

APPROVED JULY 9, 2008

CITY OF EDMONDS PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

June 18, 2008

Acting Chair Young called the meeting of the Edmonds Planning Board to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Public Safety Complex, 259 – 5th Avenue North.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Jim Young, Acting Chair
Judith Works
John Dewhirst
Don Henderson
John Reed
Philip Lovell

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Gina Coccia, Associate Planner
Bertrand Hauss, Traffic Engineer
Karin Noyes, Recorder

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Cary Guenther, Chair
Michael Bowman, Vice Chair

Chair Guenther and Vice Chair Bowman were excused from the meeting.

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Approval of the June 11, 2008 minutes was deferred until the July 9th meeting.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

Mr. Chave advised that he had two items to discuss with the staff as part of his Administrative Report. The remainder of the agenda was accepted as presented.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

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

DISCUSSION ON 2008 TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Bertrand Hauss, City Engineer, announced that the City is in the process of updating the transportation element of the Comprehensive Plan. He advised that an open house has been scheduled for June 19, 2008 in the Brackett Room of City Hall starting at 7 p.m. He explained that the purpose of the transportation element is to guide the development of surface transportation within the City of Edmonds in a manner consistent with the adopted transportation goals and policies, as well as the overall goals of the Comprehensive Plan. It is based upon existing and projected future land use and travel patterns.

He informed the Board that the City has hired the consulting firm of IFC Jones and Stokes to help staff prepare the update throughout the next year. He invited Mr. Jones to provide an update of their work to date.

Ron Jones, IFC Jones and Stokes, explained that the first step in the process of updating the transportation element was to develop a forecast model for 6, 8 and 20-year plans. These models were prepared based on the existing land use and applying projected future volumes to determine if service levels would be met during those time periods. The next step would be to identify potential projects to address deficiencies. He noted that the updated plan would include an update to the City's current walkway and bicycle plan and identify potential new projects, as well.

Mr. Jones advised that updating the transportation element would involve a number of opportunities for the public to participate in the process. At the June 19th open house, the consultant and staff would explain the existing problems and potential solutions to the public. They would ask the public to share their ideas and vision for transportation within Edmonds, particularly related to problems and maintenance issues. He said he anticipates that draft language would be available for public comment by the beginning of 2009. The draft transportation element would be presented to the Planning Board for review at that time, as well. The Planning Board would forward a recommendation to the City Council so that final adoption could take place sometime in early 2009.

PUBLIC HEARING ON APPLICATION BY DANA GILLETT AND A.D. SHAPIRO ARCHITECTS ADDING A NEW SECTION OF TEXT TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN SPECIFIC TO THE GOALS AND POLICIES FOR FUTURE COMMERCIAL LAND USE IN THE PERRINVILLE NEIGHBORHOOD (FILE NUMBER AMD-2007-17).

Gina Coccia, Planner, presented the staff report on the application by Dana Gillett, represented by A.D. Shapiro Architects, to add a new section of text to the Comprehensive Plan. The new language would be specific to the Perrinville neighborhood, and would include development goals and policies for future land use. She displayed the Comprehensive Plan Map (Attachment 1), which identifies the land use designation of the subject properties and surrounding properties as "Neighborhood Commercial."

Ms. Coccia explained that before the hearing, packets of information related to the proposal were given to members of the Planning Board, the applicant and parties of record. The staff report included 12 attachments. However, after the staff report was mailed, the City received a flood of emails and letters from neighbors requesting to become parties of record. She entered these additional items into the record as Attachments 13 through 30. Ms. Coccia advised that the applicant is proposing to add the following new language into the Comprehensive Plan:

"In the Perrinville commercial area, development should include an attractive mix of uses that create a 'neighborhood village' pedestrian-oriented environment. Commercial spaces shall be oriented toward the street in order to maximize visibility, and parking should be primarily accommodated either behind or underneath structures.

Development shall not be more than three (3) stories in height, and the design should focus on breaking up the mass and bulk of buildings by incorporating such features as setbacks, varying rooflines, and landscaping in the design of the site. The mix of uses shall incorporate not less than one-quarter commercial space."

Ms. Coccia said staff generally supports the applicant's proposed amendment, but with one change. Staff recommends that the last sentence in the proposed language be changed to read, "*The mix of uses shall incorporate not less than one-third commercial space.*"

Ms. Coccia reviewed the criteria that must be considered when reviewing Comprehensive Plan amendments and made the following observations:

APPROVED

1. **Is the proposed amendment consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and in the public interest?** Ms. Coccia referred to Page 5 of the staff report, which lists the following existing goals and policies that are supportive of the proposed amendment.

- **B.3.** *“The proliferation of strip commercial areas along Edmonds streets and highways and the development of commercial uses poorly related to the surrounding land uses should be strongly discouraged.”* (Page 56 of the Comprehensive Plan)
- **D.** *“Neighborhood commercial areas are intended to provide a mix of services, shopping, gathering places, office space, and housing for local neighborhoods.”* (Page 56 of the Comprehensive Plan)
- **D.2.** *“Permit uses in neighborhood commercial areas that are intended to serve the local neighborhood. Mixed-use developments should be encouraged within neighborhood commercial areas.”* (Page 57 of the Comprehensive Plan)
- **D.6.** *“Encourage neighborhood commercial areas to reflect the identity and character of individual neighborhoods, thus strengthening their importance as neighborhood centers. Neighborhood commercial areas may set additional specific goals for their community in order to further refine the specific identity they wish to achieve.”* (Page 57 of the Comprehensive Plan)

Ms. Coccia pointed out that, just recently, additional text was added to the Comprehensive Plan specific to the Five Corners and Firdale Village commercial areas. She expressed her belief that the proposed application is similar in nature, and staff feels the proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

2. **Is the proposed amendment detrimental to the public interest, health, safety and welfare of the City?** Ms. Coccia said staff argues that the proposed amendment would not be detrimental. She noted that the new language is fairly consistent with the relatively new language provided for the Five Corners and Firdale Village areas.

3. **Does the proposed amendment maintain the appropriate balance of land uses within the City?** Ms. Coccia said staff argues that adding new goals and policies to the neighborhood commercial section of the Comprehensive Plan would maintain the appropriate balance of land uses within the City. However, there is one wording change staff is recommending related to the mix of commercial versus residential uses required. She noted that the applicant’s proposal is that at least one quarter (25%) of a development be devoted to commercial use. Staff recommends changing this to one third (33%). Staff believes this would be equivalent to the policy direction established in other neighborhood commercial areas, in that the equivalent of at least one floor of the overall development is reserved for commercial use. She reminded the Board that the primary reason for establishing and encouraging neighborhood commercial areas is to provide commercial uses and services in proximity to larger residential neighborhoods. Allowing residential uses to dominate neighborhood centers would be counter productive in meeting this goal.

4. **Is the subject parcel physically suitable for the requested land use designation(s) and the anticipated land use development(s), including, but not limited to, access, provisions of utilities, compatibility with adjoining land uses and absence of physical constraints?** Ms. Coccia said staff argues that the subject area, itself, would be physically suitable for the requested language change. The site is relatively flat and located at the base of a fairly steep slope. She referred to Attachment 4, which is a liDAR map that illustrates the contours of the subject properties. She noted that the identified stream, Perrinville Creek, would need to be taken into consideration with any future development proposal, and all future development would have to meet the applicable zoning criteria for height, setbacks, lot coverage, parking critical areas, etc.

Based on the Statements of Fact, Analysis, Conclusions and Attachments in the staff report, Ms. Coccia recommended the Board forward a recommendation to the City Council to approve the request to add a new section of text to the Comprehensive Plan specific to the Perrinville Neighborhood. However, she recommended the last sentence in the proposed language be changed to read, “The mix of uses shall incorporate not less than one third commercial space.” She concluded that the applicant has demonstrated that the proposed amendment is consistent with the provisions of the Comprehensive Plan and in the public interest.

Board Member Henderson inquired regarding the maximum height allowed in the Neighborhood Business (BN) and Community Business (BC) zones. Ms. Coccia replied that the maximum height allowed in the BN zone is 25 feet. The BC zone allows a height of up to 25 feet, with a provision for an additional 5 feet if certain conditions are met. Board Member Henderson questioned why the proposed language makes reference to limiting future construction to three stories instead of allowing the zoning criteria to govern height. Ms. Coccia suggested the applicant be allowed to respond to this question.

Board Member Dewhirst requested an update from staff regarding the status of the City annexing the property in the area that is currently located within Snohomish County's jurisdiction. Mr. Chave explained that Edmonds went before the Boundary Review Board a few years ago with a request annex this property. However, their request was denied even though the current property owner was in favor of the change. He summarized that, at this point, Edmonds cannot go forward with annexation. Instead, annexation would be the prerogative of the City of Lynnwood.

Board Member Dewhirst inquired if there is transit service available in the Perrinville Neighborhood. Mr. Chave answered that he is not familiar with transit service in this area, but he suggested the Board ask this question of the applicant.

Board Member Works asked what the height limit is for the area that is currently under Snohomish County's jurisdiction. Ms. Coccia said she did not know what the height limit for that property is. Board Member Lovell asked if any leg work had been done by staff to ascertain if there are any guidelines or criteria for the development of this island. Mr. Chave answered that, presumably, the County's zoning would be similar to what exists on the properties that are part of Edmonds. He explained that when the City of Edmonds annexed the northeast quadrant, it was determined appropriate to apply the BC zoning designation. The City staff felt that would be the most equivalent zoning to what the County already permitted on the properties.

Board Member Reed pointed out that the proposed language is nearly identical to the language that was adopted for the Five Corners and Firdale Village Commercial Neighborhoods. Mr. Chave agreed that the language is extremely similar. Board Member Reed pointed out that no specific neighborhood characteristics were called out in the proposed language. He referred to Item D.1 on Page 57 of the Comprehensive Plan (Attachment 10), which states that neighborhood commercial development should be located at major arterial intersections and should be designed to minimize interference with through traffic. Further, he referred to Item 4 on Page 6 of the staff report, which describes the intersecting roads (76th Avenue West and Olympic View Drive) as a minor arterial and a collector street. Neither street is described as a major arterial, as would be required by Item D.1.

Acting Chair Young inquired if the end result of the application was intended to be BN zoning for the subject properties. Mr. Chave said that, logically, if the Comprehensive Plan amendment were approved as presented, a rezone to BN would eventually have to be approved to implement the change. He further explained that if the City Council adopts the proposed change, the property owners would likely follow up with a series of neighborhood meetings to identify the appropriate design and zoning standards to implement the plan change. He said the current BC zoning designation is not perfect for the subject properties because it does not address the appropriate height for the ground floor commercial space. He summarized that if the amendment is adopted by the City Council, staff would anticipate a public process to figure out what zoning would best implement the change.

Acting Chair Young recalled earlier comments related to the similarities in the language proposed for the Perrinville Neighborhood and the language that has already been adopted for the Five Corners and Westgate Neighborhoods. He asked staff to describe the existing zoning in the Westgate, Firdale Village and Five Corners Neighborhoods. Mr. Chave replied the Firdale Village Commercial Neighborhood is zoned BN, and the Five Corners Commercial Neighborhood is zoned BC. There is a mixture of BC and BN zoning in the Westgate Commercial Neighborhood. However, as a result of the recent Comprehensive Plan text changes associated to address the different zoning and design standards that should be applied. He emphasized that although the Comprehensive Plan has been amended relative to these areas, it is important to keep in mind that no zoning changes have been approved yet. He cautioned that the Westgate Commercial area is different in that it is more of a community commercial area than a neighborhood commercial area. Mr. Chave concluded that no automatic zoning changes would result from the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment. However, approval of the amendment would set the stage for zoning changes to occur in the future.

APPROVED

Acting Chair Young summarized that if the proposed amendment is adopted by the City Council, a neighborhood planning effort would commence to refine what the BN zone in the Perrinville Commercial Neighborhood might contain and how future development would look. Mr. Chave agreed that a public process would follow to figure out the details because the proposed language is very broad. Another public process would be required to identify the zoning and design standards that should be applied and this would be done absent of any proposal for a specific project and use.

Board Member Henderson again expressed surprise that the proposed language mentions a 3-story limit on height. He suggested that height should be addressed by the zoning regulations that pertain to the Perrinville Commercial Neighborhood and not by the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Chave pointed out that there is some discussion in the Comprehensive Plan about the number of stories allowed in commercial zones. He explained that the concept of “stories” helps broadly define what a development can look like, but it is up to the development regulations to identify the details. The language is intended to give a picture of generally what the Comprehensive Plan is talking about.

Board Member Works pointed out that if the proposed amendment is denied, the property owners would still have the opportunity to redevelop the properties based on the current zoning. Mr. Chave agreed. However, he clarified that the proposal is not necessarily to change the zoning of the neighborhood commercial area, but to provide direction for future development. Board Member Reed pointed out that both the BC and BN zoning designations allow residential development, and both have a height limit of 25 feet. However, the BC zone includes a provision that allows an additional 5 feet in height if certain conditions are met. In addition, there are severe restrictions on the amount of residential use that is allowed in the BN zone; one unit per parcel or property. Therefore, the existing zoning would not really allow for a mixture of uses since the residential space would be a very minor component of the commercial development.

Tony Shapiro, A.D. Shapiro Architects, indicated he was present to represent the applicant. He clarified that while some of the adjacent neighbors believe otherwise, the current proposal is not a rezone request. Instead, it is a proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan that is very general in nature. The specific details would be addressed in the future as part of a rezone proposal if the proposed amendment is adopted.

Mr. Shapiro expressed his belief that land use patterns are changing at this time as a result of the high cost of fuel. From an architectural and urban planning standpoint, this change necessitates a higher density than what is currently allowed by the present land use designations. He noted that the current BN zoning for the subject properties only allows one residential unit per parcel. While the BC zoning designation doesn’t limit the number of residential units, it does have a floor area ratio maximum of three. He expressed his belief that Perrinville is a unique area that is different than Five Corners or Firdale Village. These unique characteristics would be more appropriately addressed in the zoning language than in the Comprehensive Plan text.

Mr. Shapiro explained that although cities do not typically want to consider economic factors when reviewing land use criteria, it is important to keep in mind that in order for a property owner to be able to sell a parcel of property, there must be some economic vitality for the proposed project. Once buildings are constructed, they spiral downward unless they are maintained and kept up, and the buildings in the Perrinville area are on the last half of their life or further.

Mr. Shapiro noted the current construction that is taking place on the property that is part of the County. He said it appears the project will be some type of strip development that is set back from the street by the width of the parking lot. He suggested this type of development is not really conducive to a vibrant commercial area. He explained that one goal that planners typically try to achieve when attempting to revise land use is to encourage pedestrian activity on the street edge and bring the buildings out to the street edge. This encourages interest and gives back to the street. He explained a concept called “urban walls,” in which two or three-story walls create a boundary that helps contain the vitality of the street edge. This ends up being a positive aspect that brings life to communities and the buildings. It is also an important component to the livability of the City. He explained that the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment would result in buildings being pushed out to the street edge. He agreed that perhaps the language could be more forceful in order to achieve this goal, but it is the applicant’s thought that the buildings would be right at the property line and have glass fronts to encourage people in their cars and passersby to see into them.

Mr. Shapiro provided pictures to illustrate the conditions that currently exist in the Perrinville Commercial Neighborhood. He particularly referred to the newer strip mall type development, which is nice and has a lot of activity. He noted that because of the grade change and the buildings significant distance from the street edge, it is difficult to encourage and entice passersby to come inside. People passing by in cars may not even be aware of what is going on in the building. The applicant believes this situation would be dramatically improved if the buildings were lined up at the street edge. From an architectural standpoint, Mr. Shapiro advised that there are some challenges associated with placing development at the street edge. For example, two doors would be required so that access could be provided from the parking area located at the back of the property and from the sidewalk along the street frontage. He expressed his belief that the land use criteria should encourage or require that buildings in the Perrinville Commercial Neighborhood be built up to the street edge. He expressed disappointment that the City was unable to annex the property that is currently under the County's jurisdiction. However, he said a representative from the City of Lynnwood indicated they are in the process of annexing this portion of land.

Mr. Shapiro explained that because of the existing contours, it would be difficult to present a glass retail frontage at the street edge. However, he felt that Perrinville would be better off in the future to have a main street type configuration with buildings bounding the street to encourage people to interact with buildings rather than looking at parking lots. The developments that currently exist in the neighborhood do not encourage people to interact with the buildings.

Mr. Shapiro emphasized that the existing BN zoning only allows one residential unit per lot in the story above the street. The minimum lot area requirement is 6,000 square feet. The BC zoning designation would allow both retail and office uses on the ground floor, with unlimited housing units on the upper floors. There would be a height limit of 25 feet, plus an additional 5 feet if certain conditions could be met. There would be no setback requirement in the BC zone, with the exception of property lines that are adjacent to single-family residential zones. The gross building area cannot exceed three times the lot area.

Mr. Shapiro provided an aerial contour map of the neighborhood, which shows a 60-foot grade change between the adjacent properties and the subject properties. He explained that topography has significant implications on the future redevelopment of the properties in the neighborhood. This brings down the value of the properties, as well. He said his client currently operates a business in the neighborhood, and he is interested in relocating to a new site. He plans to sell his property in Perrinville and allow another property owner to develop the site in a manner that is more conducive to the neighborhood. The proposed amendment is intended to encourage a commercial retail setting that gives back to the community. It would also allow the future property owner to develop the site in a more competitive and economical fashion.

Mr. Shapiro provided a photograph of the properties located on the other side of 76th Avenue West, which illustrates the hillside that rises 60 to 70 feet. He noted that the existing building has parking on either side of the drive aisle and is located 60 to 80 feet from the street edge. This does not encourage passersby to identify with what goes on inside. He noted that building to the street edge would give back to the community in a more favorable fashion than a parking lot would. Mr. Shapiro provided an aerial map to illustrate the properties that would be impacted by the Comprehensive Plan change. The application would not change these boundaries.

Mr. Shapiro referred to earlier questions raised by the public about why the property that contains Perrinville Stream was included in the proposed amendment. He noted that this property has been included as part of the Perrinville Commercial Neighborhood for a number of years, and the proposed amendment would not impact the site where the post office is currently located. In addition, the property where the current new construction is located would not likely change in the near future. The proposed amendment would only impact three parcels, but the change could be very positive to the neighborhood.

Leslie Brown, A.D. Shapiro Architects, reviewed the existing conditions in the Perrinville neighborhood. She explained that, in many ways, Perrinville is at a crossroads in its development and residents are grappling with how to move forward and incorporate appropriate scale development while still maintaining the charm of the area. She noted that in just the last few days, adjacent residents have raised concerns about traffic and the condition of the roads, stormwater runoff, sewer capacity, and the preservation of habitat. She noted that most of these issues would be addressed by the City as part of the zoning ordinance and not within the context of the Comprehensive Plan. The applicant understands that any future changes in zoning would have to address all of these concerns.

Ms. Brown explained that the proposed amendment describes a type of neighborhood village development, which is more human scale, more efficient in land and energy use, and more attractive than the current strip mall development. She noted that this concept could be applied at any scale. She provided pictures to illustrate the existing conditions in the Perrinville Commercial Neighborhood. She explained that the neighborhood already includes many elements of a neighborhood village. For example, there are a variety of shops and services, and the coffee shop/deli/bar serves as a meeting place. There is residential housing nearby, as well as some commercial/office space. The commercial area is easily accessible by car, but less accessible to pedestrians. There is some useable outdoor space associated with the existing development, such as the courtyard in front of the deli and a lot of nearby parks and other natural attributes.

Ms. Brown reviewed some of the land use concerns that have resulted from the existing conditions as follows:

- **Quantity of traffic and patterns.** Ms. Brown explained that the current quantity and pattern of traffic could possibly be changed in the future if volumes get too heavy, but any future proposals would also include a traffic analysis to address problems. She explained that because the applicant is not proposing a specific project, they did not do a traffic analysis. However, a traffic analysis would be an important component of any development proposal.
- **Current condition of the arterials.** Ms. Brown pointed out that there are a lot of potholes on 76th Avenue West and Olympic View Drive, and these problems need to be taken care of by the City.
- **Safety and pedestrian access.** Ms. Brown advised that there is currently a lack of safe pedestrian access in the neighborhood, and the proposed amendment would encourage an improvement to this situation.
- **Lack of mid-range office space.**
- **Need for more stores and/or services.**
- **Physical condition of buildings in Perrinville Village.** Ms. Brown explained that, in some ways, the vitality of the area is challenging, making it difficult for certain businesses to maintain themselves over time.
- **Environmental and infrastructure issues.** Ms. Brown cautioned that environmental issues must be considered in the context of anything that is proposed for development.

Mr. Shapiro explained that the proposed application is for an amendment to the City's Comprehensive Plan. The goal is to be specific to the need and nature of Perrinville. The proposed language is very similar to the language that was recently adopted for Firdale Village, and the applicant believes the goals and objectives for Firdale Village would be appropriate for Perrinville, as well. He noted that his office is involved in writing language for the Firdale Village area, which would include design guidelines as well as zoning language. The applicant anticipates any future rezone for the Perrinville neighborhood would also include design guidelines, as well as zoning language.

Mr. Shapiro advised that many of the neighbors have expressed concern about the possibility of allowing three-story buildings. However, it is important to understand that there are different ways to address the bulk and mass of buildings, and these methods would be considered during the rezone phase of the process. The applicant incorporated three-story buildings into the draft language to add economic vitality to the property. If three-story buildings are not allowed, it is not likely that redevelopment would occur and the existing buildings would continue to deteriorate. The community must address how they want to reinvigorate the community.

Mr. Shapiro referred to the staff's recommendation that the draft language be changed to require that at least 33% of a development be utilized by commercial space. He pointed out that the language that was recently adopted for Five Corners and Firdale Village only required 25% commercial space. He suggested that if 25% is sufficient to achieve economic vitality in these other two areas, it should be appropriate for the Perrinville area, too. He reminded the Board of the challenging topography that exists on the subject properties. He noted that in order to achieve a density that is economically feasible, parking must be provided at grade or below the building. However, the land values in Perrinville would not support the cost of providing underground parking. In order for projects on the subject properties to be feasible, developers must maximize the parking. It is also important to place the commercial space at the street edge. The applicant believes that a depth of 60 feet would be appropriate for commercial space on the ground floor. He agreed with staff that it would be possible to provide some commercial space on the upper floors, but there are issues associated with fire safety and the need to separate the uses. He expressed concern that if the Board recommends approval of the staff's proposed change, the economic potential for redevelopment of the properties would be diminished. He emphasized that redevelopment is driven by

economics, and architecture is driven by parking requirements. Buildings that do not provide adequate parking would not attract tenants or residents, and they would become economically unviable. Achieving reasonable parking levels is mandatory in order for a property to redevelop. He asked that the Board retain the 25% ratio for commercial space.

Mr. Shapiro referred to the criteria that must be considered when reviewing Comprehensive Plan amendments as follows:

1. Is the proposed amendment consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and in the public interest? Mr. Shapiro referred to several existing goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan that are supportive of the proposed amendment. He specifically noted the following:

- **Policy B.3.** *“The proliferation of strip commercial areas along Edmonds streets and highways and the development of commercial uses poorly related to the surrounding land uses should be strongly discouraged.”* Mr. Shapiro explained that the current zoning designations of BC and BN would typically result in commercial strip mall development, which is highly discouraged by this goal. Policies which encourage a mixture of uses and allow for building more stories as opposed to building out would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, bringing the commercial development out to the street edge would be better than the existing style of development. This would allow people driving by to see what is going on inside the building. He summarized that how land use patterns are develop and laid out has a direct impact on the economic vitality of the area. He expressed his belief that the proposed amendment would enhance the economic vitality of Perrinville.
- **Policy D.** *“Neighborhood commercial areas are intended to provide a mix of services, shopping, gathering places, office space, and housing for local neighborhoods.”* Mr. Shapiro explained that the new language emphasizes the goal of providing housing along with commercial uses and providing mixed-use buildings that provide a combination of housing alternatives that contribute to a neighborhood center pattern of development.
- **Policy D.2.** *“Permit uses in neighborhood commercial areas that are intended to serve the local neighborhood. Mixed-use developments should be encouraged within neighborhood commercial areas.”* Mr. Shapiro pointed out that the proposed language would encourage mixed-use development. It also talks about potentially amending the zoning code to allow for residential uses to better utilize the property.

2. Is the proposed amendment detrimental to the public interest, health, safety and welfare of the City? Mr. Shapiro said he believes the application meets this criterion. He explained that there are similarities between Five Corners and Firdale Village, but Perrinville presents its own unique setting. He noted that no adverse environmental impacts were identified through the SEPA process. The applicant believes that providing a more attractive form of development would have numerous benefits for local residents, the City, and regional traffic patterns by increasing options for more pedestrian access and less energy intensive development and services. He concluded that, in general, the goal of encouraging neighborhood center type development would help to reduce patterns of sprawl and encourage more efficient uses of the property in the area. He suggested that perhaps with the future enhancement of Olympic View Drive, a bus route could be added on 76th Avenue West. It is the applicant’s hope that the Perrinville area would be linked to transit service in the near future. He also emphasized that any environmental impacts would have to be addressed in detail before a rezone application could be approved for the properties.

3. Does the proposed amendment maintain the appropriate balance of land uses within the City? Mr. Shapiro argued that the proposed application would satisfy this criterion. He pointed out that the proposed language would allow for more land use options in the area, including neighborhood scale mixed-use development. In addition, mixed use development would allow an increase in residential capacity by including commercial and residential uses in and on a single lot area. He said he does not believe the proposed amendment would impact the City’s land use balance, as it would allow for residential and commercial, as well as more creative combinations of these uses.

4. Is the subject parcel physically suitable for the requested land use designation(s) and the anticipated land use development(s), including, but not limited to, access, provisions of utilities, compatibility with adjoining land uses and absence of physical constraints? Mr. Shapiro said he believes the proposed application would satisfy this criterion, as well. He pointed out that the land parcels within the Perrinville area are physically suitable for the

requested Comprehensive Plan amendment. The parcels currently have utility provisions and public access, and emergency services are also readily available. In addition, the parcels are not known to contain critically sensitive areas. However, the steep slope of the topography creates a natural buffer between adjacent residential neighborhoods. Adjoining land uses vary at this time from multi-family residential to small commercial and single-family residential.

Mr. Shapiro pointed out that issues related to sewer service would have to be addressed as part of a rezone application. The applicant would have to show that adequate sewer capacity would be available to accommodate the proposed change in zoning. He pointed out that the increased density that would result from the change would not be so dramatic that upgrades to the existing system would be required.

Ms. Brown explained that implementing a “Neighborhood Village” design concept would involve the following elements:

- **Walkability.** Ms. Brown explained that implementing this concept involves creating a compact site design. Uses must be located within walking distance of the residential neighborhoods, and the access must be pedestrian friendly with attractive sidewalks. The goal should be to create a safe environment for pedestrians. She provided pictures to illustrate the benefits of wide sidewalks.
- **Ground Floor Commercial Space.** Ms. Brown advised that special attention should be given to make a distinction between the ground floor commercial space and the residential space above.
- **Live-Work Opportunities.** The “Neighborhood Village” concept encourages opportunities for business owners to live in the residential space above their commercial space. She noted that this type of development is popular in many cities.
- **Mixed-Use Building Types.** Ms. Brown explained that special attention must be given to the first floor commercial spaces. The retail uses should be located closer to the primary streets, with parking below or behind the retail buildings. She provided pictures of buildings that were constructed up against the sidewalk, with street parking available. She also provided several pictures of pedestrian friendly design, such as courtyards.
- **Transit Connections.** Ms. Brown advised that the site should include connections to a major transit or bus stop. In addition, the transit stops should be attractive and incorporate elements of safety and comfort.

Ms. Brown provided several pictures to illustrate different Neighborhood Village designs. She also provided pictures to illustrate the concept of three-story buildings, with commercial space on the ground floor and residential uses above.

Acting Chair Young invited Mr. Shapiro to share his ideas for how the proposed Comprehensive Plan language would be applied in the future. Mr. Shapiro provided a 3-dimensional model depicting how the parcels could be built out, with three-story buildings, parking located behind the buildings, and buildings that are built to the street edge. He noted that the buildings would step into the hillside as they go up in height. He said the drawing was provided to illustrate what might be possible if the amendment were approved. However, no development plans have been prepared at this point in time.

Mr. Shapiro expressed his belief that parallel parking on the street edge should be encouraged when improvements are made to the street in the future. He noted that parallel parking tends to slow cars down and neighbors and other pedestrians would be protected from traffic on the street. This type of design would provide a more urban type of pedestrian friendly zone at the intersection of 76th Avenue West and Olympic View Drive.

Board Member Works pointed out that while Mr. Shapiro talked about the need for buildings to be built up to the street, what he really meant was that the buildings should be constructed up to the sidewalk. Mr. Shapiro agreed.

Board Member Reed requested that Mr. Shapiro provided a synopsis of what occurred at the June 4th neighborhood meeting. Mr. Shapiro reported that seven to ten citizens attended the neighborhood meeting, and their primary concerns were related to height and increased density. He noted that many of the slides shown to the Board were also displayed at the neighborhood meeting, and the neighbors were offered an opportunity to interact with the applicant.

Board Member Works inquired how many stories are provided on the apartment building located to the south of the subject properties. Mr. Shapiro answered that this building is three stories high. *(Note: A member of the audience clarified that the apartment had two stories of residential space, and a ground floor space for parking.)*

Acting Chair Young cautioned the Board that they are only discussing the Comprehensive Plan text change at this time. While issues related to traffic, ground water, and critical areas are legitimate, they would be appropriately addressed as part of a rezone application. At this time, the Board must simply consider the Comprehensive Plan policy change as it has currently been proposed. He encouraged the public to limit their comments to those related to the proposed Comprehensive Plan text change, as well. He briefly reviewed the rules and procedures for the public hearing. He noted that all of the written comments that have been submitted to date have been provided to the Board.

John Heighway, Edmonds, presented a contour map from Snohomish County, which depicts the steep slopes and the location of the stream. Ms. Coccia identified the map as Attachment 32. She identified the Power Point presentation provided by Mr. Shapiro as Attachment 31. Mr. Heighway reviewed the information he received from the County for the property that is currently under construction across the street from the applicant's property (Snohomish County Permit Number 05-12520). He said the developer is constructing a 22-foot high building, with a binding site plan that requires a 10-foot buffer of green space between the sidewalk and the parking area. Setbacks were required for the site, and the developer was required to address surface water runoff issues. He noted the green space is actually a swale to handle the stormwater runoff. He emphasized that drainage is a big issue in the Perrinville Valley, and he encouraged the Board to direct staff to provide information from the County regarding this property.

Mr. Heighway expressed concern about the applicant's proposal to place buildings right up against the street. He noted that this type of development would be incompatible with the development that already exists in the area, and even the new development that is taking place now. He emphasized that the Board should not consider the property that is currently under the County's jurisdiction as part of Edmonds. The City can only consider changes for property that is within their jurisdiction. He pointed out that development across the street offers a light industrial atmosphere, and there are not too many areas in this location that act as an incubator for small businesses. He expressed his belief that economic vitality is already present in the Perrinville area that is not present at Five Corners or Firdale Village. He encouraged the Board to look at the application from the standpoint that any new development would look different than what currently exists.

Mr. Heighway noted that the proposed language is the same language that was recently adopted for Five Corners and Firdale Village, but it should not be. The language should be pertinent to Perrinville, which is the headwater to an environmental stream. He referred to the four criteria the Board must consider when reviewing Comprehensive Plan amendments. He said that while the applicant painted a rosy picture of what the proposed amendment would look like, the Board must stick to the four criteria when reviewing the application. He pointed out that the SEPA review contained 37 questions, and the applicant indicated that at least half of them would be addressed as part of the building permit application. He provided comments about each of the four Comprehensive Plan amendment criteria as follows:

- 1. Is the proposed amendment consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and in the public interest?** Mr. Heighway said that in his research with the City and County, he learned that the new building across the street from the subject sites would be 22 feet in height. Other buildings in the area are only 22 to 25 feet in height, not counting the attached appurtenances. He said he does not believe the proposed amendment would be in the public interest.

Mr. Heighway provided a map to identify the location of the steep slopes, which have associated building restrictions. He suggested that the restrictions should apply to the subject properties, as well. He also noted that the outlet for Perrinville Creek is within 200 feet of the subject properties. He concluded that the Comprehensive Plan and the Critical Areas Ordinance could be compromised by the proposed amendment. He summarized that these special circumstances need to be addressed as a separate issue.

- 2. Is the proposed amendment detrimental to the public interest, health, safety and welfare of the City?** Mr. Heighway said that because Perrinville Creek is a fish bearing stream, special consideration needs to be given to the condition of the stream, the slope, etc. These unique conditions do not exist at Firdale Village or Five Corners. In addition, the streets in the Firdale Village and Five Corner areas serve as major arterials between downtown Edmonds and Highway 99. It makes sense to have small business areas between these larger commercial areas. However, most people do not use 76th Avenue West as a main arterial. He expressed his belief that Perrinville is a node of the City and not a major arterial. Therefore, the application would not comply with this criterion. In addition, he noted there is no public transportation available in the area. He said he was offended that the applicant plagiarized the language from

another area of the Comprehensive Plan to determine what the Perrinville Neighborhood should look like. He emphasized that their neighborhood is different than these other commercial areas.

3. **Does the proposed amendment maintain the appropriate balance of land uses within the City?** Mr. Heighway expressed his belief that the subject parcels would likely be combined in order to develop a large building with retail and residential space. This type of massing would not be consistent with what currently exists in the neighborhood, and it would not create a pedestrian friendly atmosphere. Mr. Heighway said he believes the existing sidewalks on Olympic View Drive already provide a safe place for pedestrians. He doesn't necessarily object to BN zoning for the subject parcels on a lot-by-lot basis. He said he would be willing to listen to what the zoning issues are and work with the applicant to come up with a solution. He concluded that it is not necessary to add another level of bureaucracy by initiating a Comprehensive Plan amendment.
4. **Is the subject parcel physically suitable for the requested land use designation(s) and the anticipated land use development(s), including, but not limited to, access, provisions of utilities, compatibility with adjoining land uses and absence of physical constraints?** Mr. Heighway pointed out that there is a 70-foot bank along the back portion of the subject properties, and there would not be a trail from the top of the bank to the commercial areas to provide pedestrian access. He emphasized that there is no pedestrian access in this location, and the applicant has not proposed any ideas for providing access from the residential neighborhoods to the commercial uses. He also noted that in order to develop a three-story building, the applicant would be required to dig into the steep slope, and this would influence the properties above and below the subject sites.

Mr. Heighway pointed out that Olympic View Drive is not a major arterial. He said that, as a citizen of Perrinville, he was somewhat offended that the neighborhood was included in the same thought process that made Five Corners and Firdale Village. He suggested the applicant should have come up with a better proposal that identifies what the new development would like. He encouraged the Board to review the four Comprehensive Plan amendment criteria carefully. He suggested they would find that the application fails all four. He also encouraged the Board to reject the proposal or send it back to the staff for more work to come up with something that is more narrow and complete. He recalled that negative comments were voiced at the neighborhood meeting. At that time, the applicant presented plans showing what the zoning of the property could be, but now the Board has indicated they would be addressing the Comprehensive Plan amendment only.

Paul Tomlin, Edmonds, pointed out the location of the steep bank along the back of the subject properties. He suggested that three-story development would not even come close to reaching the top of either side of the bank. He observed that there are already buildings constructed up to the sidewalk on 76th Avenue West, and there are also multi-family developments that are three-stories high. He reminded the Board that the City would be making major improvements to Olympic View Drive that would reach all the way to 76th Avenue West, and it is his understanding that the City would also participate in a joint sewer improvement project with the City of Lynnwood at that time. He noted that extensive work was done on the drainage of Perrinville Creek to mitigate the problems associated with landslides. Mr. Tomlin agreed that Perrinville is a unique area, but he suggested it is not necessarily charming. He noted that the Lynnwood side of the street is developed into a hodgepodge of different kinds of uses, and the buildings on the Edmonds side of the street are old. He suggested that the area could benefit from redevelopment.

Thomas Blazey, Edmonds, said he supports the comments provided by Mr. Heighway. While the applicant has provided good examples of what the street could look like, he expressed concern that the buildings would be too large and out of character with the surrounding neighborhoods. He pointed out that future development could actually look quite different than the examples portrayed by the applicant, and the City has no control over what takes place on the Lynnwood side of the street. Approval of the amendment could result in contrasting development styles. He expressed concern that if the amendment were approved, the resulting development could be quite different than what was shown by the applicant.

Alan Suter, Edmonds, said he is the manager of the Perrinville Village Apartment Complex. He explained that the apartments are very unique. They are all the same, and they have real fine tenants. When occupancy changes occur, they do not have a problem filling the space because of the location of the units. .

Linda Hicks, Edmonds, referred to the letter she submitted prior to the meeting, which was identified as Attachment 25. She said she attended the June 4th neighborhood meeting and voiced her opposition to the proposed amendment. She said she and her husband like Perrinville the way it is, and they are upset that Mr. Shapiro could represent a proposed change from a property owner who doesn't even want to stay in the area. She pointed out that Mr. Shapiro brought up the concept of rezoning the property on several occasions. She encouraged the Board Members to visit the quaint neighborhood and see how it is different than Five Corners or Firdale Village. She said she both walks and runs in the neighborhood, and other people consistently use the streets for this purpose, too. She recalled that at the neighborhood meeting, the applicant presented slides of what the neighborhood could look like, but she emphasized there is no guarantee since the City doesn't have jurisdiction on all parts of the property. She urged the Board to take this fact into consideration.

James Pope, Edmonds, said his main concern is related to the massive wall that could potentially be constructed against the street if the proposed amendment is adopted. He said he both walks and runs along 76th Avenue West, and he doesn't want to run next to a large building with glazed windows. He emphasized that 76th Avenue West is not a major arterial with a lot of traffic. Therefore, the idea that people would drive by and want to visit the businesses does not really seem possible. He summarized that he is quite comfortable with the community as it currently exists, and he would like to keep it that way so it remains safe.

Andy Gates, Edmonds, agreed with the previous speakers who opposed the proposed amendment. He noted that the applicant provided a lot of details about what redevelopment would look like, even though that is not what the Board is supposed to consider. He noted the community's strong desire to maintain their quaint neighborhood. He said he lives on top of the ridge overlooking Perrinville, and he and his neighbors are opposed to a large structure at the bottom of the ridge.

Donald Bishop, Edmonds, agreed with the previous speakers who spoke against the proposal. He said he has a problem with design illustrations provided by the applicant with the building against the sidewalk and two layers of apartments with parking underneath. This type of design indicates that the people living in the residential units would take up all of the parking space provided by the development. He noted there would not be enough parking along the street to accommodate the commercial use unless the street was widened. If the street was widened, it would take up some of the building space. He opposed the concept of placing commercial buildings against the sidewalk, and he doesn't support requiring people to park underneath a building, either. He said he walks through the area everyday, and it is perfectly safe at this time. He said he would not want to walk against a large building that is three-stories high. He suggested that would not be safe or conducive to the area.

Christen Leupold, Edmonds, said she submitted written comments to the Board prior to the meeting, and many of her comments have been addressed by previous speakers. She said she is opposed to the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment. She noted that the person who hired Mr. Shapiro to present the application is selling the property and leaving the area. She suggested he wants the amendment so he can increase the value of his property. He doesn't really want to give back to the community, and he doesn't care about the community at all. She said she purchased her home because she likes the rural nature of the area, and many of the neighbors enjoy the area because it doesn't have tall buildings. While three stories is not that tall given the topography and location, buildings against the sidewalk could result in a greater impact. She summarized her belief that the proposed application does not address all of the issues that must be considered.

Phil Hillstrom, Edmonds, said he lives just north of the post office. While he understands that the Board would not be addressing the sewer problem at this time, it is important to keep in mind that a serious problem exists. Residents of the area have experienced severe impacts from sewage flowing out of the manhole covers and onto their properties and into their homes. Whatever happens with the proposed amendment, he said he would like the City to address the sewer issue.

Laura Spehar, Edmonds, provided recent pictures to illustrate the flooding problems that have occurred at 76th Avenue West and Olympic View Drive. She noted that there are still signs of sewer seepage on 76th Avenue West, and she asked that the Board keep this in mind. She said she owns two acres on Perrinville Creek, but she didn't receive notice of the neighborhood meeting until after it had occurred. She noted that while signs were posted, they were taken down and left in the ditch. She provided pictures to illustrate the location of the notice signs.

Ms. Spehar said that as she read through the staff report she identified several discrepancies, particularly related to the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) that was prepared by the applicant. She suggested the EIS does not adequately portray the environmentally sensitive areas that exist in the neighborhood. It does not address existing erosion problems or possible impacts to wildlife, either. She said she is a member of the Edmonds Backyard Wildlife Program, and they are working towards a citywide community wildlife certificate for the City of Edmonds. She said she was present to provide a voice for their project and the potential impacts the proposed amendment could have. She emphasized that there is wildlife living on Perrinville Creek, including, but not limited to, great blue herons, mountain beavers, and other types of endangered species. She referred to a map created by the Department of Wildlife that identifies nesting eagles in the area. She asked the Board to note these discrepancies. She urged the Board to remember that Perrinville Creek is home to wildlife, and local residents are being encouraged to work with Adopt a Stream and the Stream Keeper Program to take better care of the area. Ms. Spehar provided each of the Board Members with a copy of the National Wildlife Federation's Tree Conservation and Home Site Development Guide, which was identified as Attachment 33. She also provided information related to the Green Cities Act and noted there are some large conifer trees on the subject sites.

Roger Hertrich, Edmonds, said he took interest in this proposal because it involves BN zoning, and he happens to live across the street from BN zoning. He said he is cautious about changes that are made in areas zoned BN because the changes can result in large impacts. He suggested the proposed amendment over generalized the need to change the zoning to BN. The applicant did not take into consideration that the property is located within three jurisdictions: Edmonds, Lynnwood and Snohomish County. He referred to the property that is within the County's jurisdiction, which is currently being developed. He noted that a grassy area is located between the road and the structure. He suggested the Board consider the concept called "rural by design," which paints a picture of the Perrinville area. He pointed out that the entire area is natural, and placing buildings right next to the sidewalk would not maintain this rural character. This type of development is more common in downtown Edmonds. He suggested that there would never be a significant amount of pedestrian traffic in the Perrinville Neighborhood, and most would be people who are exercising rather than shopping. He suggested the City consider changing the zoning of the subject properties to multi-family residential, instead.

Mr. Hertrich pointed out that no SEPA appeals were filed by adjacent property owners, and staff did not adequately deal with the SEPA review, either. He recalled an application for development that was submitted to the City before the post office was developed. The application was approved, but the applicant was required to reduce the number of lots allowed in order to protect the environment around Perrinville Creek. He noted that the City of Lynnwood currently contributes a significant amount of stormwater runoff that passes through the area. Anything that would add to the runoff problem should be considered a SEPA problem. He urged the Board to realize that significant environmental issues were never addressed by the SEPA Determination. The SEPA review should also consider the impact total build out would have on traffic in the area.

Mr. Hertrich said that while a three-story structure might fit well on properties where there is a significant slope, the buildings should not be allowed to be three stories high along the sidewalk. He suggested that setbacks be required to give a natural feeling of openness. He emphasized that Perrinville should not be allowed to develop like downtown Edmonds. He recalled that the original BN zone did not allow residential uses at all. This was later changed, but certain restrictions applied. One story of residential housing above commercial space was previously allowed in the downtown, and this has been changed to allow up to two stories of residential space in the mixed-use zones. However, this type of development does not need to take place in this tiny restricted area. He expressed his belief that it is not appropriate to change the zoning for the entire area in order to address the needs of just a few properties. He encouraged the Board to consider designating the area as "rural by design."

Alison Pope, Edmonds, addressed her comments to the lot that is located just north of the proposed office development on 76th Avenue West and the lot north of Lunds. She asked that these two properties be excluded from the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment so there would be no opportunity to change the height or setbacks requirements. This would allow future development to remain consistent with the adjacent residential areas. It would also allow the residential neighborhood retain to its existing character.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED. THE BOARD TOOK A BREAK AT 9:00 P.M. TO REVIEW THE ADDITIONAL WRITTEN COMMENTS THAT WERE SUBMITTED PRIOR TO THE MEETING. THEY RECONVENED THE MEETING AT 9:12 P.M.

APPROVED

Tony Shapiro, A.D. Shapiro Architects, pointed out that surface water issues are governed by the Department of Ecology (DOE). Future build out of the properties would have to comply with the DOE requirements, which stipulate that a development proposal cannot increase runoff at a rate that is beyond what currently exists. He noted that options for addressing stormwater runoff include detention tanks, bioswales, green rooftops, and retaining the water to use for irrigation. Another option is to percolate the water back into the ground if the existing soil is conducive to this technique. He emphasized that the Comprehensive Plan doesn't get into this level of detail, but these issues would be addressed as part of the design and development process.

Again, Mr. Shapiro advised that the City of Lynnwood is looking at the possibility of annexing the area that is currently within the County's jurisdiction. However, their director of planning made it clear that they have not started the process to commence annexation at this time. Once this property is annexed into the City of Lynnwood, they would go through a similar process of creating and applying their Comprehensive Plan to the parcels. He suggested the City of Edmonds must address the parcels they have jurisdiction over now and not wait for other jurisdictions to take action on adjacent properties.

Mr. Shapiro referred to comments made earlier that the applicant doesn't care about the community. He emphasized that the owner does care, and that is why he feels that the current use is inappropriate for the site. He believes he needs to relocate and allow the property to be redeveloped. The proposed amendment is intended to allow development that would result in a positive impact on the community. He said he cannot see any negative aspects associated with the proposed amendment.

Mr. Shapiro referred to Mr. Hertrich's suggestion that the Perrinville Neighborhood be identified as a "rural by design" area. He noted the site constraints associated with the steep slope that is located fairly close to the road. He explained that the most efficient way to address this concern and achieve parking that any development would be required to provide without going below grade is to put the parking below the building. He further noted that existing zoning requires buildings to be set back 20 feet from the property line, and landscaping would be required, as well. This would push the building 20 feet closer to the slope, and the additional engineering requirements would make a redevelopment project unfeasible. Mr. Shapiro said he completed an analysis of the site and determined that a building could not comply with the criteria set forth by the BN zoning designation. He suggested that if a Comprehensive Plan amendment is not approved and a rezone does not occur, the properties would continue to degrade and they would not contribute to the economic vitality of Perrinville.

Mr. Shapiro referred to comments made earlier that neither 76th Avenue West nor Olympic View Drive were major arterials; and therefore, they would not qualify for commercial activity. He suggested this comment is short sided. He explained that neighborhood structures that respond to the neighborhood needs could be a benefit to the community. The type of building configuration proposed by the applicant would support these types of uses. Incubation space would also work in this location.

In regards to parking being consumed by the residential uses, Mr. Shapiro explained that one of the beauties of mixed-use development is that parking that supports the residential uses is available during the day to support the business uses. This eliminates the need to build redundant parking lots. He disagreed with the assessment that there would not be adequate parking by building over the at-grade parking that is constructed below the residential space.

Mr. Shapiro referred to the massing study that was completed for the proposal, and he particularly noted the neighbors' inability to discern what the building would look like. He clarified that at this stage in the process, the massing study was not intended to be a rendered design for a proposed building. He agreed this was probably misleading to the public as to what the applicant's ultimate intent is and what redevelopment possibilities might include.

Board Member Works inquired about the setback requirements for a BC zone. Mr. Chave said there are not any setback requirements in the BC zone. However, if the property is adjacent to a single-family residential property, a 15-foot setback would be required. He noted that the BN zone has a 20-foot street setback, as well as a setback requirement when adjacent to single-family residential zones.

Board Member Works referred to the Mr. Shapiro's earlier statement that the applicant is not interested in the properties to the north on both sides of 76th Avenue West. She asked why staff required the applicant to include these properties as part of

the proposed amendment. Mr. Chave explained that the proposed text covers the entire neighborhood center, which involves all of the properties. He suggested that differences could be addressed as part of the rezone process. Board Member Lovell clarified that the proposal is not asking to change the zoning from BN to BC.

Mr. Chave referred to apparent confusion about misleading language in the Comprehensive Plan, particularly related to arterial intersections. He explained that, technically, none of the City's established neighborhood centers are located on major arterials. However, they are located on significant intersections where a minor arterial intersects with another minor arterial or collector street. That means that neighborhood centers must be located at major intersections, and not necessarily on major arterials. Acting Chair Young suggested this issue be clarified at some point in the future by a staff initiated Comprehensive Plan amendment.

Mr. Chave noted that Perrinville is different than some of the other neighborhood centers because it is located further north and is not served by public transit. He said he checked with the City's transportation element of the Comprehensive Plan to review the planned bus routes. He noted that not only is there currently no bus service through the area, there is not even a bus stop within a half mile. That speaks to why Perrinville should be considered differently than Firdale Village or Five Corners.

Board Member Henderson disclosed that he lives 1.6 miles north of Perrinville and goes through the neighborhood all the time. In addition, he remembers his mother taking him to visit Gertie Perrin in 1958. He recalled that her husband, Gus, ran for president every four years on the greenback ticket. He emphasized that he feels he would be able to objectively participate in the discussion and recommendation.

Board Member Henderson pointed out that commercial development is located in numerous areas of the City that are not identified in the Comprehensive Plan as "Neighborhood Business Areas." He expressed his belief that Five Corners, Westgate, Firdale Village and Edmonds Way are sufficient enough in size and activity to be noticed as such, but Perrinville and other numerous intersections throughout the City with business development do not need to be specifically called out in the plan. He suggested that if the applicant wants to have more flexible zoning, she should apply to rezone the property to BC or ask for another zone to be created that would allow for additional height. However, these types of regulations and policies do not really belong in the zoning code.

Board Member Henderson pointed out that there is very little retail space in Perrinville; just one coffee shop and a mini mart. However, there are numerous commercial spaces that offer services to the area, and these do not need to be located up against the street. He summarized that there is no need for a retail window environment right up against the street. The area is not appropriate for that type of interaction. He said he would vote against the proposed amendment.

Board Member Dewhirst said the Perrinville Neighborhood is a conundrum to him. He said his initial thought was that the proposed amendment could be an instrument to start defining what the Perrinville Neighborhood is and what it might become. However, he now believes this work would be best accomplished by the City conducting a neighborhood planning program rather than trying to "shoehorn" a similar process on the back of a current application. He said he believes that both sides have valid arguments and the current zoning is not working well. He also agreed with the applicant that the economic life of some of the buildings is coming to an end. He said he would like see something more and different than just another strip commercial development. He suggested that neither the City nor the neighborhood would benefit from allowing the current type of development to continue.

Board Member Dewhirst said he sees communities like Perrinville starting to play a different role in the future, particularly with the dramatic increase in gas prices. People will be looking for services and retail business that are closer to home. However, the City's current zoning tools will not allow the area to redevelop in this fashion. He suggested the City participate in a unified approach with the City of Lynnwood and Snohomish County to figure out what is best for the future of the area. He reminded the Board that the City would be undertaking a large road project on Olympic View Drive in the very near future, and the new road could attract more traffic to the intersection of 76th Avenue West where it would likely come to a halt. He reminded the neighborhood that the City is currently working on an update of their transportation element of the Comprehensive Plan. If they are worried about existing and future traffic problems in their neighborhood, it would be behoove them to attend the open house on June 19th to voice their concerns and opinions.

APPROVED

Board Member Dewhirst said he believes the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment would be premature, and he would not support the application as presented. He noted that the application has the potential to open the door to change, which needs to be done; but more discussion needs to take place before the City could take the next step.

Board Member Lovell said he has lived right up the street from Perrinville Village for the past 18 years. He expressed concern that the property that is under Snohomish County's jurisdiction seems to be the brunt of the problem. He said the current construction pattern in the area is frightening. He expressed his belief that something good needs to happen in the area, and there are better development options that strip malls. He summarized that the Perrinville area does need some help as it continues to grow. He said he predicts that as the City grows, the traffic through the neighborhood would increase, as well.

Board Member Works said she drives through the Perrinville neighborhood frequently, and she has noticed that traffic has increased dramatically over the years. Some of the properties in the neighborhood are in bad shape, particularly those that are under the County's jurisdiction. She said she would like to see these properties redeveloped into some type of mixed use, with housing opportunities that are more affordable than in many other areas in Edmonds. She said she is not convinced it would be appropriate for development to take place right up to the sidewalk edge, but the current style of development is also unattractive. She said she would support the concept of three-story buildings on the southern properties because of the topography. She concluded that if the area is changed in the future, detailed design guidelines would be critical. In addition, any future plans must address the current sewer problem.

Board Member Reed thanked the citizens for attending the meeting and for providing written comments for the Board to consider. He said it is important for the Board to have a clear understanding of how adjacent property owners feel about a proposal. He expressed his belief that the proposed amendment is not appropriate for the subject area. While he agreed that something needs to be done, he is not sure what the change should be. He suggested that the Perrinville Neighborhood is different than other BN commercial areas in the City. He referred to the sizeable citizen group that formed to testify before the Board and encouraged them to work together to come up with a plan for what might be appropriate for the commercial intersection. He agreed with Board Member Dewhirst that the future reconstruction of Olympic View Drive would have an impact on the neighborhood. He summarized that the BC zone would probably be sufficient zoning to deal with the properties, and multi-family residential could also be considered. He said he would not vote to recommend approval of the proposed amendment.

Acting Chair Young said he could not support the proposed amendment, either. He said he sees the proposal as the first step towards intensification and redevelopment, which is not necessarily a bad thing. However, he is not sure the proposal is the best way to get there. He noted that testimony and the staff report pointed out the similarities between the subject property and two other neighborhood commercial planning areas, which may be appropriate up to a point. However, the Perrinville Neighborhood is distinctly different in that it has only a fraction of the intensity that exists at Westgate and Five Corners. While the intersection at 76th Avenue West and Olympic View Drive is significant to those living in the Perrinville Neighborhood, it could not really be classified as a commercial destination for people living outside of the area.

Acting Chair Young recalled that the City conducted neighborhood meetings for residents living in the Five Corners and Firdale Village neighborhoods, and the neighbors were invited to share their ideas for the future. He applauded the applicant and her representative for attempting to follow this same process, but he suggested that the effort must be sponsored by an impartial third party like the City. Until this type of process occurs, he would be unable to support a change. He summarized his belief that the proposed amendment is not the appropriate way to get more intensive redevelopment in this kind of a commercial area within the City.

Board Member Dewhirst reminded the Board of the City's policy to no longer support more intense uses in areas that are not served by public transportation, which is the case in the Perrinville area. He said that while the proposal represents a relatively minor change in zoning, the incremental impacts associated with the change could be much greater.

BOARD MEMBER DEWHIRST MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION OF DENIAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR FILE NUMBER AMD-2007-17, BASED ON THE BOARD'S REVIEW OF THE FOLLOWING COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT CRITERIA:

- 1. Is the proposed amendment consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and in the public interest?**

THE BOARD FINDS THAT THE APPLICATION IS NOT CONSISTENT WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OR IN THE PUBLIC INTEREST.

- 2. Is the proposed amendment detrimental to the public interest, health, safety and welfare of the City?**

THE BOARD FINDS THAT THE APPLICATION IS PREMATURE AT THIS POINT IN TIME, PARTICULARLY GIVEN THE INFORMATION AT HAND.

- 3. Does the proposed amendment maintain the appropriate balance of land uses within the City?**

EVEN THOUGH THE PROPER BALANCE OF LAND USES WOULD BE MAINTAINED, THE BOARD BELIEVES THE PROPOSED CHANGE IS PREMATURE AT THIS POINT IN TIME.

- 4. Is the subject parcel physically suitable for the requested land use designation(s) and the anticipated land use development(s), including, but not limited to, access, provisions of utilities, compatibility with adjoining land uses and absence of physical constraints?**

THE BOARD FINDS THAT THE SUBJECT PARCEL WOULD NOT BE PHYSICALLY OR ENVIRONMENTALLY SUITABLE FOR THE REQUESTED CHANGE.

BOARD MEMBER HENDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 5-1, WITH BOARD MEMBER WORKS VOTING IN OPPOSITION.

Mr. Chave announced that this item has tentatively been scheduled on the City Council's agenda for July 22nd for a public hearing and final decision. He noted that anyone on the mailing list would receive notice of the hearing.

BOARD MEMBER REED MOVED THAT IF THE CITY COUNCIL DECIDES TO ADOPT THE PROPOSED AMENDMENT (FILE NUMBER AMD-2007-17), THE BOARD RECOMMEND THEY ACCEPT THE STAFF'S RECOMMENDATION TO CHANGE THE LAST SENTENCE OF THE PROPOSED LANGUAGE TO READ, "THE MIX OF USES SHALL INCORPORATE NOT LESS THAN ONE THIRD COMMERCIAL SPACE." BOARD MEMBER LOVELL SECONDED THE MOTION.

Board Member Henderson expressed his belief that requiring 25% of the space to be commercial would be sufficient. He once again pointed out that there are numerous business centers throughout the City, and he did not feel it appropriate to address all of them specifically in the Comprehensive Plan. However, if the City Council chooses to adopt the proposed amendment, then a 25% requirement for commercial space would be acceptable.

Board Member Reed pointed out that the Comprehensive Plan identifies a 25% requirement for the Firdale Village and Five Corner planning areas; however, these two areas would allow construction up to four stories high. That means the entire ground floor could be dedicated to commercial uses. If the City were to establish a 25% commercial requirement in the Perrinville area and limit the height to three stores, there would be no assurance that the entire first floor would be dedicated to commercial. This could result in development that is really more residential in nature, which is not the intent of the BC and BN zones.

THE MOTION CARRIED 5-1, WITH BOARD MEMBER HENDERSON VOTING IN OPPOSITION.

APPROVED

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Mr. Chave advised that, upon the recommendation of the City Attorney, the City Council has referred a code amendment to the Board for consideration. He explained that several years ago a provision was added to State law to allow planned actions, which are essentially subarea plans with an Environmental Impact Statement or environmental review attached. He pointed out that the City’s code adopts the SEPA rules by reference, but it does not acknowledge the existence of this provision. The proposed amendment would recognize the existence of the planned action option. He suggested this is one option the City might want to consider for future redevelopment of the downtown waterfront area. The Board would discuss the proposed amendment further on July 9th.

Mr. Chave announced that the July 9th meeting agenda would also include a public hearing on an application by Harold Houston to change the zoning and/or Comprehensive Plan land use designation for property located at 110 Sunset Avenue. While Mr. Houston is proposing the property be rezoned to Office Residential (OR), it is important to keep in mind that the designation was really geared more towards properties on the west side of Sunset Avenue. He suggested that it might be appropriate to expand the subject of the hearing to include multi-family residential zoning since there are other multi-family residential areas that sit between the single-family residential and commercial properties.

Mr. Chave noted that the July 9th meeting agenda would also include a public hearing regarding proposed revisions to the Edmonds Community Development Code Chapter 17, as well as a work session on the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments addressing sustainability and climate change.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Acting Chair Young thanked the Board Members for their participation in the hearing. He summarized that it was a good meeting, with good discussion.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

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

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 10:00 p.m.

APPROVED