

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
January 12, 2005

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
Judith Works
Cary Guenther
Don Henderson

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Jennifer Gerend, Economic Development
Director
Karin Noyes, Recorder

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER DEWHIRST MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 15, 2004 AS CORRECTED. BOARD MEMBER CRIM SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

There were no changes made to the proposed agenda.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Roger Hertrich, 1020 Puget Drive, expressed his concern about the procedure used by the Board for their review of the Comprehensive Plan amendments, particularly the public hearing the Board held on December 15th. He noted that Chair Young requested that staff draw up the Findings of Fact for approval of the amendments. In addition, several members of the Board expressed their desire to discuss certain issues with staff prior to the Board’s next discussion of the amendments. However, there was no Board discussion at the hearing about any of the issues that were raised by the public. He felt the public should have been included in all Board discussions about the proposed amendments. He also voiced his opinion that it is inappropriate for the Board to ask staff to draw up the Findings of Fact before they had held a discussion or made any decisions. He suggested that this should not occur until after the Board has reviewed all of the comments from the hearing, discussed the changes they felt were important, and then requested additional information from the staff. Any feedback and clarification from the staff should have been provided at the public hearing. He said he has reached the conclusion that the Board operated outside of the public’s view in their discussions with staff. Therefore, he urged the Board to consider holding another public hearing to allow the citizens an opportunity to discuss all of the new information, including the items put forth by the Port of Edmonds. He recommended that the staff’s response to the Board’s questions and the Port’s

questions should be funneled through the public hearing process, and the Board should not make any decisions until these problems have been addressed and an additional public hearing has been held.

Mr. Hertrich referred to the public notice that was sent out regarding the December 15th public hearing. He said he believes this notice was flawed in that it did not provide a clear explanation of the term “averaging.” He suggested that the public did not have a clear understanding of this term and the impacts it would have to the City. He said he believes the proposed averaging concept would allow for buildings up to six stories tall, and the real impacts were mis-advertised to the public. This is yet another point in support of another public hearing.

Mr. Hertrich advised that when the Board discussed changing the building heights to 33 feet, they did not discuss the formula that the City presently uses, which has been mandated by the court. At this time, the building height is 25 feet, plus an additional 5 feet for modulation. However, the proposed formula presented to the Board is based on the concept of building from the top down, with no definition related to the additional 5 feet that would be allowed for architectural roof designs, etc. But it is important to remember that this is part of the code today. The proposed height increase would actually increase from 25 feet to 33 feet, with no definition as to the type of roof that would be required. He concluded by stating that unless the Board wants the controversy to continue on to the City Council, they should reevaluate the process and do a better job of correcting the shortcomings of the proposed Downtown Waterfront Plan.

Sandy Eastly, 16858 – 76th Avenue West, referred to an article she found in the 2005 *GREATER SEATTLE INFORMATION GUIDE* regarding the City of Edmonds. She read the article, which stated that Edmonds had been voted “friendliest town in the region” for nine straight years. The article lists all of the things there are to do and enjoy in Edmonds, and invites people to visit. This indicates that Edmonds is doing a great job now. She concluded her remarks by stating that she enjoys living in Edmonds and that is one of the reasons she has attended the past few Planning Board Meetings.

Ron Wambolt, 530 Dayton Street, referred to the Board to an e-mail letter he sent to the staff, asking that it be distributed to each of the Board members. Chair Young indicated that each of the Board members received a copy of Mr. Wambolt’s e-mail correspondence.

John Bissell, Higa Burkholder Associates, 1721 Hewitt Avenue, Everett, referred the Board to a letter he sent them in response to two letters submitted by property owners on Sunset Avenue since the public hearing on December 15th. He said the two letters that were submitted stated reasons why the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments for the property on Sunset Avenue should not be approved. He said his major concern is that the photos that were provided appear to be misleading, and it is important for the Board to have straightforward evidence when considering the proposed change. He explained that the opponents of the change are concerned that a 25-foot height limit measured from the street would allow a new building to significantly obstruct the view from the properties on the other side of Sunset Avenue. The opponents attempted to illustrate the possible view obstruction by taking pictures using a 25-foot ladder. However, they did not take into account any vanishing points. In the picture submitted by the opponents it appears that an actual development would be allowed to be 6 to 10 feet taller than what would be allowed by the proposed change.

Mr. Bissell referred the Board to the technical plans he provided of a development that could be constructed on the subject properties on Sunset Avenue. The plans are within a foot of what would be allowed under the concept of the four corners being averaged to determine the maximum height limit. The proposed amendment would measure the height from the elevation at the curb. The technical plans represent a building that would be similar to what already exists to the south. It would certainly block some view, but not anything like what is suggested in the illustration submitted by the opponents.

Alan Young, 111 Main Street, said he is one of the individuals who submitted the illustration related to the properties on Sunset Avenue. He apologized for not being as sophisticated in their work, but said the photos were done on the spur of the moment to demonstrate the impact a 25-foot height limit would have on the neighboring properties if measured from the street level. He explained that 85 percent of the subject property is sloped, with the north side 20 feet below the street level and the south side 15 feet below the street level. If the City allows the property owner of the subject properties to measure the height from the street level, the impact to the property owners on the other side of the street would be significant. In addition, he noted that the proposal would reduce the front setback from 20 feet to 5 feet, which would have a dramatic

impact to the properties on the other side of Sunset Avenue. He noted that both of the buildings on the north and south side of the subject property are set back 20 feet from Sunset Avenue, but the new building would only have to be set back 5 feet from the curb. He questioned how this change would benefit the property owners along Sunset Avenue.

Mr. Young summarized that it appears the City is bending backwards to accommodate the needs of this one property owner when the proposed change would have a negative impact on all of the residential property owners across the street. If the City were to measure the height by averaging the four corners of the property, their concerns could be addressed. If the lots were combined, the view corridor would be lost. He said he feels the proposed change has been railroaded down the neighbor's throats and it appears that decisions have been made without the property owners in the area really understanding what the changes would be.

CONTINUED DISCUSSION AND DELIBERATIONS ON 2004 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN CHANGES (FILE NUMBER CDC-04-23) AND AMENDMENTS TO THE DOWNTOWN WATERFRONT PLAN (FILE NUMBER CDC-04-25)

Chair Young clarified that the Findings of Fact and Conclusions are being presented to the Board for the first time. He emphasized that the Board has made no decisions.

Chair Young also emphasized that no decisions related to the properties on Sunset Avenue have been made by the Board, either. However, he pointed out that the Board is not considering a specific project application, but building policies for that particular piece of property. The Board's discussions will not be about the type of building that might be developed on the site. However, he said he appreciates the neighbors bringing to the Board's attention the fact that the proposed change would call for a new method for measuring the height of a building on the site.

Chair Young explained that the Board is not finished with their review of the proposed Comprehensive Plan changes, and they intend to discuss the issues that were raised by the public. Mr. Chave added that the City Council would likely hold at least two additional public hearings: one that would focus on the Downtown Waterfront Plan and one that would focus on the rest of the Comprehensive Plan amendments. He suggested that most of the Board's discussion would center around the Downtown Waterfront Plan, so it might make sense to try and deal with the rest of the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments first and reach a consensus. Then the Board could focus their remaining discussion on the Downtown Waterfront Plan issues. The Board agreed that this would be the best approach.

2004 Comprehensive Plan Changes

Mr. Chave referred the Board to the letter that was received from the Department of Community Trade and Economic Development (CTED). He explained that CTED reviewed the City's draft Comprehensive Plan amendments as required by State law before adoption. CTED provided a few technical suggestions. One was that the City should include a summary of the public participation involved in developing the Comprehensive Plan update. They also suggested that an additional Growth Management Act goal be listed related to the Shoreline Management Act and that the Shoreline Management Plan be referenced in the section titled "Elements Adopted." Mr. Chave advised that staff prepared a letter of response indicating how each of CTED's suggestions could be accommodated. He further advised that CTED made note of the fact that Edmonds is meeting their population target requirement, which is documented in the Plan. In addition, they indicated their support of the analysis that went into the large lot critical areas work.

Board Member Freeman referred to the diagram on Page 45 of the draft document and suggested that the street that is located by the "Hospital Community and Family Retail Center" be identified as 220th Street. The remainder of the Board agreed. Board Member Freeman also referred to Item E.4 on Page 57 and Item F-3 on Page 58. She suggested that the word "available" in Item F-3 should be changed to "feasible" so that it is consistent with Item E.4. The remainder of the Board concurred.

APPROVED

Next, Board Member Freeman referred to Item C.13.d on Page 76 and Item D.2.d on Page 77. She noted that the word “site” should be inserted between the words “their” and “by.” She also questioned the impact to uphill properties if this concept were applied to buildings located on steep slopes. She said she is concerned that this concept could have unfavorable repercussions for adjoining properties. Mr. Chave answered that this objective would not override the way heights are currently calculated in the City. He also noted that it would not apply to the downtown area. The intent is to use this objective to encourage people to move the massing away from the street instead of grouping the entire building into one big block. However, any building would still be restricted by the City’s overall method for calculating height.

Board Member Freeman noted that while this objective could help prevent situations of large massing, it could allow a greater height on the uphill side than what would be allowed by the current method. Mr. Chave said his interpretation of the objective is that if a building proposal could meet the letter of the method identified in the code, it would encourage a developer to step back the building on one side. It would not allow a building to have additional stories than what the building code currently allows.

Board Member Freeman agreed that, in many cases, the objective would result in a better building. But there could be unfavorable results on the uphill side, and there would be no safeguards in place to protect the adjacent property owners. Mr. Chave suggested that rather than including this concept as a design objective, it could be more of a policy or goal to encourage people to reduce the massing of buildings on the downhill side. Another option would be to simply take this item out of the Comprehensive Plan. The Board agreed to change the word “allow” to “explore” in Item D.2.d.

Board Member Freeman referred to Item F.4.d on Page 86, which relates to the siting of essential public facilities. She requested that staff provide further clarification. Mr. Chave said this item refers to a number of different things, such as being consistent with how other similar essential public facilities are sited. It would require the City to consider how a proposed essential public facility would relate to other essential public facilities that are currently in the vicinity. Board Member Freeman suggested that the word “consistent” could be interpreted to mean that if there were already one type of essential public facility in an area, then another essential public facility of the same type would be okay.

Board Member Henderson suggested that perhaps Item F.4.d should be deleted from the document. Mr. Chave expressed his concern that it is important for the City to evaluate how other essential public facilities are sited and the criteria that is used. For example, there are several essential public facilities on the waterfront, and before another one is put in, the City must identify the impacts to make sure it is consistent with the facilities that already exist.

The Board agreed to change Item F.4.d to read, “its location criteria is compatible with the siting of other essential public facilities.” Mr. Chave said he would seek feedback from the City Attorney as to whether this change would meet the City’s intent or not.

Mr. Chave suggested that the Board break their recommendation into parts since the hearings at the City Council level would be done separately. The Board could make a recommendation for the 2004 Comprehensive Plan changes and a separate recommendation for those elements associated with the Downtown Waterfront Plan. He referred the Board members to the green memorandums from staff related to previous amendments that were reviewed by the Board. The applicants for these two amendments are Hans Lammersdorf and Gaston Enterprises LLC. The memorandums outline the Planning Board’s previous recommendation for each. He advised that both of the amendments would be included as part of the Board’s overall recommendation on the 2004 Comprehensive Plan changes.

Board Member Dewhirst recalled that the Board held a couple of public hearings regarding the Highway 99 Corridor. They also held a public hearing on the issue of separating the large lots into Urban 1 and Urban 2 zones, and they recently received validation from the State that this approach was good. The impacted property owners appear to have a “wait and see” attitude in that the Board promised that the first work of the new year would be to come up with a new zoning district to satisfy their concerns. He summarized that most of the changes were not significant and were intended to update changes in the law, the regulations, numbers, service, etc.

BASED ON THE FACT THAT IT MEETS THE FOUR CRITERIA STATED IN THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, BOARD MEMBER DEWHIRST MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION OF

APPROVED

APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL OF ALL ELEMENTS OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS AND ASSOCIATED GUIDELINES AS IDENTIFIED IN THE DRAFT DATED JANUARY 12, 2005, EXCLUDING THE SECTIONS RELATED TO THE DOWNTOWN WATERFRONT PLAN. BOARD MEMBER WORKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Board Member Henderson expressed his concern about approving the draft 2004 Comprehensive Plan Amendment Document, but excluding certain sections that relate to the Downtown Waterfront Plan. He said he does not feel this would be the best approach. Chair Young explained that approval of the motion would enable the City Council to start their deliberations on the other elements of the Comprehensive Plan while the Board continues to work on the Downtown Waterfront Activity Center. Mr. Chave further explained that, once this action has been completed, the Board could begin their discussion of Pages 25-42, which relate to the Downtown Waterfront Activity Center. Board Member Henderson suggested that the page numbers of the Downtown Waterfront Plan sections should be identified as part of the motion.

BOARD MEMBER DEWHIRST AMENDED HIS MOTION TO ADD “IDENTIFIED IN PAGES 25-42.” BOARD MEMBER WORKS AGREED TO THE AMENDMENT. THE AMENDED MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Downtown Waterfront Activity Center Plan

Mr. Chave advised that Roger Hertrich filed a request for records with the City for all correspondence that has taken place between the Board and staff since the last public hearing. Three memorandums were received from Board members, and staff has provided copies of each of these, along with the staff’s response, to Mr. Hertrich. There has been no other communications between the staff and Planning Board. Mr. Chave referred the Board to Attachment 2, which is the staff’s response to questions raised by the Board. Attachment 3 is the staff’s response to questions raised by the Port of Edmonds.

Board Member Dewhirst suggested that the Board begin their discussion of the Downtown Waterfront Activity Center Plan by focusing on the proposed Planned Residential Office Designation that is being considered for two properties located on Sunset Avenue. He noted that a number of residents provided comments at the public hearing, and he said he understands their concerns. It appears that the neighbors are not really against the properties being developed for some type of residential office use, but they are concerned they be treated as any other parcel in the City would be treated, particularly when calculating the height limit. He said he has reviewed the various methods used by cities to calculate height and he has also reviewed the resulting impact of each method. He pointed out that the current code regulations would not allow a building to be constructed on the site that is 25 feet above the street level.

Board Member Dewhirst said that while the subject property is a difficult site, it is important to remember that the property owners across the street have some expectations as to what can be developed on the subject properties in the future. He said he agrees with the proposed Planned Residential Office Designation, but he does not agree with the proposal to measure the height from the mid point on Sunset Avenue. He felt the height should be measured the same as it is measured on any other property in the City. He suggested that the height limit for the subject properties be limited to only 25 feet, he also suggested that the words “above street/sidewalk level” be deleted from the second to the last paragraph on Page 37. The front setback should be 20 feet and the side setbacks 10 feet.

Alan Young advised that he owns property at the corner of Sunset Avenue and Bell Street. Right now, his property is zoned RS-6, with a 20-foot setback required on both Bell Street and Sunset Avenue. Board Member Dewhirst clarified that he is proposing that the side setback requirement be 10 feet, but that the front setback requirement remain at 20 feet.

Board Member Works requested further clarification from Board Member Dewhirst as to why he is proposing a 10-foot side setback when the RS-6 zone only requires 5 feet. Board Member Dewhirst answered that the City is offering a land use benefit to the property owners, and they have the ability to gain some benefit for the City through additional view corridors.

John Bissell clarified that in the sample design submittal he provided to the Board, he assumed that an additional 5 feet of height would be allowed if a pitched roof were provided. He explained that the document was prepared several months ago with the assumption that the Board was considering a proposal to change the zoning on the property to BC, and this would

APPROVED

have allowed an additional 5 feet for a pitched roof design. The attachments were prepared for their earlier presentation with height being calculated from the four corners of the proposed building. He advised that if the land use designation were changed to allow office uses to occur on the site, but the zoning regulations require residential setbacks or greater, the properties would not likely develop in the future because it would be too expensive to get a driveway to the useable area that would have to be located below street level. He suggested that the issue then becomes a matter of economics.

Board Member Young reminded the public that the Board has a policy that everyone be treated equally when it comes to calculating building heights, and that is what Board Member Dewhirst is trying to promote. If there were some overriding economic development policy that would cause the Board to rethink this policy, they would like to hear about it. But Comprehensive Planning is not a matter of addressing all of the needs of someone who wants to develop the site. Mr. Chave summarized that Mr. Bissell stated a correct point of fact related to his attachment, but if the Board wishes to get into open testimony with the public, they would have to re-advertise the public hearing and open it for the rest of the public to participate, as well. He reminded the Board and public that the issue would go before the City Council, and everyone would have an opportunity to introduce information at that time. Any new economic factors or other issues could be raised, as well.

Board Member Crim questioned if it would be appropriate to require a 10-foot side setback for the two properties, when other RS-6 zoned properties in the vicinity require only 5 feet. He suggested that if the front setback is required to be 20 feet, then perhaps the side setbacks should be 5-feet instead of 10 feet. Board Member Freeman said she would support a proposal that would require a 5-foot side setback, as long as the 20-foot front setback is maintained. Board Member Works also agreed.

Board Member Crim agreed with Board Member Dewhirst that the height should be calculated the same as other properties. Board Member Henderson agreed. He said another option would be to reduce the front setback to 10 feet and then require a 10-foot side setback, as well. This would help preserve the view corridors. Board Member Freeman agreed that perhaps the front setback could be reduced to some extent, but the building height should still be calculated using the same method that is used for other properties in the City.

Board Member Dewhirst noted that in order for a building proposal to go forward for the subject property, a zoning ordinance would have to be adopted by the City. Figures for setback requirements do not typically appear in the Comprehensive Plan, and he questioned if it would be more appropriate to just identify the maximum height limit of 25 feet and then address the setbacks as part of the future zoning ordinance. The Board does not need to come up with specific zoning numbers now. They could wait until more specific information is available during the rezone action. Mr. Chave agreed, and noted that the Comprehensive Plan should specify the height limit, the mix of uses that should be allowed, and what the view corridor expectations should be. But the setbacks do not need to be identified at this point.

BOARD MEMBER FREEMAN MOVED THAT THE FOURTH PARAGRAPH ON PAGE 37 OF THE DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DATED JANUARY 12, 2005, BE MODIFIED BY DELETING ALL VERBIAGE AFTER THE WORDS "25 FEET." BOARD MEMBER CRIM SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Board Member Crim referred to the Conclusions document that was prepared by the staff for the Downtown Waterfront Activity Center Plan and suggested that the following language be added to the section related to the Fountain Square, "Edmonds is an arts oriented town with many pieces of art such as the fountain, which is located at Fifth and Main Streets. It is the Board's desire to preserve the scale around the fountain and ensure compatible commercial development. The Board believes that restricting building heights to 30 feet and increasing the first floor height requirement to 12 feet would be a reasonable compromise."

Chair Young said he would support Board Member Crim's suggestion. However, he questioned if there would be an issue in the future if the City were to limit the height in the fountain area to 30 feet while allowing 33 feet in other areas of the downtown. Mr. Chave answered that there are various land use and zoning designations throughout the City, and different bulk standards apply to each. He did not anticipate this being an issue in the future.

The Board agreed that Board Member Crim's proposed language should be incorporated into the Conclusions document as Item H.

Board Member Dewhirst referred to the area identified as the "Historic Center" on the diagram found on Page 30. He noted that the pedestrian connections demonstrate the uniqueness of this area. However, since the community just passed a Historic Preservation Ordinance, perhaps they could also identify other reasons why this area is special and why it should not change. If the height limits were not changed, property owners would still maintain a reasonable use of their land. Board Member Crim suggested that the conclusions related to the Fountain Square Area should make reference to the historic nature of the area. Mr. Chave suggested that "historic" could be mentioned in the Fountain Square section on Page 35. The Board agreed.

The Board discussed whether the height limit identified in the Fountain Square section should be 30 feet or if it should be 25 feet, plus an additional 5 for a modulated design. Mr. Chave pointed out that the City Council is currently discussing this issue, and whatever they decide could have an impact on this section.

BOARD MEMBER CRIM MOVED THAT THE FIRST TWO LINES OF THE FOUNTAIN SQUARE SECTION ON PAGE 35 OF THE DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DOCUMENT DATED JANUARY 12, 2005 SHOULD BE CHANGED TO READ, "THE AREA IMMEDIATELY SURROUNDING THE FOUNTAIN AT 5TH AND MAIN IS CONSIDERED THE HISTORIC CENTER OF EDMONDS AND BUILDING HEIGHTS ARE LIMITED TO 30 FEET, WITH THE . . ." BOARD MEMBER FREEMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 4-3, WITH BOARD MEMBERS GUENTHER, WORKS, CRIM AND FREEMAN VOTING IN FAVOR AND BOARD MEMBERS DEWHIRST, CASSUTT AND CHAIR YOUNG VOTING IN OPPOSITION.

THE BOARD TOOK A BREAK AT 8:50 P.M. THEY RECONVENED THE MEETING AT 9:02 P.M.

Mr. Chave referred the Board to the language that was provided on Page 36 in the section titled, "Downtown Master Plan." He explained that the notion of averaging building height came out of the Heartland Study recommendations. He recalled that Mr. Dykes, the owner of the Edmonds Shopping Center Property, pointed out that below grade development is not possible on properties closer to the waterfront because of the soil conditions. The Heartland Study indicated that there was a very low probability of redevelopment of these properties, but the situation could be improved if building height averaging was allowed, with lower building heights along the streets and in the view corridors. Buildings of greater height could be located in the shadow of taller buildings and would not interfere with someone else's view. He advised that the proposed language would set up the option for height averaging to occur, but it would not be specific about building heights for the sites. A master plan would have to be presented to the City for consideration, and this review process would be similar to that used for the Point Edwards site where public hearings and design review was done.

Mr. Chave said that if the Board is worried about the concept of height averaging for these properties, they could set a maximum percentage of the site that could be devoted to higher buildings, or they could set a maximum height limit. But the more specific they get in the Comprehensive Plan, the more danger there could be of precluding something they would ultimately like to approve.

Board Member Freeman said she does not like the idea of tying additional height to the presence of taller buildings. Any master plan brought before the City for consideration should stand on its own merit. However, she is in favor of maintaining flexibility for the City to vary the heights as part of a master plan proposal.

Board Member Freeman referred to Mr. Dyke's letter dated January 8th regarding the current uphill property owners having to look down hill on the mechanical equipment on the existing buildings. She reminded the Board that new development is currently taking place on the old Unocal property, and with the new Edmonds Crossing Project an overpass will be required 40 feet above the railroad tracks. The people using this overpass will have a direct view down onto the properties identified for master plan development. Roof treatment will be important and that is another reason to provide flexibility in regard to building heights. She concluded her opinion that this section of the Comprehensive Plan should remain flexible, but the City must justify different heights on the merits of the proposed development without tying it to taller buildings that already exist

APPROVED

on the waterfront. Mr. Chave advised that another reason to allow flexibility in regards to height is the fact that these properties are situated at the bottom of the bowl area.

Board Member Freeman suggested that future developers of the master plan sites should be required to provide 3-dimensional models of any redevelopment plans. This would help eliminate opposition to the concept of height averaging. Chair Young agreed but suggested that this would be more of a design guideline issue that could be addressed during the zoning ordinance process.

Board Member Guenther briefly described two situations his office is currently working on in Bellevue. In these two proposed developments, there are low town house structures around the perimeter, with taller condominiums located within the interior of the property. While Bellevue is on a different scale than Edmonds, the concept is similar. He suggested that the language should include the concept of locating the lower development around the exterior of the site, with increased heights for the interior buildings.

Board Member Cassutt pointed out that there are many different scenarios for this property. The Board discussed whether it would be appropriate to limit the height or the number of stories allowed. Board Member Cassutt felt it would be inappropriate to make this type of decision before a master plan has been proposed for the sites. Board Member Guenther disagreed. He felt it would be best to identify the design intent so that potential developers would have a clear understanding of the parameters the City would allow.

Mr. Chave pointed out that the current height limit for the Harbor Square property is two stories. Board Member Dewhirst suggested that the height limit for any future master plans should be the same. Mr. Chave expressed the importance of providing flexibility on one hand and describing the maximum that should be allowed on the other hand, which is difficult to do without a lot of information to work with. Mr. Chave recalled that the Heartland Study recommended one and two-story buildings along the street front, with four to five-story buildings allowed on a minority of the interior. He emphasized that the taller buildings should only be allowed on a minor portion of the interior of the site.

The Board agreed that the issue of maximum height would be better addressed when the zoning district for the Downtown Master Plan Area is created.

BOARD MEMBER CRIM MOVED THAT THE THIRD PARAGRAPH ON PAGE 36 OF THE DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN DOCUMENT DATED JANUARY 12, 2005 BE CHANGED TO READ, “. . . APPROPRIATE FOR DESIGN DRIVEN MASTER PLANNED DEVELOPMENT WHICH PROVIDES FOR A MIX OF USES AND TAKES ADVANTAGE OF ITS STRATEGIC LOCATION BETWEEN THE WATERFRONT AND DOWNTOWN. THE LOCATION OF EXISTING TALLER BUILDINGS ON THE WATERFRONT, AND THE SITES SITUATION AT THE BOTTOM OF “THE BOWL,” COULD ENABLE A DESIGN THAT PROVIDES FOR HIGHER BUILDINGS OUTSIDE CURRENT VIEW CORRIDORS. ANY REDEVELOPMENT. . .” BOARD MEMBER WORKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Mr. Chave suggested that one option would be for the Board to sponsor a design charette as part of the zoning process to develop some parameters for height.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Board Member Dewhirst referred to Item D under the Section titled, “Building Entry Location.” He noted that at the December 15th public hearing, several people stated the importance of having the main retail floor at the same elevation as the entrance. He questioned if this should be a requirement in the design guidelines. Mr. Chave answered that if the street front were level, this type of requirement would be effective, but it could be problematic if the street grade is not level. Chair Young suggested that as long as a proposed entry meets all of the criteria listed in this section (active, safe and lively street edge; pedestrian friendly environment; provides outdoor active spaces at the entry to retail/commercial uses; and easily recognizable and oriented to the pedestrian streetscape), it should not be required to be located at sidewalk grade. Board Member Crim suggested that perhaps this section could state that it is desirable, but not that it is required. Mr. Chave agreed

APPROVED

that the ideal situation would have the commercial entrance at grade level, but flexibility should be allowed to address situations where this is not possible. The Board agreed that no changes were necessary for this section.

Board Member Dewhirst referred to the staff's response to issues raised by the Port of Edmonds. He said he is confused about the Port's concerns related to bus traffic on Admiral Way. Mr. Chave explained that part of the Port's concern is historic, and they feel that too much bus traffic with awkward turning movements would be a hazard. However, he pointed that Mr. Clifton has indicated that this issue would be best dealt with during the EIS process. He suggested that the current language remain in the Comprehensive Plan, and that the Port and City staff work to resolve the issues of concern. Board Member Henderson said that while visiting the waterfront in May, he noticed eight school buses parked along Admiral Way. It was clear to him that buses can easily be accommodated.

Board Member Freeman referred to the section titled "Downtown Mixed Residential" on Page 36 and questioned why the City would be concerned about weather protection for residential buildings. Board Member Crim recalled that the rationale for requiring weather protection was to connect the pedestrian access throughout the area. Board Member Freeman suggested that this type of requirement could have an impact on residents of the units who don't want to have the sunlight blocked from their windows by an awning. The remainder of the Board agreed.

BOARD MEMBER FREEMAN MOVED THAT THE "DOWNTOWN MIXED RESIDENTIAL" SECTION ON PAGE 36 OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE DOCUMENT DATED JANUARY 12, 2005 BE CHANGED TO READ, ". . . ONE-FOOT-OF-HEIGHT-FOR-ONE-FOOT-OF-SETBACK TRADEOFF WOULD STILL APPLY THE SAME AS IN THE DOWNTOWN COMMERCIAL DISTRICT. BUILDINGS FACING THE DAYTON STREET CORRIDOR SHOULD PROVIDE A PEDESTRIAN-FRIENDLY STREETScape, PROVIDING PEDESTRIAN AMENITIES AND DIFFERENTIATING THE GROUND FLOOR FROM UPPER BUILDING LEVELS. BOARD MEMBER CASSUTT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BOARD MEMBER FREEMAN MOVED THAT ITEM E.11 ON PAGE 34 OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE DOCUMENT DATED JANUARY 12, 2005 BE CHANGED BY ADDING THE WORDS, "AND THE LARGER EDMONDS COMMUNITY" AFTER THE WORD "RESIDENT" AND BEFORE THE ",". BOARD MEMBER CASSUTT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Board Member Guenther referred to Item F on the Conclusion document that was prepared by the staff. He noted that there is nothing in the list that references parking. Mr. Chave suggested that a reference could be made to the Downtown Parking Study.

BOARD MEMBER FREEMAN MOVED THAT AN ADDITIONAL BULLET BE ADDED TO CONCLUSION F AS FOLLOWS, "PROVIDE PARKING WHICH PROMOTES PEDESTRIAN ACTIVITIES." BOARD MEMBER CRIM SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Board Member Freeman advised that the lettering on Page 2 of the Findings of Fact should be reorganized to be consecutive.

Board Member Crim referred to the last sentence of Conclusion A, and suggested that some rewording is necessary to make it clear. Mr. Chave explained that the level of commercial development was fairly steady in the 1990's, but residential development increased substantially. He recalled that an early concern was raised that mixed-use development occurred in the downtown at the expense of commercial development, but studies show that is not the case. The level of new commercial square footage did not decline. The Board agreed to delete the last sentence of Conclusion A.

Board Member Guenther asked that the word "les" be changed to "less" in the second bullet in Item C of the conclusion document.

BOARD MEMBER CRIM MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD TO THE CITY COUNCIL THE DOWNTOWN WATERFRONT PLAN SECTION OF THE DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE DATED JANUARY 12, 2005 AS AMENDED BY THE BOARD WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL BASED

APPROVED

ON THE FACT THAT IT MEETS THE FOUR CRITERIA STATED IN THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN. BOARD MEMBER FREEMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ELECTION OF 2005 PLANNING BOARD OFFICERS

BOARD MEMBER FREEMAN MOVED THAT BOARD MEMBER YOUNG BE ELECTED TO SERVE A SECOND TERM AS BOARD CHAIR. BOARD MEMBER CASSUTT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, WITH BOARD MEMBER YOUNG ABSTAINING.

BOARD MEMBER WORKS MOVED THAT BOARD MEMBER FREEMAN BE ELECTED TO SERVE A SECOND TERM AS BOARD VICE-CHAIR. BOARD MEMBER CASSUTT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, WITH BOARD MEMBER FREEMAN ABSTAINING.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Mr. Chave referred the Board to the third page of the extended agenda, which lists all of the issues that are on the Board's plate for 2005. He advised that at the next meeting, the Board would receive a report from the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Department and a report from the Edmonds Skate Park Work Group. Staff would also review an outline of the draft code amendments for ECDC Title 20, which is related to the procedures for staff, Hearing Examiner, Planning Board and City Council decisions. Staff may also have a draft of the RS-10 zoning regulations for the Board's review at their next meeting.

Mr. Chave said that sometime in the near future, the City Attorney would speak to them regarding the essential public facilities and methadone treatment facilities regulations, which are scheduled for review by the Board in 2005.

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 viewed the entire videotape from the December 15th public hearing, and he was impressed by the quality of the comments that were provided.

Board Member Dewhirst announced that Sound Transit is holding a series of open houses on the draft Environmental Impact Statement for the long-term plan update. One is scheduled in Lynnwood on January 18th from 5:00 to 8:00 p.m. Others are scheduled in Shoreline on January 13th and in Everett on January 20th. He advised that interested Board Members could contact him for more information.

ADJOURNMENT

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 10:11 P.M.

APPROVED