

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
October 11, 2006**

Chair Freeman called the regular meeting of the Planning Board to order at 7:04 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Public Safety Complex, 250 – 5th Avenue North.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Janice Freeman, Chair
John Dewhirst, Vice Chair
Cary Guenther
Jim Young
Don Henderson
Judith Works

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Dave Gebert, City Engineer
Don Fiene, Assistant City Engineer
Karin Noyes, Recorder

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Virginia Cassutt

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

VICE CHAIR DEWHIRST MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 27, 2006 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER YOUNG SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, WITH BOARD MEMBERS HENDERSON AND WORKS ABSTAINING.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

No changes were made to the agenda.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

There was no one in the audience who expressed a desire to address the Board during this portion of the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING ON SANITARY SEWER COMPREHENSIVE PLAN 2006 (FILE NUMBER AMD-06-1)

Don Fiene, Assistant Engineer, advised that the Growth Management Act requires the City to complete a comprehensive examination of their existing sanitary sewage conveyance system. The goal of the review is to identify problems for the system, ensure the City is in compliance with Federal and State laws, and identify and prioritize projects and other actions to meet these objectives.

Mr. Fiene provided a map to illustrate the City's current system and noted that there are certain areas within the City limits that are within the Olympic View Water and Sewer District. He recalled that when he presented the preliminary draft of the plan, Vice Chair Dewhirst requested information regarding the systems current capacity and whether the City had sufficient

capacity for treatment in the future. The Department of Ecology also requested this information. As a result, additional information was added to the document to identify the City's current agreement with Lynnwood. He said that after further review, staff concluded that there is sufficient capacity at both the Lynnwood and Edmonds Treatment Plants.

Mr. Fiene pointed out that, at this time, the City has problems with inflow and infiltration (I&I) associated with storm and groundwater entering the sewer system. This can cause sewer backups and raw sewage overflows. He noted that high flow rates observed during the recent January 2006 storm raised concerns that warranted flow monitoring and smoke testing. They have also created a list of small works projects to connect I&I sources to the storm system.

Mr. Fiene advised that no significant changes in Operations and Maintenance have been proposed. The City currently uses a video program to help them identify problem lines. In addition, they contract out for a vapor rooting program to clean roots out of the pipes. This program helps keep the existing system in place.

Mr. Fiene advised that the draft plan identifies specific problem areas and provides recommendations for solutions. The projects were prioritized by the Engineering and Public Works staff and include rehabilitation or replacement of all sewer lift stations, replacement of many sewer mains that are poor grade, and implement inflow and infiltration projects. In addition, the City would implement the cured-in-place pipe restoration program in 2008, which would allow the City to upgrade the system by lining the pipes. The goal is to upgrade or replace all lift stations over the next six years. They would also resolve situations where sewer lines have bellies using trench replacement and the cured-in-place program.

Mr. Fiene reported that the financial projections are good at this time. The City just completed a rate study that indicated no rate increase would be necessary for 2007. He said that when he analyzed the financial program, he found that a slight rate increase would be needed, but the increase would be much less than inflation. He provided information comparing the City's sewer rates with rates from other municipalities in the area, and he noted that the City's rates are on the low side.

Mr. Fiene recommended the Board forward the plan to the City Council with a recommendation of approval. A hearing before the City Council has been scheduled for November 6th, and it is anticipated the document would be adopted by the City Council at that time.

Board Member Guenther pointed out that construction and material costs have and will continue to rise drastically. He asked if the financial plan provides a sufficient contingency fund to cover the increased costs in the future. Mr. Fiene said the financial plan does include a good contingency buffer. Staff reviewed the cost of projects over the last several years, and then they escalated the costs to provide a healthy contingency and to account for future inflation. He summarized that the financial numbers are very conservative.

Board Member Young asked if the areas that were recently annexed into the City were already served by the sewer system described in the plan. He also asked if there was sufficient capacity with the current system to serve the other areas that are being considered for possible annexation. Mr. Fiene said almost all of the recent annexations are served by the Olympic View Sewer and Water District, with the exception of the Perrinville area. There is sufficient capacity at the Edmonds Treatment Plant to handle flow from the Perrinville area. He noted that when the area was annexed, there was no sewer system, and an LID was used to provide a new system. The current capacity is good for the Lynnwood Treatment Plant to treat this area, as well.

Board Member Young asked how the proposed plan and the City's overall capacity align with the new growth projections that were recently identified by Snohomish County Tomorrow. He asked if the City would have sufficient capacity to handle the additional growth and a substantial increase in the number of multi-family residential units. Mr. Fiene answered that the draft plan utilized the growth projects that are currently identified in the City's Comprehensive Plan. He explained that, for the most part, Edmonds is a built-out community, so there is not a lot of room for growth other than infill development. He emphasized that the City has not adopted the new set of numbers yet, but when they are adopted, they will have to look at the capacity again. Board Member Young cautioned that the Board has serious concerns that as they consider future increases to the population growth targets, they must also address whether or not the current infrastructure is sufficient to accommodate the changes.

APPROVED

Chair Freeman reminded the Board that the City and Port have had discussions about the possibility of redeveloping the waterfront. If this project goes ahead, it could place a significant demand on the current infrastructure. She noted that the sewer system in the downtown and waterfront areas is older and might not be able provide the additional capacity. She asked if the plan looks ahead to warn the City Council to take this into account as they consider additional growth in these areas. Mr. Fiene answered that staff completed a hydraulics analysis as part of the last Sewer Comprehensive Plan review, and this analysis is still current with the City's existing population. The overall capacity is good, but there are some areas that need to be addressed as per the plan. He acknowledged the City has an aging system with a lot of concrete pipes that were installed in the 1960's. Mr. Fiene concluded that one strategy for addressing the demands of additional growth would be to have a more aggressive inflow and infiltration program. He noted that the factor used in the plan for flow rates was four times the average daily flow rates, which is generally a result of flow that is not supposed to be in the system such as rain fall, etc. Replacing the older pipes would allow them to reduce the amount of stormwater entering the sewer system.

Chair Freeman asked who is responsible for approving rate changes. Mr. Fiene explained that the City Council must make the ultimate decision on whether or not to increase rates. However, the Finance Director, Public Works Director, City Engineer and Rate Consultant meet together to review the rates and make a recommendation to the City Council. This was done fairly recently, and the financial picture looks good at this time.

Mr. Fiene explained that staff proposed a new position called utility engineer because the City needs a more aggressive program as recommended in the Comprehensive Plan. They anticipate this position would have specific expertise to allow many projects, such as the cured-in-place program, to be designed and monitored in house. This would result in a considerable cost savings for the City. However, he noted that this position was not included in the Mayor's proposed budget at this time.

Mr. Gebert added that staff has previously mentioned the value of having this type of talent and in-house resource rather than having to go to a consultant. For example, Mr. Fiene completed the Sewer Comprehensive Plan, the Water Comprehensive Plan and the Stormwater Comprehensive Plan in-house. It would have cost the City between \$50,000 to \$100,000 to hire a consultant to do each of these tasks. Having more in-house talent would allow the City staff to design the more straightforward tasks.

Mr. Fiene said he reviewed the rates to make sure the capital plan would not have a significant impact on them. He said his original calculations were a little bit higher than those of the rate consultant. He originally thought the City would have to raise the rates slightly, but the consultant did not feel that would be necessary.

Chair Freeman asked why the City Council turned down the Engineering Department's request for a utilities engineer if it would not require any funding from the City's general fund. Mr. Gebert answered that the City Council did not turn down the request. The request was presented to the City Council's Budget Committee which consists of members of the City Council, the Mayor, and some City staff. He said he presumes the Budget Committee made the decision not to include the request in the Mayor's 2007 budget proposal that would be presented to the City Council next week. He suggested that an endorsement from the Planning Board might be helpful. It is important for the City Council to understand that the added position would be paid for by the utilities account and would not create a funding issue for the general fund.

Mr. Chave explained that his understanding is that the financial picture for 2007 is likely okay, but 2008 looks to be very bleak. He suggested the Mayor is taking a very cautious approach at this point in time. He is evaluating all positions and increases in funding, and the new utility engineer position is not necessarily off the table for consideration.

Board Member Young asked for more information about how bad the infiltration and inflow situation is. Mr. Fiene answered that this is a problem in all municipalities, especially those with older systems. The water gets in through poorly connected joints, etc. There was a combined stormwater and sewer system in the downtown bowl area several years ago, and some of the pipes might not have been disconnected. There are also some areas that have such poor storm drainage that property owners have hooked up to the sanitary sewer system. The City is trying to locate and resolve these problems. He noted that flow rates at Lift Station 1 are much higher during storm events, and there are a few other areas in the City, as well. The bowl area is one of the worst areas because of older lines that are poorly jointed, etc.

APPROVED

Board Member Young recalled that the Board recently discussed the Growth Management Act requirement that the City must either have sufficient infrastructure or plans to improve the infrastructure before approving any zoning changes to address population needs. While he is confident the Engineering Department has a good handle on this situation, he suggested the plan should also identify how the City would accommodate intensive increases to density in the bowl area, which is one of the worst areas. Mr. Fiene explained that if increased densities in the downtown area were to become a reality, the Engineering Department would have to reevaluate the current infrastructure and identify necessary improvements. One option would be to require developers to pay their share of the upgrades. He emphasized that the current draft plan was based on the growth targets included in the City's adopted Comprehensive Plan.

Board Member Young suggested that the plan specifically call out issues related to infrastructure and increased density. Mr. Fiene said the City's main attack strategy would be to aggressively pursue an inflow and infiltration program and cured-in-place program. New development should be paying the majority of the costs to upgrade the system. A sewer system would not be the only infrastructure that must be addressed as significant density increases take place. If extensive development were approved in any given area in the City, they would have to carefully consider the infrastructure needs including parks, water, storm drainage, etc. Again, Board Member Young said this issue should be included in the plan when it is presented to the City Council. The Board has made the point more than once about the need to have a plan for the infrastructure to be in place before they permit any new growth. He encouraged the staff to inform the City Council about how the City would deal with this issue.

Chair Freeman said she is not sure how long the City would be able to use pesticides and herbicides in their effort to clean roots from the sanitary sewer system. Mr. Fiene agreed this could become an issue in the future. The City might have to find another technique.

Chair Freeman expressed concern that the proposed plan only calls for the replacement of 1.3 percent of the City's sanitary sewer pipe per year. Mr. Fiene said that the video program has allowed the staff to gain a clear understanding of the situation. The root program is helping the City get by, and staff believes the City is ahead of the game by starting with the worst problem areas in 2008. He concluded that if they continue with the plan as proposed, they will be able to keep up with necessary replacement. He said the best way to stay on schedule with the LIPP Program is to have a staff member on board who can do the design work in house without hiring an outside consultant.

BOARD MEMBER FREEMAN MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD THE 2006 SANITARY SEWER COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL AND A STRONG RECOMMENDATION THAT THEY AUTHORIZE THE UTILITY ENGINEER POSITION UNDERSTANDING THAT THE COST OF THE NEW POSITION WOULD COME OUT OF THE RATE STRUCTURE RATHER THAN THE CITY'S GENERAL FUND. BOARD MEMBER HENDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

REVIEW OF MINOR TEXT AND MAP CORRECTIONS AND UPDATES TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (FILE NUMBER CDC-06-4)

Proposed Amendments to the City's Comprehensive Walkways Plan

Vice Chair Dewhirst recalled that during the Board's retreat, they indicated their concern that the City did not always require sidewalks when new developments were constructed. As a result of this discussion, the Board asked him to review the City's current Comprehensive Plan Policies for pedestrian facilities and recommend appropriate changes, and he found them to be out of date and narrowly focused. He also found there is no effective method for prioritizing sidewalk projects. He reminded the Board of their discussion about the need to provide sidewalk access to schools and parks. They also discussed the idea of sidewalks between parks being created as linear parks, using parks funding. Instead of tying sidewalk construction with improvements to arterial and collector streets, he suggested a better approach would be to identify the areas where people like to walk. He noted that people tend to stay away from arterial and collector streets when there are other alternatives. He suggested that perhaps it would be better to look at where sidewalks should be placed other than just by street classification.

APPROVED

Vice Chair Dewhirst explained that the purpose of the proposed changes is to increase the scope of awareness for building pedestrian facilities throughout the community that are tied to other activities the City is doing and where people walk. He said he recently attended a State Planning Conference and participated in a sessions on improving security, creative design, and conserving energy. The number one priority identified in all three sessions was sidewalks and how they are built.

Vice Chair Dewhirst advised that he met with Engineering staff to review the proposed changes, and the City Engineer provided a written response identifying his concerns. Chair Freeman noted that the City Engineer expressed concern about the use of “shall” instead of “should” in policy statements, especially when such policies are directives that have the potential to involve significant costs. The Engineer Department would prefer the word “should.” Vice Chair Dewhirst expressed his belief that using the word “should” in policy is “wishy-washy.” However, the Engineering staff has expressed concern that using the word “shall” means the City would have to provide sidewalks irrespective of the situation. He said he addressed his concern by adding the words “as funding becomes available.”

The Board reviewed Vice Chair Dewhirst’s recommended changes as follows:

- **Goal 1** – Board Member Guenther suggested that Item 2 be changed to read, “Improving community and individual physical, mental and social health.” Mr. Gebert said staff supports the use of the word “shall” in this goal. When recommendations pertain to City codes, “shall” would be appropriate. The Engineering Department’s concerns with “shall” versus “should” is when it might be considered a directive that the City must follow. If there is an accident, the City could have a problem if they haven’t implemented their own policy.
- **Policy 1.0** – No changes were made to this proposed new policy.
- **Policy 1.1** – Mr. Gebert provided an example to clearly indicate his concern about the proposed changes to the policy that would require sidewalks on both sides of the street. He recalled the recent walkway project that was done in the Westgate Elementary School area. He said the objective was to provide a safe walkway for the children to get to school. Because the City had to stretch a limited amount of funding, they chose to put sidewalks on one side of the street, only. He said it is important that the intent of the proposed language is clear. The City would like to maintain the flexibility to only provide sidewalks on one side of the street so that available funds could be used on other sidewalk projects.

Mr. Chave agreed that if the words “on both sides of the streets and highways” is included in the opening statement of this policy, this would become the primary focus of the policy rather than the priority order that comes later. He explained that, in some cases, the priorities would conflict with available funding. There might also be situations where it is simply not feasible to do sidewalks on both sides of the street. While this phrase would be a good purpose of intent, he would be concerned about elevating it to the first sentence in the policy. He suggested it might be better to add this statement as one of the priorities without making it a rule that sidewalks would always be constructed on both sides of the street if funding is available. Mr. Gebert referenced the highly visible sidewalk improvements that are planned for 76th and 75th Avenues. This was a very expensive project just to put sidewalks on one side of the street because geological constraints are present on both sides. The City would have to decide which side to put the sidewalk on. The sidewalk improvement on 164th Street has the same issue.

Board Member Works inquired who would be responsible for determining when safety issues exist. She pointed out that if sidewalks are required to be placed on both sides of a street, it would take a long time for sidewalks to be developed in some of the neighborhoods that have lower priorities. However, there is definitely a need for safe places to walk in these areas, too.

Vice Chair Dewhirst pointed out that Mr. Gebert’s concern is addressed in Policies 3.1 and 3.4, which allow the City Engineer to approve alternative designs, materials and locations. Mr. Gebert pointed out that Policies 3.1 and 3.4 pertain to the sidewalk construction policies as they relate to private development. The other policies pertain to the general policy of the City for pedestrian facilities.

Vice Chair Dewhirst suggested that perhaps they should drop the list of priorities from the policy. Board Member Young disagreed. He expressed his belief that the priorities make the language a strong policy statement that allows the City to pursue funding from all of the Federal and State pedestrian improvement programs.

Mr. Gebert suggested the first sentence in the first paragraph be changed to read: "Pedestrian facilities shall be constructed on both sides of all streets and highways within the limits of available funding and in consideration of other priorities." The Board concurred with this change. The Board also agreed to clarify the second sentence by changing it to read, "Construction priorities shall be based on current and planned land use activities and current pedestrian activities, not street classifications. They should be lighted where nighttime use is common or anticipated."

- **Policy 1.9** – Mr. Gebert noted that the City is already required to have an Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Implementation Plan, so this proposed policy language would fit nicely with the program. Board Member Guenther noted that sidewalks are not limited to slope, as long as they follow the contour of the street. However, ramps are limited on the amount of slope allowed. In addition, ramps require side rails, etc. Mr. Gebert said the ramps in the proposed language were intended to refer to curb ramps at the sidewalk corners. Mr. Chave pointed out that ADA ramp requirements are covered under the City's Building Code. The proposed language would apply to sidewalks, only. The Board agreed to change the proposed policy language to read, "Curb cuts and side ramps must be provided for disabled persons where necessary, meeting the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). Any object located within the sidewalk area shall not impede pedestrian safety, circulation and access."
- **Policy 1.15** – Mr. Gebert said the City Attorney has advised that, as a general rule, the City cannot require sidewalks and other improvements to be constructed beyond the limits of the development or its frontage, except through SEPA or development impact fee analysis, and then only to the extent that the impacts are attributable to the development and the mitigation requirements are roughly proportional to the impact of the development. Mr. Chave explained that the proposed language would require a developer to connect a subdivision all the way to a school or park, which the City is not allowed to do. Vice Chair Dewhirst pointed out that the County requires developers to build sidewalks to schools, as does the Revised Code of Washington. Mr. Chave emphasized that the City Attorney has advised differently.

Chair Freeman pointed out that the policy language does not provide a definition for "new development." She said she can understand the need to require large developments to provide sidewalks beyond their property boundaries to connect to schools or parks, but this same requirement should not apply to small developments. Mr. Chave reminded the Board that the City Attorney is concerned that much of the development in the City would be short plats and infill development, and it would not be feasible to require these developers to put in blocks of sidewalks to connect with schools. While very large subdivisions could possibly be required to provide sidewalk connections to schools, using the word "shall" would allow no flexibility for when the nexus argument could not be made.

Board Member Young reminded the Board that they do not want to discourage infill development in Edmonds. He questioned if there are any other legal mechanisms available to the City, such as impact fees or donations of land, to contribute to the pedestrian facility program. Mr. Gebert said he is not sure about other available options, but he would ask the City Attorney to respond. He said the City has diligently required developers to install sidewalks along their property frontage where possible, but they do not require them to go beyond.

Mr. Chave suggested that Vice Chair Dewhirst meet with Mr. Gebert and the City Attorney to discuss this policy further and come up with revised language. The Board agreed. They emphasized that the new proposed language should not discourage infill development.

Board Member Young asked if a short plat developer would be required to connect their street front sidewalk to adjacent bus stops with a crosswalk. Mr. Gebert said he is not aware of any situations of this type, but he would ask the City Attorney to respond.

- **Policy 3.1** – Mr. Gebert said the proposed change to this policy is consistent the City's normal policy when the law allows them to require a developer to provide sidewalks. Mr. Chave suggested that the proposed new policy language

APPROVED

should not include references to specific sections of the Edmonds Community Development Code, since these could be changed when the code is rewritten next year.

- **Policy 3.4** – Mr. Gebert said staff supports this proposed new policy, and the City tries to apply this concept on a voluntary basis if it makes more sense to install the sidewalk somewhere else instead of along the property frontage. However, the City Attorney has cautioned that this program must be voluntarily offered by the developer. The property owners adjacent to the proposed sidewalk location must offer their support, as well.
- **Implementation Section** – Vice Chair Dewhirst advised that the implementation section would be the next step in the process and would be reviewed when the City’s development codes are redone. At this point, he is only asking the Board to consider the Comprehensive Plan policy changes.

Amendments to the City’s Downtown Plan

Mr. Chave explained that the purpose of the proposed changes to the City’s Downtown Plan is to ensure that the plan is consistent with the new zones, zoning map and code language that was recently adopted by the City Council for the downtown area.

Mr. Chave advised that the current Downtown Plan includes discussion about a Fountain Square area, which seems to relate well with the newly created Retail Core. Most of the language works fine, with only some minor changes to clearly describe the boundaries of the Retail Core area to be consistent with the BD-1 zone.

Chair Freeman pointed out that the current description of the Retail Core area does not make it clear that no curb cuts would be allowed and that there would be no parking requirements. In addition, it is not clear that the vehicular access and parking requirements found on Page 38 would not apply to the Retail Core. Mr. Chave said they could add this language to the Vehicular Access and Parking Section to reflect the important points. However, he expressed concern about providing so much detail in the plan that they end up repeating the zoning codes. The Board agreed to add language to Page 38 to make it clear that no curb cuts would be allowed and no parking would be required in the Retail Core. At the request of Chair Freeman, the Board agreed to change the word “create” to “provide” in the Vehicular Access and Parking Section.

Chair Freeman pointed out that at the Board’s last meeting, they recommended approval of some changes to the MPOR zone. Therefore, the Planned Residential-Office Section (bottom of Page 37) should be revised. Mr. Chave agreed to double check this language. The Board agreed to take out the last sentence of the section to reflect their previous recommendation and make it clear that a building height would be limited to 16 feet above Sunset Avenue, with a 15-foot setback.

Amendments to the Land Use Element

Mr. Chave referred the Board to the document prepared by staff to provide information about plan map designations and compatible zoning classifications. He noted that a change was made to indicate that BN or the equivalent zoning based on a neighborhood plan would be compatible zoning classifications for the Neighborhood Commercial Comprehensive Plan Map Designation. In addition, a BP, BN, BC or similar commercial zone, as well as RM zones would be compatible zoning classifications for the Edmonds Way Corridor Comprehensive Plan Map Designation.

Mr. Chave explained that in the Lake Ballinger area, there is a tier of lots surrounding the areas zoned RSW-12 that were not updated when the new Comprehensive Plan Map was adopted in March of 2006. They were retained as Urban 1 zoning when they should have been identified as Resource. This is a technical correction rather than a significant map change.

Mr. Chave announced that a public hearing on the proposed Comprehensive Plan Amendments is scheduled for October 25th.

The Board took a break at 8:52 p.m. The meeting reconvened at 9:01 p.m.

APPROVED

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION ON CODE UPDATES REQUIRED TO INTEGRATE DESIGN GUIDELINES AND REVISED DESIGN REVIEW PROCESS INTO THE DEVELOPMENT CODE

Mr. Chave reported that staff is continuing to work on draft code language to implement the proposed new design review process. He referred the Board to the draft design guidelines and checklist that have been proposed by the Architectural Design Board (ADB). The ADB would use the design guidelines and checklist in their new “up front” review role. He also referred the Board to the proposed process and the current draft-in-progress of the code amendments. He explained that, essentially, a new code Chapter 20.11 would be inserted for the “district-based” design review process. When not in a design review district, projects would be reviewed under the normal design review process. Eventually, all parts of the City should be incorporated into a design district with appropriate design standards included in City codes. At that point, Chapter 20.11 would become the de-facto design review process for the entire City and Chapter 20.10 would be dropped.

Mr. Chave explained that the City’s traditional process places the ADB review towards the end of the design review process. The public hearings are also held at the end of the design review process. When extensive changes are identified by the ADB, developers are sometimes required to expend a substantial amount of money to change the designs. The new design review process would place the ADB review earlier in the process. A preliminary review at the start of the design phase would be mandatory for every application. At the preliminary review, the ADB would review the checklist of items and identify those that should be applied to a project and what the priorities should be. After a preliminary discussion between the applicant and the ADB, the applicant would be required to show how they would address the applicable design guidelines. A public hearing would also be conducted as part of the preliminary design review, when changes to the design could be easily made. The checklist items identified by the ADB would be incorporated into the SEPA review. The intent is to integrate the design review and SEPA process together. Once the SEPA determination and ADB conditions have been identified, there would be an opportunity for appeal. Once the appeal period has expired, the applicant would be allowed to proceed directly to the building permit application phase. Staff would then make sure the completed design meets all of the conditions and requirements of the ADB review and the SEPA determination. No new appeals would be allowed at that point.

Board Member Guenther asked if the proposed new design review process would be similar to the review process used by other neighboring jurisdictions. Mr. Chave answered affirmatively. Mr. Guenther summarized that with the City’s current design review process, all of the design decisions have been made by the architect and his client before the ADB reviews the plans. Having design review occur early in the design process would make it easier for applicants to make changes.

While the draft code language is not ready for the Board’s review at this time, Mr. Chave said he provided some preliminary language for the Board to review to make sure they are comfortable with the direction staff is heading. Board Member Works asked that staff provide language to clarify the right-hand column on the document titled, “Draft ADB Process.” Vice Chair Dewhirst also asked staff to review all of the documents to make sure the terminology is consistent. Although pictures are important to include in the document, Vice Chair Dewhirst suggested it would be inappropriate to use pictures of six or seven story buildings. He encouraged staff to obtain photographs with people in them, too. He summarized that people tend to start with the pictures before they get into the actual language. Therefore, the pictures should communicate what the City intends to do. Chair Freeman agreed and noted that the photograph on Page 11 is of a building that is actually located on Green Lake and is not a building design that would be compatible in Edmonds. Mr. Chave suggested that staff provide photographs depicting both small and larger scale buildings.

Board Member Guenther asked how the ADB would use the checklist to review applications. Mr. Chave answered that the ADB still has to work out their process for reviewing the applications, but the checklist would be part of their review. Board Member Guenther asked if the ADB would have the discretion to add items to the checklist if applicable. Mr. Chave answered that if there is something exceptional about a project, the ADB could possibly add items to the checklist as long as they can state reasons why it is important. He said he would ask the City Attorney to provide further direction regarding this issue.

Vice Chair Dewhirst indicated that he had several comments to make regarding the draft language, but he would forward them to staff for consideration in the new draft.

APPROVED

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

No additional comments were provided regarding the Board's extended agenda.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Freeman thanked Vice Chair Dewhirst for all of his hard work on the proposed amendments to the City's Comprehensive Walkways Plan.

Chair Freeman referred the Board to an article written by Bill Birgin in the October 10th *POST INTELLIGENCER* regarding changing the character of the town. He suggested that use of the term "quaintness" is becoming too wide spread and uniform. The Board should keep this in mind and not get too quaint in their attempts to change the downtown.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

None of the Board Members provided comments during this portion of the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

APPROVED