

APPROVED JANUARY 23RD

CITY OF EDMONDS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

January 9, 2008

Chair Guenther called the meeting of the Edmonds Planning Board to order at 7:03 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Public Safety Complex, 259 – 5th Avenue North.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Cary Guenther, Chair
Michael Bowman, Vice Chair
John Dewhirst
Judith Works
Jim Young
Don Henderson
John Reed

STAFF PRESENT

Duane Bowman, Development Services Director
Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Bio Park, City Attorney
Karin Noyes, Recorder

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER WORKS MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF DECEMBER 12, 2007 BE APPROVED AS CORRECTED. BOARD MEMBER DEWHIRST SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as proposed.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Barbara Chase, Edmonds, said she was present to learn more about the changes that are being proposed for the design review process. She expressed her desire to become better informed about the design review process, as well as the design standards the Board is currently working on for the BD1 zone.

CODE REWRITE PROJECT UPDATE AND TOPICAL DISCUSSION

Mr. Bowman introduced Bio Park from Ogden Murphy Wallace, who is currently working with staff and Mr. Snyder on the code rewrite process for Title 20. He referred the Board to the draft code language that was prepared by Mr. Park to start the Board's discussion. He noted that this draft version is predicated upon a review process that would move the City Council away from the quasi-judicial decision making process and place this responsibility with the Hearing Examiner. He emphasized that no public hearing has been conducted on the present draft language.

Mr. Bowman explained that the proposed ordinance is different than a zoning code amendment where the Comprehensive Plan must be the basis for the Board's review and recommendation. The proposed language for Title 20 is really driven by the requirements of the State Regulatory Reform Law that was approved in 1995. While this law stipulates that only one

open record public hearing could be conducted on an application, jurisdictions are free to decide who would make the final decision. He advised that the goal of the proposed ordinance is to clean up the review process regulations to make them more consistent with state law and to make it easier for applicants to determine the required review process for each permit.

Mr. Bowman advised that the first pages of the draft document provide tables to clearly outline the various types of permits and the review process required for each. Board Member Henderson suggested that Table B should be placed before Table A so that each of the action types is defined at the outset of the ordinance. The remainder of the Board concurred. To make the tables more clear, Board Member Works suggested that Types III and III-A should be identified as Types III-A and III-B.

Mr. Parks advised that the purpose of the draft ordinance is to move the City's process more in line with most other jurisdictions by categorizing the different types of actions. He noted that the table on Page 3 of the draft ordinance defines all five of the action types and lists what permits fall under each one. The Table on Page 2 of the draft ordinance identifies the step-by-step process required for each action type. He suggested the two tables would make the document more user-friendly. He pointed out that when applicants are required to obtain more than one permit, they can choose to consolidate the permit review process, using the highest process of review in effect.

Mr. Bowman referred to Section 20.02.001.A and noted that the City already has a provision for pre-application conferences, but they are optional and not mandatory. The proposed language would not change this provision. Mr. Chave referred to Table A and noted that Type II Actions would require a notice of application. Mr. Bowman agreed to make this change. Mr. Bowman advised that the purpose of the two tables is to make it easier for applicants to identify the type of permit they need and the process that must be followed. The remainder of the document describes the review process for each type of action. He noted that the current code is not nearly as clear.

Board Member Dewhirst inquired if the spreadsheet that was provided to the Board to outline the process for the various permit applications would become part of the ordinance. Mr. Bowman answered that the spreadsheet was provided to the Board as a working document that would not become part of the ordinance. However, it could be turned into a handout for applicants. Board Member Henderson suggested that if the document is to be used as a handout for applicants at some point in the future, they should spell out the abbreviations on a legend. He recommended that abbreviations in the two tables be spelled out, as well.

Mr. Park pointed out that the main body of the draft ordinance specifies those sections that are being repealed and substituted with new language. Mr. Bowman explained that the goal is to turn the existing Chapter 20 into a "Process and Procedures" chapter of the code only. This would require moving the review criteria elsewhere in the Code. While this information could be moved to Chapter 17, staff would prefer setting up a new "Permit Review Criteria" chapter. Board Member Reed inquired if the draft ordinance related to Chapter 20 could move forward before the new chapter is written. Mr. Parks explained that after Chapter 20 is adopted, the City's goal would be to create a new chapter that moves all of the review criteria out. However, until the new chapter has been created, the other review criteria not addressed as part of the proposed ordinance would remain in Chapter 20. Mr. Bowman added that the goal is to finish all sections of the code rewrite by the end of 2008 with the help of a consultant.

The Board and staff reviewed the draft ordinance page-by-page and specifically commented as follows:

- **Section 20.01.004.** Mr. Bowman pointed out that the proposed language would allow the director to combine any public hearing on a project permit application with any hearing that may be held by another agency as long as the hearing meets the criteria identified in this section of the code. In this case, the highest level of review would be required.
- **Section 20.01.005.** Mr. Bowman advised that this section outlines the legislative review process.
- **Section 20.01.007.** Mr. Bowman said this section identifies the types of permits that are exempt from the design review requirement. It also states that building permits, boundary line adjustments or other construction permits are categorically exempt from environmental review under SEPA.

Board Member Henderson suggested that if the City is going to exempt certain decisions, they should be identified in Table B, which is being used as a type of index for Chapter 20. The Board agreed the exemptions should at least be listed at the bottom of Table B.

Board Member Young recommended that only actions that require a permit be listed in Chapter 20.01. Mr. Bowman pointed out that permits are required for street vacations, etc. but these actions are not subject to the notice requirements and other provisions of the review process. The Board agreed that all actions requiring a permit should be listed in the ordinance, and then the ordinance should clearly identify those that are exempt from the review criteria.

- **Section 20.02.003.A.** Mr. Bowman advised that currently, Planning Department staff has 28 days to review a project permit application and determine whether or not it is complete, and the proposed language would continue this provision. However, he suggested the Board discuss whether it would be more appropriate for staff to review the application at the counter and determine if the applicant has provided all of the required items rather than waiting for 28 days to make this determination. He suggested that determining completeness of an application is a quantitative decision that is different from determining the quality of each of the submitted items.

Board Member Dewhirst said that in his experience, complete applications are often deficient in quality. If staff were allowed 28 days to review an application and make sure it is complete both quantitatively and qualitatively, applicants would be more willing to provide additional information requested by staff in a timely manner. Mr. Bowman said the proposed ordinance includes a process by which the City would be allowed to make a decision based on the information available and possibly deny a permit application if an applicant is not responsive to staff's request for additional information. This provision would encourage applicants to quickly provide additional information upon request.

Board Member Young inquired if the City would be open to legal liability if they offer a determination of completeness and then later decide they need more information. He pointed out that the City provides a detailed list of the items that are required for each application. If an applicant provides all of these required items, the application should be determined complete. Chair Guenther suggested this would depend upon how detailed the requirements are.

Mr. Chave said that from an applicant's standpoint, receiving a determination of completeness at the counter would speed up the process. However, from a process standpoint, there would be no slack to help staff manage their workloads. He expressed his belief that it could be dangerous to offer a determination of completeness at the counter. If the City were to provide a very detailed list, staff could make this type of decision at the counter. However, it would require a significant amount of staff time at the counter. On the other hand, if the list is not detailed enough, the City could end up with applications that are incomplete and require more detailed information.

Mr. Chave suggested another alternative to address the issue of completeness would be to retain the 28-day time period, but have an administrative policy that staff would make the decision at the counter, if possible. If staff finds over time that the policy doesn't work, they wouldn't have to amend the code to address the problem. He cautioned that this may require language adjustments to distinguish between review for completeness and review for compliance. He explained that the City currently uses a combined process to check not only for completeness but to determine whether or not an application meets the code requirements, and this process generally takes about 28 days to complete. Staff often requests additional information from applicants that is more related to code compliance than to completeness. While applicants tend to think the 28-day review period is too long, they often don't realize that staff is reviewing the application for both completeness and code compliance.

Board Member Henderson suggested that perhaps the City could establish a 7-day time period for reviewing applications for completeness, with an additional 21-day time period to review applications for code compliance. Mr. Parks pointed out that the 28-day review period is in addition to the 180-day state-mandated time period for reviewing applications. If staff makes a decision regarding application completeness at the counter, the clock would start and the City would then have 180-days to issue a decision.

Mr. Bowman cautioned that the City must respect that time is money for applicants. At the same time, the City must make sure the applications are compliant with code. Board Member Dewhirst pointed out that the State of Washington is one of

the few states that allow applications to vest at the time of submittal. All other states do not allow applications to vest until they have been granted final approval. He said he would rather error on the side of the City and give staff the necessary time to review applications for completeness and compliance before issuing a determination of completeness.

The Board agreed to retain the 28-day review period for the public hearing. However, they directed staff to discuss what could be done administratively to address this issue.

- **Section 20.02.003.D.2.** Mr. Bowman advised that the language proposed in this section would encourage applicants to respond to staff's request for additional information in a timely manner. It would allow the director to make findings and issue a decision that the application has lapsed for lack of information necessary to complete the review if an applicant fails to submit the additional information requested within a 90-day time period.

Mr. Bowman noted that the document must be updated to be consistent throughout regarding the meaning of the word "days." Does it refer to calendar days or working days? Mr. Park said "days" always refers to calendar days unless otherwise specified. However, he agreed to make sure the word is used consistently throughout the document.

- **Section 20.03.** Mr. Bowman suggested the City follow the example provided by the City of Bothell and shift all responsibility related to the notice requirement to the applicant. As proposed, the City would prepare the notice and provide a list to the applicant to indicate where and how the notice must be posted. The applicant would then be required to submit an affidavit of posting, mailing and publishing. If the applicant makes a mistake in the notice requirement, he/she would be required to start over. He pointed out that shifting this responsibility to the applicant would save a significant amount of staff time. He suggested it would be helpful to provide a graphic illustration in this section to clearly identify the standards for posting notice signs. This would help ensure the signs are consistent. He noted that applicants would be responsible to maintain the signs while they are posted, and staff would drive by the sites periodically to make sure all are still in place. The Board agreed it would be appropriate to shift the notice responsibility from the City to the applicant.
- **Section 20.04.002.** Mr. Bowman explained that all applications must be consistent with the development regulations and how SEPA is integrated into the decision-making process. This section discusses how the SEPA requirements would be linked to the decision making process. Mr. Park summarized that this provision does not deviate from the City's current process. However, it does make it clear that the City's ordinance complies with the SEPA regulations.
- **Section 20.04.003.** Mr. Bowman pointed out that the City's current code does not have a provision for planned actions. He explained that the planned action process defines an area of the city and then conducts an environmental analysis for the entire area. Once approved, no further SEPA review would be required for future proposed development within the planned action area. Staff anticipates using the planned action process at some point in the future, so it would be helpful to add the appropriate language to this section now. The Board briefly discussed the planned action process and possible locations in the City where the concept could be applied.
- **Section 20.06.** Mr. Bowman advised that open record hearings and reconsiderations have typically been an issue for the City in the past. This section outlines the rules and procedures for conducting open record hearings.
- **Section 20.06.010.** Mr. Bowman recalled that the Hearing Examiners have stated their concern that the City's current process for reconsideration of decision is unclear, and the proposed language is an attempt to clarify the language by outlining the process and procedures. He noted that the Hearing Examiners have reviewed a previous draft of the ordinance and indicated their support. Very little change has occurred to the language since that time. It was noted that the first word of the second sentence in Section 20.06.010.G.2 should be capitalized.
- **Section 20.07.005.** Mr. Bowman explained that state law only allows the City to conduct one open-record hearing on a permit application. Therefore, he suggested they avoid using the term "hearing" for closed record reviews since it gives the connotation that the public would be invited to provide comment. Mr. Park reviewed that, currently, the City allows parties to summarize their position to the City Council during closed record reviews, as long as no new information or arguments are introduced. However, he said it is often difficult for the staff, City Council and City Attorney to police the

APPROVED

comments, and the participants tend to insert new information into their statements. This has the potential of creating a lot of discord without adding anything substantial to the review. He advised that staff has proposed eliminating all oral summaries and comments from the closed record review process. Instead, people would be allowed to submit their arguments and briefs in writing prior to the review.

Mr. Bowman expressed his belief that appellants should be required to submit their arguments to the City Council in writing, and all parties of record should have an opportunity to review the arguments and submit their written briefs. All of this information would be forwarded to the City Council for their consideration. He emphasized that the City Council should still have an opportunity to ask specific questions of clarification during the closed record review. However, allowing the appellant and parties of record to speak freely before the City Council can place the staff, City Council and City Attorney in the awkward position of having to decide whether or not new information was provided.

Board Member Young said he would support the concept of requiring parties of record and the appellant to submit their comments in writing, but allowing the City Council to ask questions during the closed record review related to anything on the record that is unclear. He agreed with Mr. Bowman that allowing people to freely comment during a closed record review creates discord. The majority of the Board indicated their support of the concept, as well.

Board Member Reed asked who would be responsible for reviewing the written comments to make sure no new information is submitted to the City Council. Mr. Bowman advised that the project planner would review the comments and identify potential concerns. Staff could challenge or remove these comments, and the public would have an opportunity to argue their case. At that point, the issue would likely be presented to the City Attorney for a final determination.

Board Member Reed suggested that it might be appropriate to allow the appellant and/or parties of record to briefly summarize the points they made in their written comments to emphasize their main concerns and issues, as long as they follow their written submittal. Mr. Bowman cautioned that once the City allows oral arguments during a closed record review, they introduce the potential for new arguments coming in that were not offered to the initial decision maker. Submitting comments in writing only forces people to think through and clearly outline their arguments. He concluded that main points could be adequately emphasized in writing. Board Member Reed summarized that, as currently proposed, all comments would be submitted in writing, and the City Council would only be allowed to ask clarifying questions if necessary. The City Council would then deliberate and make a decision in an open public meeting based on the record.

Board Member Young expressed his concern that the City does not really have a closed record review process at this time because allowing people to provide oral testimony tends to turn the review into a quasi-public hearing. This places the City Council and staff in the position of having to make decisions on whether information is new or not.

Board Member Dewhirst inquired if the City Council would have the ability to ask for additional information during the closed record review. Mr. Bowman answered that they would not. They could ask for information pertaining to the record only. Mr. Park summarized that no new evidence could be introduced in a closed record review.

Mr. Bowman said he believes strongly that if the City is going to conduct closed record reviews, they should be done correctly to eliminate the potential for legal challenges in the future. Mr. Chave pointed out that to implement the concept described by Mr. Bowman, Section 20.07.005 would have to be separated into two sections: one for open record appeal hearings and one for closed record reviews. It was noted that Chapter 20.05, as referenced in Section 20.07.005.F, does not exist.

Board Member Henderson expressed his desire to remove the City Council from the closed record review process. Mr. Bowman said the City Council has discussed this concept and agreed to look at the issue. It is the Planning Board's responsibility to forward their recommendation to the City Council. If the City Council decides not to get out of the closed record review process, he said he would push extremely hard towards a written testimony only policy. Board Member Henderson agreed. However, he suggested that rather than be involved in the closed record review process, the City Council should address their concerns by changing the code.

Board Member Young recalled that the Board previously agreed the City Council should be removed from the quasi-judicial decision making process, with the exception of rezones. The Board previously indicated their desire that the Hearing Examiner make the final decision with an appeal to Superior Court. Mr. Bowman said that is the intent of the proposed new language. However, staff also recommends a fall-back position in case the City Council decides they want to stay involved in quasi-judicial decision making. The Board agreed that both options should be presented to the public at the hearing.

Chair Guenther said that as part of the public hearing, it will be important to educate the public on the City Council's two distinct roles: legislative and quasi-judicial. Many people believe that if the City Council is hearing a land use issue, they can do whatever they want. It must be stressed that the City Council does not have this leeway. If an application meets the permit requirements, the City Council must approve it.

Board Member Reed asked staff to prepare a spreadsheet to identify the City's current review processes. This could be made available to the public at the hearing to help them compare the current processes with the proposed new processes. Mr. Bowman agreed to prepare the spreadsheet prior to the Board's next meeting. Board Member Henderson referred to the spreadsheet and noted there are a number of permits that are not included on Table B. If the spreadsheet is going to be used as a supplement to the tables during the public hearing process, they should be consistent with each other. Mr. Bowman agreed to cross section the two documents for consistency.

Mr. Bowman summarized that the Planning Board is in favor of the Hearing Examiner making the final decision. However, if the City Council decides to stay in the process, a draft proposal should be prepared to outline how closed record reviews should take place.

- **Section 20.08.020.** Mr. Bowman advised that while development agreements are not specified in the City's current code, they are options that can be used. For example, the City could enter into a development agreement with Sound Transit and Community Transit for the bus rapid transit program along Highway 99. This section outlines the procedures for the review process, which would require approval by the City Council in order to bind it into an agreement.

Board Member Dewhirst asked if the language in this section differentiates between development agreements and master plans. Mr. Bowman answered that development agreements are similar to master plans, but separate. They are used when someone wants to deviate from a development standard in exchange for something else. Master plans provide more specific information and must be reviewed by the Planning Board before being adopted by the City Council. A development agreement would move directly to the City Council for approval.

Board Member Henderson pointed out that master plans and development agreements should be added to the spreadsheet and tables. Mr. Bowman agreed and noted that both would be considered Type V Actions.

- **Section 20.09.** Mr. Bowman advised that this section would clarify the process for amending the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Chave agreed to work with Mr. Bowman and Mr. Park to make the appropriate changes to this section prior to the Board's next meeting.

Board Member Reed inquired if the Board would have the ability to recommend potential Comprehensive Plan amendments. Board Member Young answered that the Board can propose amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, and they have done so in the past.

Chair Guenther noted that on Page 30, the sequencing of various items in Section 20.09 must be corrected. He specifically referenced Items 20.09.100 through 20.09.020.

Mr. Bowman invited the Board Members to submit their written comments to him via email no later than January 15th. The Board's comments would be integrated into a new draft document for them to review at their next meeting on January 23rd. He would also provide a spreadsheet outlining the City's current review processes. In addition, Mr. Chave would provide feedback regarding Section 20.09. Staff anticipates the Board scheduling a public hearing for the draft ordinance on February 27th.

THE BOARD TOOK A BREAK AT 8:55 P.M. THEY RECONVENED THE MEETING AT 9:08 P.M.

UPDATE ON DESIGN STANDARDS FOR DOWNTOWN RETAIL CORE (BD1)

Mr. Chave recalled that the Board reviewed the draft design standards at their December 12th meeting. He further recalled that the Architectural Design Board (ADB) completed its detailed review of the proposed BD1 Design Standards during a special meeting on November 28th, and this was followed up with further discussion on the thresholds for design review on December 19th. He referred the Board to the minutes from the two ADB meetings, as well as the summary that was updated to include the ADB's December 19th discussion.

Board Member Henderson expressed concern about the provision that would allow a property owner in the BD1 zone to repair or replace an existing feature like-for-like without requiring design review. He suggested that in some situations, like-for-like replacement would not be desirable. He suggested this provision be approached more carefully. He questioned if a property owner should be allowed to replace bad design that would not be approved by the ADB or Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). Chair Guenther summarized that this is more a question of whether bad design should be grandfathered in.

Board Member Works voiced her concern that changing the provision as recommended by Board Member Henderson might discourage property owners from repairing their buildings. Mr. Chave explained that the like-for-like concept is the notion that the existing building is grandfathered in. The ADB's intent was that property owners should be allowed to repair or maintain an existing feature without going through design review.

Board Member Henderson asked if the proposed BD1 Design Standards address the intent of the HPC's original recommendations. Commissioner Steve Waite, HPC, advised that the ADB actually conducted a more lengthy discussion of the proposed language than the HPC did. While there are a few things the HPC didn't agree with, they felt it was generally a good document to forward to the public hearing. Mr. Chave agreed that the HPC indicated they were generally in support of the draft ordinance.

Mr. Chave advised that prior to the public hearing, staff would incorporate the ADB and HPC's final comments into the draft document. He invited the Planning Board to provide their additional comments and suggestions, as well. Staff could present the public hearing package to the Board at their January 23rd meeting in preparation of a public hearing on February 13th. This schedule would allow the HPC an opportunity to provide additional comments, as well.

Board Member Works inquired if the HPC has received feedback from business owners in the BD1 zone regarding the proposal. Commissioner Waite said he has spoken with a few business owners on his own time. The forward thinking ones realize that good design is essential and that there must be standards. They recognize there would be a return on investment if good design occurs. He expressed his belief that the proposed ordinance represents good design principals for retail store frontage, which is very important for the BD1 zone. He felt that the property owners in the BD1 zone would gradually come to accept and support the ideas, but it would be a struggle to help the public understanding the intent of the Design Standards.

Regarding Board Member Henderson's earlier concern about allowing building features to be repaired and/or replaced like-for-like without requiring a design review, Commissioner Waite pointed out there is a significant difference between repair and replacement. He agreed that some things need to be eliminated at some point rather than replaced, but this should be handled differently than repairs.

Board Member Dewhirst asked if staff anticipates the public would offer general support for the proposed Design Standards. Commissioner Waite expressed his belief that the proposed ordinance represents a positive move in the right direction.

Board Member Reed inquired if notice of the public hearing would be mailed to all property owners in and within 300 feet of the BD1 zone. Mr. Chave answered that because this is a legislative matter, the City would not be required to send notices to

APPROVED

property owners. However, staff would get the word out to the Chamber of Commerce, the Downtown Merchants Association, the local newspapers, etc. He said he is confident staff could adequately notify the public about the hearing.

Commissioner Waite said it is important to educate the property owners that the Design Standards would protect property values by elevating the quality of buildings that are constructed. He said he doesn't find the standards too restrictive, and they allow for adequate flexibility and creativity, as well.

Board Member Henderson said he would like the City to offer a bonus to property owners for doing good design to enhance development in the BD1 zone. However, he is not ready to propose this concept again, given the results of Board's previous effort.

Chair Guenther noted that the BD1 zone has never been named, even though it has been identified as an important district. He referred to the ADB minutes and noted that one member mentioned the proposed standards are eclectic, yet they reflect the public's interpretation of the character of Edmonds. He agreed this would be appropriate for the BD1 zone, but he felt the standards might be too narrow and prescriptive to apply elsewhere in the downtown. Commissioner Waite explained that what exists in the BD1 zone now represents a good foundation for future development of an eclectic nature. People seem to be attracted to the variety of buildings from different periods of time. Chair Guenther expressed his belief that the proposed Design Standards provide enough flexibility to avoid a very prescribed style of development in the downtown. Commissioner Waite agreed and said the HPC is hoping the eclectic style would continue into the future. It is not their intent to create a style that is the same throughout the zone. Mr. Chave said the goal was to find commonalities within this very small area so the proposed standards are more prescriptive than those that are applied throughout the remainder of the downtown.

Board Member Reed noted the ADB raised concerns about the similarities and differences between the Design Standards for the BD1 zone and the existing Design Standards for the entire downtown. He asked if these two documents would be coordinated for consistency. Mr. Chave answered that the two documents compliment each other, but the BD1 Design Standards are more specific.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Mr. Chave advised that the extended agenda would be revised to incorporate the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Comprehensive Plan Review. Chair Guenther reported that a representative from Stevens Hospital would present their master plan to the Board on February 12th.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Guenther reported he received an email from Linda Carl asking him to join the Mayor's Climate Control Meeting and he accepted the assignment. However, he would be unable to attend the first meeting, and Vice Chair Bowman agreed to attend in his place. He noted that upcoming meetings are scheduled for February 26th and March 6th at 9 a.m. in the Brackett Room of City Hall.

Chair Guenther referred the Board to an article in the January Planning Magazine titled, "Saving the World through Zoning." The article is about sustainable community development codes and it includes a process for incorporating sustainable codes. It proposes an outline that the City is currently following; taking out all of the hindrances to sustainability and adding new language to support sustainability. He noted that it may be necessary to address the City's height limit in order to accommodate sustainable development.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

APPROVED

Board Member Young apologized for missing the last meeting as a result of work responsibilities. He said he was pleased that Chair Guenther accepted the position of Chair for 2008. He also announced that the City has obtained funding from the Federal Highway Administration Emergency Relief Program to make repairs on Olympic View Drive and 76th Avenue.

Board Member Reed asked staff for information about why the project at 3rd and Dayton Street is not moving forward. Mr. Chave said he doesn't have particular information about this project now, but the delay is not related to any type of City action.

Board Member Reed announced that City Councilmember Dawson invited him to serve on a Snohomish County committee dealing with affordable housing and homelessness. The first meeting is scheduled for January 11th.

Vice Chair Bowman agreed with Board Member Henderson that the City would be better served if they used a carrot approach and gave something back to the developers who incorporate sustainable elements into their projects.

Board Member Dewhirst reported that he attended a Vision 2040 meeting on December 18th that was sponsored by the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC). The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the creation of a regional plan, which is nearly completed and should be released later in the year. The PSRC announced that a new regional transportation plan would be crafted this year, as well.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:39 p.m.

APPROVED