plates, a 12-foot ground floor ceiling height, and a total of three stories. He suggested that the more appropriate height limit would be 35 or 36 feet.

Mr. Gregg referred to the properties located along Main Street west of the fountain and pointed out that there are already buildings that are in the 40-foot range on Main Street east of Fifth Avenue that are considerably uphill from that portion of Main Street which is west of the fountain. This, and the fact that Main Street west of the fountain slopes fairly steeply to the west means that view blockage in this zone would not be an issue when talking about two or three additional feet. However, these additional feet would make all the difference in finally being able to build the kind of buildings Main Street needs to maintain its vitality over the coming decades.

Mr. Gregg stated that, far more than height, the Planning Board has correctly identified design as the primary cause for concern and attention. Architecturally separating the ground floor retail from the residential upper stories would provide far more real world benefit than using a laser to see exactly how tall a building is. In addition, providing awnings or canopies for street level weather protection would visually screen the upper floors. While he is not a fan of multi-level setbacks due to weather proofing problems, he asked the Board to remember that achieving the current 30-foot height requires an approved modulated building and/or roof design. He said that while he believes setbacks should be used as one option for design approval, they should not be mandated. However, he said he does believe that 12-foot ceiling heights for first floors should be a mandatory requirement. He suggested that the actual height for the properties located on Main Street west of the fountain should be a function of lot slope, 12-foot ground floor ceilings, three stories, and an approved design. However, if the City decides to establish a maximum height limit, it should be at least 36 feet.

Lastly, Mr. Gregg asked that the Board be careful with the terminology of "at grade" for the ground floor. Since Main Street slopes to the west, portions of the retail space will have to be above grade and some will have to be below grade. He referred to several businesses that provide good examples of this type of situation.

Chair Young reminded the public that the purpose of the public hearing is to solicit input regarding the proposed Downtown Waterfront Plan. Issues that are better addressed through the development code and design review can be dealt with after the Comprehensive Plan amendments have been adopted.

**Natalie Shippen, 1022 Euclid**, said that a lot of materials have been made available for the citizens to review regarding this issue, and she is not sure all of them were necessary. She suggested that some of the materials might have been provided to act as a diversion from what is really being considered. The basic questions a citizen must ask is what the Planning Board expects to accomplish and why and who would benefit. She said the bottom line is the Planning Board is being asked to raise the height limit in the BC zone. That is the beginning and the end of the discussion. She provided each of the Board members a map with the boundary of the BC zone outlined in black. She noted that the current height limit for this zone is 30 feet. Now the Board is considering an option that would break the current BC zone into ten districts. But the main thing they are considering is a height limit increase. If the proposal were adopted, the entire BC zoned area, with the exception of the area around the fountain, would have a 33-foot height limit. That is exactly what the public should know is being discussed. She said the results of the change in height limit would be drastic to the scale of all historic Edmonds. She expressed her opinion that the current height limit is too high.

Ms. Shippen referred to the Harbor Building that is located kitty corner from the Post Office and suggested that the Board Members imagine this same building, only two feet lower, being placed along Main Street. She emphasized that if the City wants to maintain the low profile, they would not adopt the proposed changes. She said the changes are being proposed as

necessary in order for the City to be economically viable. She questioned if Edmonds is economically unviable now. She referred to a recent article in the newspaper that said that Edmonds' taxable retail sales climbed three percent over the past year. The City is doing just as well financially as any other cities in the County and better than Bellevue.

Ms. Shippen said developers have complained about the vacant retail space that exists in the BC zone, but the consultants have indicated that there are few vacancies along Fifth Avenue and Main Street, and available space in key locations leases quickly. She said this information leads her to conclude that the retail market in Edmonds is healthy, but it is constrained within a few blocks of the fountain. The recent study indicated that there is poorly configured retail space located on the ground floor of some of the condominium developments, but no statistical data has been provided to indicate that these spaces are located within the BC zone. She said she would expect the City staff to provide a map showing the location of the vacant retail spaces that are located on the ground floor of condominium developments.

Ms. Shippen said the argument has also been made that one-story buildings are not economically viable. She listed numerous buildings that have been in Edmonds for many years. She noted that several buildings around the Edmonds and Lynnwood area have operated successfully as businesses in one-story buildings. She specifically noted that businesses such as Barnes and Noble, Old Navy, Best Buy and Linens N Things are all successful businesses in one-story buildings. In fact, she said two-story retail buildings are hard to find since one-story buildings can be and are economically viable for successful business uses.

Ms. Shippen referred to the issue of developers being unable to obtain financing if the first floor ceiling height requirement is changed to 12 feet, but the height limit is not increased. She said that before she would believe this to be true, the City or the developers would have to provide written documentation from lending institutions. She suggested that the real problem is that the changes would only address economic viability as it relates to developers. The merchants in Edmonds don't necessarily need two and three-story buildings. Developers have created substandard retail space, with two floors of condominium units above. It doesn't really matter if the retail space is marketable because the residential space provides the financial return to a developer. She suggested that the developers are holding the merchants and the residents hostage. Because merchants want to have viable retail space, the developers are telling the City that the height limit must be increased. The citizens don't want this to occur.

Ms. Shippen suggested that the Planning Board has a choice. They could dramatically change the scale of Edmonds to ensure the greatest return for the developers, or they could refuse to consider a height increase in the BC zone, while at the same time require a first floor building height minimum of 12 feet. The Board should consider other options such as the suggestions made by at least two consultants that retail commercial space be required on the first two floors of a building in the BC zone. Each of these floors could have a minimum height requirement of 12 to 15 feet.

Ms. Shippen recalled that a few meetings ago, in the course of cross examining the consultant, Board Member Dewhirst asked if there was any way for the consultant to determine which scenario would provide the greatest tax revenue to the City. The consultant answered that this was not part of their scope of work. She said she finds this interesting since she thought this was the goal of the study in the first place. The other consultant suggested that the City should encourage non-retail uses on the upper floors for the greatest return to the City, and that is what the Hyatt-Palma study said too. She said the economic analysis consultant also explained that an owner of a piece of property could renovate at about a 70 percent rate of return. Chair Young asked if someone could purchase the property and redevelop it with a favorable rate of return. The consultant answered that it would not be impossible, but the land would likely be priced in such a way that it would be difficult to purchase the property and redevelop it. The residential units that could be constructed on the upper level could provide the acceptable rate of return.

Ms. Shippen asked that the Board reconsider the concept of mixed-use development, since it does not appear to be working for Edmonds. She noted that Lynnwood does not use this concept, except for a small area around the college. She asked them to also consider not allowing residential development in the BC zone, or at least reduce it to one floor only. She suggested that perhaps some of the BC zoned properties should be rezoned to RM. In addition the retail space could be consolidated to allow more space for outright residential development. Ms. Shippen said she is not a key supporter of the concept of setbacks. She felt this concept results in a waste of land. Setbacks are being used in a campaign for a greater height limit. Ms. Shippen advised that the City has had a 30-foot height limit for 25 years. Residents approved this height

limit and they like it. Edmonds has grown substantially over the years, but there is no reason to change the height limit. Economic viability is good right now, and there is no argument to support a proposal to raise the height limit. The only people who would benefit are the developers.

**Ron Wambolt, 530 Dayton Street**, said he is a resident and a taxpayer of the City of Edmonds. He spoke in opposition of the proposal to raise the height limits. He said there is no reason to have building heights in excess of 30 feet. Builders do not need greater heights for their projects to be financially feasible. If higher ceiling heights are needed to make the first floor retail space feasible, he questioned why the developer of the project on Fifth Avenue added additional height to the upper floors but not the ground floor retail space. He said higher first floors are not needed to provide for restaurants because few people would buy high-priced condominiums that are located above restaurant businesses anyway. Just because Edmonds residents frequent the restaurants in Lynnwood does not mean there are too few restaurants in Edmonds. He pointed out that often, buildings are constructed at a greater height than 30 feet since the height is determined by averaging the four points of the building, and many properties in this area are sloped. Mr. Wambolt concluded by stating that the City does not need more commercial space. Developers are getting such poor returns of the existing commercial space because there is an overabundance at this time. Perhaps there needs to be a reduction in the area that is zoned commercial. He said that just zoning an area as commercial would not increase the demand for commercial properties.

**Sandy Eastly, 16858 – 76<sup>th</sup> Avenue**, said that as a realtor, she works with people who are interested in moving to the Puget Sound area from other areas of the country. People love Edmonds. There is something about the City's charm that she feels would be destroyed if the building height limits were raised. She said she spent her childhood in Kirkland, and it is really an ugly place now. She asked that the Board proceed with caution so that Edmonds can remain the lovely City that is it right now.

**Albert Dykes, 2850 Southwest Yancy, Seattle, 98126**, said he is the owner of the Edmonds Shopping Center at Sunset and Dayton. He said he is glad to see that the Planning Board is considering development options for both his site and the Harbor Square site. He referred to the Harbor Square site, where development of up to 45 feet in height is allowed under a contract rezone arrangement. He noted that at this time, development on his property is limited to 35 feet in height. Mr. Dykes said that under the current zoning, any redevelopment of the two sites would like be lot-line-to-lot-line, with flat roofs. The soil on these two sites would not allow underground parking to be constructed, and with a two-story height limit on his site, it is absolutely and completely unfeasible to redevelop it. He suggested that if the zoning standards are not changed for these two properties, it is likely that they will be turned into paid parking lots at the end of the useful life of the current developments. No one would be able to make money by redeveloping the sites without a degree of flexibility. He said he appreciates that the Board has at least opened their minds to possible solutions for these sites. He added that he could provide letters from financial institutions regarding the difficulty developers would have obtaining financing if the height limits are not changed.

Mr. Dykes pointed out that none of the great cities in the world could have been developed today under zoning controls. What makes a city the most interesting is the variety of development that has occurred over the many years, driven by market forces. However, in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century, cities have become enamored with over regulation. He said he is certain that residents of Edmonds 25 years ago thought they were taking action to preserve the idealistic small town atmosphere of Edmonds by imposing a 25-foot height limit, but the result has been lot-line-to-lot-line development with flat-topped roofs.

**Betty Mueller, 209 Casper Street**, said the Board has been very generous with their time and she does not need to speak further because she turned in a petition signed by 1,063 Edmonds residents who oppose the proposed height increases for downtown Edmonds.

**John Hayway, 1130 Fifth Avenue South**, questioned what is wrong with the current situation for downtown Edmonds. He suggested that the issue should be all about the quality of life they are trying to generate. The town has changed in the last ten years, but he really wants it to stay like it is. If developers have purchased property thinking they are going to be able to get additional height, that is not something the City needs to resolve. He questioned how the projected tax levy could be calculated based on space that is not expected to be occupied. There is no market available for additional retail space in Edmonds.

Mr. Hayway noted that very little has been said about the historical needs of the community, yet this is important. Modulated rooflines were never a definition in the architectural engineering classes he attended in college. He suggested that the City should stay with the current height limits and maintain the current image of Edmonds. The economic environment should be such that there is equal opportunity for both retail and service businesses. The City should grow in a manner that makes sense, and emphasize the historical value of Edmonds. They should find good examples to copy rather than recreating another Kirkland atmosphere.

**Stephen Bernheim, 216 Fifth Avenue North**, said his home is located along the street shown on the map as the “arts corridor.” He leases space for his business at 405 Bell Street. He reminded the Board that more than 1,000 residents have signed a petition saying that they want to retain the 25-foot height limit. It is apparent that this is important to the citizens of the City. The Board should listen to the citizens rather than developers who have purchased property at the low height limit and now want to build to a greater height. The citizens have rights, and the developers certainly do not have any vested right to change the zoning laws.

Mr. Bernheim said no one has mentioned that the commuter trains will be coming through Edmonds, and this will result in an increase in property values. Edmonds will become hugely accessible for commercial and residential development. He agreed that the proposed plan is a little over complicated and difficult to interpret. He also agreed that this could be a diversionary tactic to allow greater heights in Edmonds. He said he believes there should be more uniformity in the rules to allow people to express themselves through generally understood regulations rather than micromanaged subareas. For example, he questioned if the requirements for pedestrian cover would prohibit a property owner from planting trees along the sidewalk. He said he would rather get rained on and enjoy the trees than be covered by a canopy with planters underneath.

Mr. Bernheim said he believes that if the height limits are increased, the other valuable aspects of Edmonds would be destroyed, such as the environmental aesthetic location on the Sound. If they were to add a value of self-sufficiency for Edmonds, the plan would be different. The unilateral focus on economic development is perplexing to him, when the goal should be to keep the area open because of the City’s relationship to the Sound.

Mr. Bernheim pointed out that total build out of the downtown would only provide an additional \$469,000 in tax revenue to the City per year. That is only about \$10 per year per citizen. He suggested that instead of building out the downtown, perhaps the City could place a head tax on every person. This would be a better alternative than developing until the City is busting at the seams. In addition, Mr. Bernheim pointed out that no where was the added cost of infrastructure identified. He questioned what it would cost the City to provide the necessary infrastructure to accommodate the additional development. He suggested that any added revenue to the City would be absorbed by the increased infrastructure needs.

Mr. Bernheim said that when the Board considers the issue of property rights, they should keep in mind that there are people in the City who have purchased properties knowing the zoning map and trusting the City to protect their rights. He encouraged the Board to keep the height limits low throughout the downtown area and not just the area immediately surrounding the Fountain. That is what many citizens want.

**Norma Bruns, 960 Fifth Avenue South**, urged the Board to pay as much attention to citizen input as they do to the input provided by out of town consultants and developers. She reminded the Board of the petition that was submitted with over 1,000 names of citizens who are against the proposal to increase the height limit. She said a lot has been written in the proposed plans about all kinds of complicated zoning, when really it is just an effort to raise the building heights. She said the situation would be different if Edmonds were a crumbling town, but it is not. Edmonds is doing as well as most any other town in the area. She urged the Board to not make the proposed plans contingent on how much money an increased building height would make for developers.

**Larry Temple, 217 Fifth Avenue North**, referred to Mr. Chave’s comment that residential development is driving commercial development in the downtown. He questioned if the Board and staff are really analyzing why people are choosing to move to downtown Edmonds. He said his reason for moving to Edmonds two years ago was because of view and being able to walk to the businesses in the downtown area. When they purchased their condominium, they were concerned about height restrictions. They were told that nothing would be allowed to be built higher than the Floral Arts

Center, which is 30 feet in height. This would protect their view. Now they are hearing about the possibility of the City allowing buildings up to 33 feet in height, which is too high. Many people would lose their view and the value of their properties would decrease dramatically. The view is what makes people want to live in downtown Edmonds. He urged the Board not to recommend an increase to the height limit.

**Doug Dewer, 110 James Street,** said he believes the issues being considered by the Board are more related to flexibility than to an increase in the height limit. He said that if the height limit is changed, the City should make sure buildings would be limited to no more than three stories, with underground parking. He pointed out that the current regulations allow a developer to construct three floors and still meet the 30-foot height limit. However, this results in a nearly useless first floor commercial space. He referred to the mixed-use development that was constructed across from Petosa's and noted that the first floor retail space has never been rented. He reminded everyone that while many people tend to think of developers as evil, everyone lives in developments that were constructed by developers at some point in time. They are not all bad. There have been some good and beautiful buildings constructed in Edmonds. He suggested that developers, by and large, are fairly smart, and will figure out ways to build what will make economic sense. But more flexibility would result in better buildings as long as the City does not allow more than three stories.

**Rita Miller, 1047 Edmonds Street,** said she does not want to live anywhere else but Edmonds because it is the only place that appeals aesthetically to her. She also has a view of the Sound. She commended the Planning Department for their work and said she believes the issue is more than just related to height, although she is opposed to the proposed height limit increase. She said she is impressed that the Board has considered the needs of all of the different types of areas in the downtown. She said she hopes that the multi-family residential zones would retain their 25-foot height limit. She said she is worried that first the height limit was increased to 30 feet, then there was a proposal that it be 33 feet. Now they are even talking about an increase to 35 or 36 feet. She said she sees the height limit going down a slippery slope of ever-higher amounts. Ms. Miller said Edmonds is a unique, warm and inviting village rather than a city appearance. She would like the City to explore more options and consider more data than the static reports that have been conducted to date. If the City considers the option of going higher, she would like them to prepare some three-dimensional images to clearly identify what the impact to views and the aesthetic quality of Edmonds would be. The Sound is not the only unique feature; downtown Edmonds offers a view of the Olympic Mountains because the buildings are so low. Edmonds is not like Kirkland, and the citizens don't want a lifestyle change.

Ms. Miller said she believes developers can develop creative buildings with the current code regulations. She referred to the concept that is used in Seattle that allows artists to live in the rear portion of their shops, with their store space in front. She suggested that this would be a good use for the downtown area to fill up some of the dead commercial space. She concluded her comments by reminding the Board that the citizens of Edmonds rely on the City to provide a certain lifestyle and protect their rights. If this is taken away, the City could end up facing lawsuits.

**Joan Longstaff, 524 Main Street,** said she is a resident and real estate broker in the City of Edmonds. She started her business in 1971 at Magnolia Village, but she later moved to Edmonds because of the small town village on the water atmosphere. That is what her clients from across the country think when they visit Edmonds. It is a charming business village on the shores of Puget Sound. When people sell their homes they want to buy places to live on the water. They also enjoy being able to walk to restaurants, shops, the beach and the ferry. Edmonds has a very strong condominium market at this time, and it is this market that drives the residential community. Edmonds is a special community because the City listens to their citizens. She said she believes the current Planning Board is one of the finest she has seen in the City for the past 25 years. She appreciates all of the study and effort that has taken place on this project.

Ms. Longstaff said her business property was developed in 1890 by the town blacksmith. She said she would be concerned if someone were to propose to take down this house and replace it with an ugly box. She supports retail uses along the street level of Main Street. She pointed out that, as a real estate broker, she does not have a preference one way or another about whether real estate offices should be considered compatible with retail uses. She said that even though it would be more profitable for her to redevelop her property as a condominium, she doesn't want to do so. She said that over the years, she has worked hard to support the retailers in the downtown area. The service business operators have put a lot of time and energy into trying to support the retail businesses, too.

She noted that a group of property owners (Downtown Merchants Association) started meeting a year ago to come up with ideas that could really make a difference to the community. Edmonds offers a very special quality of life. While the City must listen to the concerns of the citizens, they must also listen to the ideas and concerns voiced by the retail community. The downtown merchants have done a fabulous job of working together to make Edmonds a place people want to visit and live in. She said she supports the proposed Downtown Waterfront Plan to have different downtown districts. Main Street should remain as retail. She said she also likes the idea of pulling development out to the street frontage. The proposed plan is on the right track, and a slight increase in the height limit would be appropriate. She said she appreciates the efforts of the Board, the staff and the community in working together to enhance the quality of life for everyone.

**Bruce Nichol森, 9829 Cherry Street,** said the statement that downtown Edmonds is currently economically viable is absolutely false. He said he has been a resident of Edmonds for 58 years, and has built two projects within the City. He said he could speak to the fact that the City needs to do something different. He recalled that from 1940 to 1980 the goal of the City was to become a type of bedroom community. Accordingly, real estate prices started to rise, and businesses moved out starting in the 1950's. He said that, years ago, a person would have been able to buy anything they needed right in Edmonds. But most of these essential businesses were forced out as a result of the significant increase in real estate land costs. He said any citizen who thinks the City is in good shape financially should review the City's budget when the fire and police protection and other City services must be cut in order to meet the budget restraints.

Mr. Nichol森 said he would like to stay in Edmonds, and his current home has a modest view of the Sound. His taxes are currently about \$7,000 per year, and he expects them to go up to \$10,000 within the next three years because property taxes provide the main source of City revenues. He said he believes the City should take advantage of every cent they can get. A very small portion of real estate tax comes back to the City, but most of the money collected from sales tax goes directly back to the community. He emphasized that it is important for the City to get the economic situation under control by making downtown Edmonds more economically viable.

Mr. Nichol森 said that if the proper spaces could be provided, businesses would come to Edmonds. But buildings that are 60 or 70 years old and have leaking roofs are not prime locations for retail businesses. Yet these are the only ones that are affordable right now. He pointed out that service businesses do not pay taxes that come back into the community. Even though they amount to 75 percent of the businesses in the City, they do not generate sales tax revenue. People have noted that Highway 99 should be used to generate the necessary sales tax, but he suggested this would not be a viable option.

Mr. Nichol森 advised that in the 1970's four high tech businesses moved out of the Edmonds area because it seemed that the City wanted to eliminate these types of businesses in order to become a bedroom community. If good retail space is developed in downtown Edmonds, with higher first floor ceilings, businesses would locate in the area. No one wants to rent the spaces that have low ceiling heights.

Mr. Nichol森 said a number of citizens alluded to the idea that one and two-story buildings could be successful in Edmonds, but in many situations the ownership goes way back. They might be viable in their current mode, but there is no way it would be economically feasible for a person to purchase a developed property under the existing codes. He said he constructed a five-unit condominium and sold the units in two weeks. He invested over a million dollars and received only a five percent return on his investment after two years. This is not healthy development. He said the office building he developed on Fifth Avenue has to be subsidized at 40 percent in order to potentially attract somebody into the space. In addition, the building is currently 40 percent vacant.

Mr. Nichol森 said he strongly supports the Planning Board's proposal to improve the economic health of downtown Edmonds. He said he is inclined to see the height limit set at whatever it takes to do a first floor retail space with a ceiling height of at least 12 feet, with two stories of condominiums above. Each floor must be constructed at an adequate height to make them attractive to potential buyers and tenants. He said he likes Edmonds and wants his assets to remain in the City, but he would not have chosen to develop in Edmonds if he had known how difficult it would be. He said the height limit should be at least 33 feet in order to accommodate viable future development. Perhaps even commercial space could be located on the second floor, with residential on the first if that is what the market demand is. He encouraged the Board to continue in the direction they are heading.

**Ruth Hayes-Arista, 18431 High Street**, said she is both a resident and a retail business operator in Edmonds. She said her business pays \$4,000 per year in property taxes, but it generates sales tax revenue of about \$2 million. She explained that she moved to Edmonds seven years ago because she liked the style and quality of the community. The notion of making space for what makes a healthy retail environment is not easy to embrace, but part of the reason her business and other businesses in the downtown are successful is because when they were large enough to grow there was space nearby that had more room. This is a result of the style of retail space in the downtown area. She said she could move somewhere else and find a much less expensive space for her business, but they wouldn't have the same amount of traffic or street appeal. She said the discussion related to design is important. Even a few feet of additional height in the retail space could make or break the situation.

Ms. Hayes-Arista said she is happy to be a part of the community and contribute in ways beyond running a business. She likes being a part of the quality of Edmonds. Being able to accommodate different enterprises in the first floor space is pretty important to the economic vitality of Edmonds. Edmonds can take a step forward by figuring out how to grow into kinds of developable properties that are conducive to the same street and neighborhood appeal that currently exists. She said that neighbor-to-neighbor businesses are vital to the community, including people living above the retail space.

**John Bissell, 8630 – 217<sup>th</sup> Street Southwest**, said he makes his living as a professional planning consultant. As he listened to the public testimony, he said he heard a lot of people talking about a belief that the City doesn't need more retail and residential space. He referred to the studies that were done to address this issue, which cannot be boiled down to just an increase in the height limit. More retail space creates a demand for more residential space, and vice versa. Although a petition in opposition to a greater height limit has been signed by 1,000 residents, the Board and City Council's job is to provide leadership. While it is a good idea to listen to the community, the Board and City Council must also address the future needs of the City.

Mr. Bissell said he has been troubled with the loss of historic identity in Edmonds with the condominiums that are being developed. He pointed out that the existing buildings that people find attractive have higher first floor ceiling heights than the current code requires. Only the new buildings have lower ceiling heights in the retail spaces. None of the new buildings have maintained the historic or pedestrian character that people want to see. A ceiling height requirement of 12 feet would be more in compliance with the historic character of Edmonds, would encourage retail uses, and would allow buildings with a pedestrian feel. He summarized that most retail business owners find 7½ foot ceiling heights uncomfortable, and Edmonds is losing their historic character. He said change would continue to happen in Edmonds and the Board's job is to plan for that change. If changes are not made, the City could end up with more boring storefronts that do not address the historic character. In addition, the City would be unable to maintain the economic vitality of their retail core.

Mr. Bissell said a lot of people have talked about the enormous change that is being proposed for building height. It is important to put this change into perspective. The proposal would only increase the existing building height by three feet. This would not block views nor destroy the character of Edmonds. But the change in building height would enable the City to retain its economic and historic character. He emphasized that when comparing Kirkland to Edmonds, it is important to understand that the height limits in Kirkland are 40 to 60 feet, so this would not be a rational comparison to make.

Mr. Bissell said the citizens have suggested that it might be illegal for the City to zone one person's property differently from another. However, he said this is not true. It is clear that properties can be regulated differently. If this couldn't be done, there would be no point in a zoning ordinance in the first place.

Mr. Bissell said it is important that everyone remember the recent changes that have occurred to take away the City's ability to tax for a revenue base. This is particularly troubling for Edmonds because it has been a bedroom community for the past 40 or 50 years. Some cities in Washington have had to unincorporate because property taxes were no longer enough to pay for the services that needed. There are some ideas being considered by the legislature now that might change this situation, but Cities must still consider options for collecting more tax revenue. There must be a positive retail sales climate in the City in order for it to be financially viable. Mr. Bissell said he has been a resident of the City for a number of years, and the City is an important place to him. He said he sees Edmonds as a great place to live, but if changes are not made to allow an economically viable downtown core, Edmonds will not remain a nice place to live. If there is not viable space for the retail shops, the character of Edmonds could be lost.

THE BOARD TOOK A TEN-MINUTE BREAK AT 8:30 P.M. THEY RECONVENED AT 8:40 P.M.

**Don Krieman, 24006 – 95<sup>th</sup> Place West**, said he found the public hearing to be amazing. The more people that are involved in the process and the more points of view that are expressed, the better decision the Board will be able to make. He said he knows the Board will craft a good document and provide the necessary leadership to move forward.

Mr. Krieman referred to the map that was prepared by staff to show the various downtown districts that are being proposed. He noted that in areas D.1, D.2 and D.3, commercial development is already limited to 30 feet in height. According to the Heartland LLC study, the demand for condominiums drives the demand for redevelopment. If developers are given options, they will create residential space rather than commercial space because it provides a better return. He provided pictures of businesses that are currently located along Fifth Avenue, Main Street and Dayton Street, which are main thoroughfares in the downtown area. He suggested that this is where the commercial district should be located. If the City were to allow any type of development to occur in these areas, the end result would be all residential, since that is what provides the greatest return.

Mr. Krieman said the Board has discussed the option of allowing residential uses on the ground floor, with a requirement that the first floor ceiling height be at least 12 feet so the space could be converted to commercial in the future. He said he does not believe this space would ever be converted to commercial once it is developed as residential.

Mr. Krieman said he liked the point made by Ms. Hayes-Arista that the downtown is not just buildings and streets. It is the people that go there to buy things and visit. These people don't come downtown to see the buildings, they come to enjoy the atmosphere. He asked that the Board not give developers an option to put residential units on the ground floor in the downtown core areas. He said he enjoys the atmosphere that exists in downtown Edmonds. He and his family plan to visit the downtown on Halloween night and have a good time. It is important for the City to save this atmosphere. He suggested that most of the retail spaces in the core downtown already have ceiling heights of at least 12 feet, and the same should be required for any new development. If this requires a slight modification in the total height limit for buildings in the downtown, the City should make this change, as well. He thanked the Board, the staff and the citizens of Edmonds for participating in the public hearing. He said this is how City government is supposed to work.

**Rowena Miller, 8711 – 182<sup>nd</sup> Place Southwest**, said that although she does not have a vested interest in what happens in the downtown area, she likes Edmonds and has been a resident since 1967. She said she doesn't like malls and big buildings. She likes the feel of Edmonds and wants to be able to go to all kinds of places. She likes the variety that Edmonds offers and dislikes the lot-line-to-lot-line massive buildings that have gone up in the last few years. Edmonds has enough of these. She said that since 1970, the City has conducted four or five studies, which all identified that Edmonds residents want to limit the buildings in the downtown to two stories and no more than 25 feet in height. She said she hopes the Board would honor the desires of the citizens.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Mr. Chave noted that the Board is scheduled to discuss this issue again at their November 10<sup>th</sup> meeting. If the Board feels they will be able to reach a conclusion at that meeting, they could schedule the final hearing for November 17<sup>th</sup>. He said he anticipates the Board will make some changes or adjustments to the proposal based on the public testimony. He also anticipates the Board will want to accept testimony on the final document before forwarding it to the City Council along with their recommendation for the entire Comprehensive Plan Update. He noted that the Downtown Waterfront Plan must also be updated to include the materials that were discussed earlier by the Board regarding the multi-modal transportation facility.

Board Member Dewhirst summarized that there was a lot of interesting testimony provided throughout the hearing, and he would like some time to think about all of the issues that were raised before he is asked to make a final decision. While they are getting closer to a final document, he said he is uncomfortable that they have not tied in the design aspect. While the design guidelines that have been forwarded to the City Council for consideration address a lot of the design issues, it is important for the Board to remember that they have still not been adopted by the City Council. Because of the City Council's inability to act on the design guidelines, Board Member Dewhirst suggested that the Board revisit some of the design aspects that are related to the Downtown Waterfront Plan and include them in the document just in case. Mr. Chave

**APPROVED**

agreed that would be appropriate. He reminded the Board that staff had already planned to provide a list of the objectives from the design guidelines and recommend that they be incorporated into the Downtown Waterfront Plan.

Board Member Dewhirst asked that staff provide a slope analysis of the downtown starting at 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue and north to the shoreline. This could be done on a block-by-block basis to help the Board understand what the slope changes are. He said this is one of the missing pieces that must be resolved before the Board could craft a final recommendation to the City Council.

Board Member Crim said he is still of the opinion that the Board should find some way to simplify the proposed document so that it is not so difficult to understand. However, he said he has no suggestions to provide at this time. If the Board decides to change the document further, they should move in the direction of simplifying it rather than making it more complicated.

Board Member Crim referred to the comments made by the public about the conflict between what the City wants in terms of building development and shape and what the use of the buildings can be. He reminded the Board that the study indicated that the uses allowed in the retail core should be retail or retail compatible. However, he said he is a little ambivalent about whether the City should legislate the use or let the market have a hand in this. Perhaps the Board should consider the idea of allowing service businesses, also. At any rate, he noted that there must be an opportunity for existing service uses to be grandfathered in.

Mr. Chave reviewed that on November 10<sup>th</sup> the Board would have a continued discussion about the Downtown Waterfront Plan. In addition, they would review the text changes that have been proposed for sections of the Comprehensive Plan. There are some updates that the Board still must consider, but they will not likely generate a high level of public interest. At the next meeting, the Board would review the design objectives and decide whether or not they should be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan, itself.

Chair Young inquired what would happen if the City doesn't have their Comprehensive Plan adopted by the end of December. Mr. Chave reminded the Board that the Comprehensive Plan can only be amended once a year. If the Board wants to take more time before making a recommendation to the City Council, the end result is that the City Council would not be able to act on their recommendation until January or February. That means the Comprehensive Plan Updates for 2005 would already be done, and the City's schedule for updating their Comprehensive Plan in the future would have to be adjusted. He said he would not anticipate a problem if the City was unable to meet the December 31<sup>st</sup> deadline. By the time anyone would be able to mount a challenge, the City would have the document completed. However, he would have a concern if the Comprehensive Plan adoption was delayed for longer than one or two months. If the Board feels they need some addition time in order to have a good product, he felt the City Council would be supportive of this request.

The Board discussed the option of separating their recommendation on the Comprehensive Plan amendments and holding off on the Downtown Waterfront until 2005. However, they agreed that it would be better to forward a recommendation on all elements of the Comprehensive Plan to the City Council at the same time. They asked Chair Young to contact the Mayor and the City Council President with a request that the Board be allowed a few more months to complete their review of the Comprehensive Plan updates. They felt this would be an appropriate action since the changes would have an impact on the City for a long time. The Board also agreed that the tentative hearing scheduled for November 17<sup>th</sup> should be postponed until December 8<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Chave pointed out that if the hearing were postponed, the City Council would not be able to adopt the final Comprehensive Plan update until at least January. Once again, the Board agreed that Chair Young should solicit input from the City Council President and the Mayor before the Board makes a final decision.

#### **PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS**

Chair Young thanked the Board for their willingness to listen to all of the public testimony regarding the Downtown Waterfront Plan.

**APPROVED**

**PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

Board Member Dewhirst reminded the Board of Snohomish County's request that they provide a representative to participate in a planning roundtable on November 3<sup>rd</sup> from 6:30 to 8:30 p.m. Board Members Cassutt and Dewhirst agreed to represent the Board at the meeting.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting was adjourned at 10:07 p.m.

**APPROVED**