

APPROVED JANUARY 13th

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

December 9, 2009

Vice Chair Lovell called the meeting of the Edmonds Planning Board to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Public Safety Complex, 250 – 5th Avenue North.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Philip Lovell, Vice Chair
Cary Guenther
John Reed
Judith Works
Kevin Clarke
Valerie Stewart

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Gina Coccia, Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Michael Bowman, Chair (excused)
Jim Young (excused)

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER REED MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF NOVEMBER 4, 2009 BE APPROVED AS PRESENTED. BOARD MEMBER WORKS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

No changes were made to the agenda.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

No one in the audience expressed a desire to address the Board during this portion of the meeting.

PRESENTATION BY MAYOR HAAKENSON

Mayor Haakenson thanked Board Member Works for her seven years of volunteer service on the Planning Board and presented her with a plaque. He noted that Board Member Young would also retire from the Board at the end of 2009, and he would be present at the Board's first meeting in January to accept his plaque. Mayor Haakenson thanked the entire Board for their volunteer service on behalf of the City. Mayor Haakenson also advised that he would interview candidates for the vacant Board positions on December 10th and would make a recommendation to the City Council for final approval on December 15th.

ELECTION OF PLANNING BOARD CHAIR AND VICE CHAIR FOR 2010

Board Member Guenther advised that he recently spoke with Board Member Bowman, who indicated he would be willing to serve an additional year as chair of the Board.

BOARD MEMBER GUENTHER NOMINATED BOARD MEMBER BOWMAN TO SERVE AS CHAIR OF THE BOARD IN 2010. BOARD MEMBER CLARKE SECONDED THE NOMINATION. THERE WERE NO OTHER NOMINATIONS. ALL BOARD MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR OF BOARD MEMBER BOWMAN SERVING AS CHAIR IN 2010.

BOARD MEMBER WORKS NOMINATED BOARD MEMBER LOVELL TO SERVE AS VICE CHAIR OF THE BOARD IN 2010. BOARD MEMBER CLARKE SECONDED THE NOMINATION. THERE WERE NO OTHER NOMINATIONS. ALL BOARD MEMBERS VOTED IN FAVOR OF BOARD MEMBER LOVELL SERVING AS VICE CHAIR IN 2010.

PUBLIC HEARING ON APPLICATION FOR DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT IN ORDER TO IMPLEMENT A CHANGE IN ZONING FOR PROPERTIES KNOWN AS “FIRDALE VILLAGE” FROM NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS (BN) TO THE “FIRDALE VILLAGE MIXED USE” (FVMU) ZONE AND ESTABLISH A TREE RETENTION BUFFER

Board Member Lovell entered a letter from Tamra Ancona dated December 9, 2009, into the record as Attachment 10. In her letter she provided some ideas for what she would like to see developed on the properties known as Firdale Village.

Board Member Reed clarified that the public hearing is actually regarding two items, a Development Agreement and a rezone application. He pointed out that the Development Agreement is a Type V Action so the City Council has the option of holding another public hearing before making a final decision. However, the rezone application is a Type 4B Action, and the City Council would have a closed record review on the record that was established at the Planning Board hearing. No additional public hearing would be held on the rezone application.

Board Member Reed said it appears the proposed rezone application is requesting a rezone to a designation that has not yet been adopted by the City Council. Mr. Chave clarified that the City Council has already adopted the FVMU zoning ordinance. Board Member Reed observed that it has not been posted on the website as part of the City’s Development Code. Mr. Chave agreed and pointed out that there is a lag time between adoption of an ordinance and when the actual Development Code document is updated.

Mr. Chave explained that the applicant is asking for a change in zoning, which is a standard rezone process. In the past, the City has allowed contract rezones that identified specific conditions that would apply to the change. However, State Law supersedes contract rezones with the development agreement option, which is a contract that modifies or adds certain conditions in the change of zoning above and beyond what a simple change of zoning would do. The proposed Development Agreement would require a landscape buffer that would not otherwise be required by a straight change in zoning. The applicant’s intent is to provide certain conditions in the Development Agreement that would improve the compatibility of the proposal with the surrounding neighborhood. The Planning Board has the responsibility of conducting a public hearing for both items, but the change in zoning would come before the City Council as a closed record review, and the Development Agreement would be an open record review. He suggested the City Council would likely conduct a public hearing on the Development Agreement first and then conduct their closed record review on the rezone application. He emphasized that both items are quasi-judicial actions, and the Board could forward a separate recommendation for each item, or they could formulate a single recommendation. Board Member Reed summarized that there would be no additional opportunity for the public to comment regarding the rezone application when it comes before the City Council for review.

Vice Chair Lovell invited Board Members to disclose any comments they might have received regarding the subject of the hearing outside of the hearing. None of the Board Members disclosed ex parte contacts, and no one from the audience voiced a concern, either.

Ms. Coccia referred to the Staff Report and specifically reviewed the rezone criteria the Board must consider when reviewing rezone applications as follows:

1. **Comprehensive Plan.** Whether the proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Coccia pointed out that the Comprehensive Plan designates the subject property as “Neighborhood Commercial” and more specifically, the

site is known as the “Firdale Village Neighborhood.” The proposed new FVMU zone is intended to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan designation, and the rezone is intended to make the zoning consistent with the Comprehensive Plan by bringing a “neighborhood village” feel to the site as visualized in the plan.

2. **Zoning Ordinance. Whether the proposal is consistent with the purposes of the Zoning Ordinance and whether the proposal is consistent with the purposes of the proposed zone district.** Ms. Coccia advised that the FVMU zone is intended to be the corresponding zone for the Neighborhood Commercial at Firdale Village. The purposes of the FVMLU zone are given in ECDC 16.100.
3. **Surrounding Area. The relationship of the proposed zoning change to the existing land uses and zoning of surrounding and nearby property.** Ms. Coccia observed that uses in the subject area are commercial, and there is no existing residential development on the site. The surrounding area contains a mixture of uses, including multi-family adjacent to the east, single-family to the north and south, and commercial further north along Firdale Avenue.
4. **Changes. Whether there has been sufficient change in the character of the immediate or surrounding area or in City policy to justify the rezone.** Ms. Coccia reminded the Board that the Comprehensive Plan designation for the subject property was amended in 2006 to establish “Firdale Village” as a specific neighborhood with its own set of goals and policies, which were designed to encourage a mix of uses on the site specific to the neighborhood’s pedestrian-friendly, mixed-use, and transit-friendly goals. The zoning change would be consistent with this amendment.
5. **Suitability. Whether the property is economically and physically suitable for the uses allowed under the existing zoning and under the proposed zoning. One factor could be the length of time the property has remained undeveloped compared to the surrounding area, and parcels elsewhere with the same zoning.** Ms. Coccia advised that the neighborhood comprising the subject application was the inspiration for the design of the new FVMU zone, and the Firdale Village Design Standards. Therefore, the site is physically suitable for the proposed rezone. The corresponding Development Agreement would ensure that any future development would take into consideration the adjacent properties through the tree buffer requirement. Staff believes the site is physically suitable for the proposed zoning.
6. **Value. The relative gain to the public health, safety and welfare compared to the potential increase or decrease in value to the property owners.** Ms. Coccia pointed out that the new FVMU zone has taken the adjacent properties into consideration through careful application of expanded setbacks, step backs, and landscaping to assist with privacy and buffering. In addition, the design standards encourage the use of “green” technologies, which provide an environmental value to the City. The proposed zoning would also enhance the aesthetic atmosphere of the neighborhood through carefully applied design standards, which are arguably a value to the neighborhood, tenants and passers-by.

Ms. Coccia summarized that based on the facts and analysis contained in the Staff Report, staff concludes the proposal satisfies the criteria for a change in zoning. She recommended the Board forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council.

Vice Chair Lovell asked where tree retention as a buffer is addressed in the Staff Report. Ms. Coccia pointed out that this issue is specifically addressed in the Development Agreement (Attachment 5)

Tony Shapiro, A.D. Shapiro Architects, Applicant, explained that the Development Agreement was prepared by the City Attorney in response to his concerns about ensuring that the 20-foot buffer on the north side of the subject property is retained. The City Attorney expressed concern that without the proposed Development Agreement, a future developer could attempt to sidestep the criteria for the 20-foot setback because no where else in the City is such a setback established in a zoning ordinance. He noted that the Development Agreement identifies the buffer area as a “native growth protection easement.” He summarized that the purpose of the agreement is to ensure that the trees remain intact after the development has been completed.

Board Member Clarke asked if the Development Agreement would require the property owner to maintain the quality of the plantings in the buffer area. Mr. Shapiro answered that the City does have penalties if trees are damaged during

construction, but the proposed Development Agreement does not specifically state what the result would be if some of the trees are damaged. Mr. Chave explained that the project would require design review, which would ensure the buffer is maintained. Any maintenance requirements would be imposed as part of design review. The property owner would be required to replace any trees that are damaged.

Board Member Clarke asked if the property owner would be required to replace any trees that are damaged or fall down during the life of the project. He observed that the buffer is intended to buffer between the existing single-family residential development and the proposed high-density development. Mr. Shapiro reminded the Board that a landscape plan would be required at the time a project is permitted. However, minimal additional landscaping would be required in this area because it is already heavily treed. Board Member Reed suggested that Section 2 of the proposed Development Agreement (Attachment 5) addresses Board Member Clarke's concern and maintenance. Mr. Chave clarified that the Native Growth Protection Easement would create an obligation for the property owner to maintain the buffer area because the easement would be recorded and considered as part design review.

Board Member Reed referred to Section 1.2 on Page 2 of the Development Agreement and asked if new property owner would be bound by the conditions of the Development Agreement if the property were sold in the future. Mr. Chave answered affirmatively. Board Member Reed pointed out that all references to the "Firdale Zone" should be changed to the "Firdale Village Mixed Use Zone." He also noted that the language in Section 2.3 on Page 2 of the Development Agreement should be updated to indicate that Chapter 16.1000 ECDC has already been adopted by the City Council.

Mr. Shapiro referred to Attachment 6, in which he responded to each of the rezone criteria. He briefly reviewed each of the criteria as follows:

1. **Comprehensive Plan. Whether the proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.** Mr. Shapiro pointed out that all seven properties are classified under the "Neighborhood Commercial" Comprehensive Plan designation. To illustrate how the proposed rezone is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, he referred to the following Goals for Neighborhood Commercial Areas:

- *D. Neighborhood commercial areas are intended to provide a mix of services, shopping, gathering places, office space and housing for local neighborhoods.* Mr. Shapiro expressed his belief that the permitted uses in the FVMU Zone would enhance the neighborhood character by reinvigorating the existing commercial development to a livelier, pedestrian environment that reduces the focus on the automobile.
- *D.1. Should be located at major arterial intersections and designed to minimize interference with through.* Mr. Shapiro pointed out that the subject property is located on Firdale Avenue and will access the street at the intersection with 3rd Avenue Northwest. The criterion in the zoning language limits the maximum curb cuts to three along Firdale Avenue.
- *D.2. Permit uses in neighborhood commercial areas that are intended to serve the local neighborhood. Mixed-use development should be encouraged within neighborhood commercial areas.* Mr. Shapiro again noted that the site is located on Firdale Avenue and the primary access point would be at the intersection with 3rd Avenue Northwest.
- *D.3. Provide for transit and pedestrian access, with the provision of facilities for local automobile traffic. Provide for pedestrian connections to nearby residential neighborhoods.* Mr. Shapiro pointed out that the proposed project would be required to provide access to transit facilities by a crosswalk, traffic signals, etc. The commercial buildings and open plazas would be configured towards the street frontage, and a covering over the sidewalk along Firdale Avenue would be required.
- *D.4. Allow a variety of architectural styles while encouraging public art and sustainable development practices that support pedestrian activity and provide for appealing gathering places.* Mr. Shapiro pointed out that the adopted design standards for the FVMU Zone would address various aspects of architectural style, etc.
- *D.5. Significant attention should be paid to the design of ground level commercial spaces, which must accommodate a variety of commercial uses, have street-level entrances, and storefront facades that are dominated by transparent windows.* Mr. Shapiro pointed out that, prior to adoption of the FVMU Zone language, the City Council expressed concern that the ground floor commercial spaces should be reserved for small scale retail uses, and the upper floors could be utilized for other types of commercial and office uses. Therefore, the draft design standards were amended to include specific language requiring glass frontages and canopies, with small suites facing the street edge.

- *D.6. Encourage neighborhood commercial areas to reflect the identity and character of individual neighborhoods, thus strengthening their importance as neighborhood centers.* Mr. Shapiro pointed out that the commercial uses would be against the street edge, and the residential component would be located along the treed buffer area to address the unique geography of the site and its relationship to Firdale Village.
- *D.6.b.i. In the Firdale Village 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.* Mr. Shapiro pointed out that the zoning language would not allow large retail uses to locate in the proposed development. The definite goal is small-scale retail uses.
- *D.6.b.ii. Development shall be no more than four 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 should include not less than one quarter commercial space.* Mr. Shapiro observed that development in District 1 would be limited to 30 feet in height, and development in District 2 would be limited to four stories.

2. **Zoning Ordinance. Whether the proposal is consistent with the purposes of the Zoning Ordinance and whether the proposal is consistent with the purposes of the proposed zone district.** Mr. Shapiro recalled that one objective of the new FVMU zone is to reserve areas for retail stores, offices, and retail service establishments that offer goods and services needed on an every-day basis by residents of a neighborhood. Another objective is to ensure compact, convenient development patterns by allowing uses that operate chiefly within buildings. He explained that the objective of the proposal is to provide an opportunity for small, retail-type development that would serve the immediate neighborhood. He further advised that because the Neighborhood Business (BN) zone only allows one dwelling unit per lot, it effectively prohibits modern, mixed-use developments. The new FVMU Zone does not limit the number of residential units per site. Instead, it controls density by mandating a parking requirement and a maximum height limit. He expressed his belief that the proposed FVMU Zone would help create a neighborhood-oriented development that would serve the immediate neighborhood, as well as opportunities to house commercial office type uses on the second floor. The location of the site could also augment the regional centers of Westgate Village and Aurora Village.
3. **Surrounding Area. The relationship of the proposed zoning change to the existing land uses and zoning of surrounding and nearby property.** Mr. Shapiro explained that one of the challenges of the sites is its adjacency to single-family residential development to the north. However, the topographical changes and the large treed setback area would provide an adequate buffer to address the single-family adjacent to multi-family aspect. The property adjacent to the single-family residential development would be a type of residential (multi-family), as well.
4. **Changes. Whether there has been sufficient change in the character of the immediate or surrounding area or in City policy to justify the rezone.** Mr. Shapiro summarized that the existing commercial facility is approaching the end of its natural life span and is in need of major renovation or replacement. However, renovating the existing complex would not address the changing life style patterns in the region. Nor would it address the State’s Growth Management Act nor the City of Edmonds Comprehensive Plan.
5. **Suitability. Whether the property is economically and physically suitable for the uses allowed under the existing zoning and under the proposed zoning. One factor could be the length of time the property has remained undeveloped compared to the surrounding area, and parcels elsewhere with the same zoning.** Mr. Shapiro pointed out that one goal of the City’s Comprehensive Plan is to place higher-density residential uses on major arterials, which is a very good reason to rezone the subject property to allow more than one residential unit per lot.
6. **Value. The relative gain to the public health, safety and welfare compared to the potential increase or decrease in value to the property owners.** Mr. Shapiro said he does not believe the current zoning represents the highest and best use for the site. The different configuration proposed in the FVMU Zone would be a more suitable response to the current conditions and growth patterns in the area.

Board Member Reed recalled an earlier presentation by Mr. Shapiro in which a property owner expressed concern about the proposed height of development adjacent to her property. He asked if the zoning language was amended to address her

concern. Mr. Shapiro clarified that this person actually owns property that is two lots removed from the subject site. However, the zoning language was amended to require a step back along this edge so there would be no three-story structure immediately adjacent to the single-family residential property. He noted that this change resulted in a loss of approximately 12 units.

Board Member Reed inquired if the landscaped courtyard is a requirement of the zoning code. Mr. Shapiro answered that the zoning code requires 20% of the property to be retained as open space, and the open space must incorporate certain aspects as outlined in the zoning language.

Vice Chair Lovell asked Mr. Shapiro to share the changes that were made to the zoning language prior to City Council adoption. Mr. Shapiro said that in addition to amending the language to require retail space on the ground floor, he met numerous times with a committee of the City Council and most of the “shoulds” were changed to “shall.”

Board Member Clarke referred to the zoning language related to “public meeting space” and noted that a 500-foot meeting space would be quite small. Mr. Shapiro pointed out that because the language uses the word “should,” a public meeting space would not be mandatory. Board Member Clarke asked if any of the City Council Members raised a concern about this requirement. Mr. Shapiro answered that they did not. Board Member Clarke expressed concern that a small public meeting room would be underutilized. Mr. Shapiro agreed but reminded the Board that a meeting room would not be a mandatory requirement. Mr. Chave explained that because the word “should” was used in the language, the intent was to point a future developer in that direction, but not make it an absolute requirement.

Vice Chair Lovell expressed concern that most of the “shoulds” were changed to “shall.” He asked Mr. Shapiro to share his opinion about how these changes would impact the zoning and future development of the site. Mr. Shapiro said that changing the “shoulds” to “shalls” definitely makes it more challenging for a developer. He noted that the most significant impediments are the requirements for underground parking and 20% open space. He explained that while underground parking is desirable, it is also very costly. The project must be high end in order to make underground parking pencil out. However, he acknowledged that because of the unique topography of the site, not as much excavation would be required as with a typical development. On the other hand, he noted that two utility lines run through the site and would have to be relocated at a significant cost to the developer. He expressed concern that the property might lay dormant for a number of years until the economy significantly improves.

Board Member Works pointed out that in her letter to the Board, Ms. Ancona suggests the property owner consider the option of developing affordable housing for senior citizens. However, this is not likely to occur given the challenges of the property. Mr. Shapiro pointed out that one option that has been discussed is an extended care facility for seniors, which would be a fairly expensive project. Board Member Works noted that this type of facility would not provide affordable senior housing, and Mr. Shapiro agreed that the underground parking requirement would not likely allow a developer to provide low-cost housing options.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS OPENED. NO ONE IN THE AUDIENCE EXPRESSED A DESIRE TO ADDRESS THE BOARD, AND THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

BOARD MEMBER REED MOVED THE BOARD FORWARD THE DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR THE FIRDALE VILLAGE PROPERTY TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL BASED ON THE VERBIAGE CHANGES NOTED EARLIER. BOARD MEMBER WORKS SECONDED THE MOTION.

Board Member Reed observed that because the Development Agreement is a Type V Action, the City Council could choose to hold an additional public hearing before making a final decision.

Board Member Clarke expressed his belief that the property owner (applicant) has gone the extra mile, recognizing the number of times he has come before the Board and the City Council, to create a proposal that would blend in with the community. He adequately addressed the concerns raised by the neighbors related to the buffer, and the proposed rezone represents a solid solution for the subject property.

Approved

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BOARD MEMBER GUENTHER MOVED THE BOARD FORWARD FILE NUMBER PLN20090020 (REQUEST TO REZONE FIRDALE VILLAGE PROPERTIES TO FVMU) TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS IN THE STAFF REPORT AND THE APPLICANT'S WRITTEN AND ORAL TESTIMONY.

Board Member Works voiced concern about the City Council's decision to change most of the "shoulds" to "shalls." She questioned whether the change would end up pushing redevelopment of the site further into the future. If the City Council wants to encourage affordable housing, perhaps they should reconsider their decision. If the zoning regulations are too tight, no new redevelopment will occur in Edmonds. Board Member Clarke concurred.

Board Member Reed emphasized that because the rezone is a Type 4B action, the item would be forwarded to the City Council for a closed record review based on the record established at the Planning Board Meeting. No additional public input would be accepted.

THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Shapiro said that as the architect, he had hoped the new zone would have sufficient requirements to mandate a high level of design detail. On the other hand, it is also important to make the requirements flexible enough that redevelopment can occur within a reasonable amount of time. He expressed his belief that development in western Washington requires a significant amount of effort, particularly in Edmonds. Many people tend to think that developers are out to rape and pillage a community, but that is not the case. It is important to keep in mind that developers must build products that meet the high demand of potential buyers. They also want to develop economically viable projects that everyone in the community can be proud of.

EDMONDS CLIMATE CHANGE ACTION PLAN

Jeanie Blair, Mayor's Climate Protection Committee, advised that the group meets on a monthly basis. Their recent efforts have been focused on creating a Climate Change Action Plan specific to reducing the amount of Green House Gas (GHG) emitted into the air. She explained that the group began the project by brainstorming ideas and researching what other cities in the Northwest and other places in the United States have done to address climate change. They also reviewed the State's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Plan to identify those elements that would work well for the Edmonds Community.

Ms. Blair advised that the Action Plan was divided into five separate segments: Transportation and Land Use, Lifestyles, Buildings, Environment, Economy, and Community Outreach and Empowerment. Each category identifies the existing problems, the best strategies for approaching a solution, and the expected benefits from reducing GHGs. Each segment includes initiatives the committee wants to pursue, and they are prioritized based on their potential to reduce GHGs. Some of the initiatives are community related, others are civic related, and some require the action of both.

Ms. Blair explained that Mayor Haakenson's adoption of the U.S. Mayor's Climate Protection Agreement requires the City to reduce its GHG emissions to 7% below 1990 levels by 2012 per the Kyoto Agreement. This means that by 2012, Edmonds GHG emissions must be reduced by at least 41%. To meet the State mandated reductions, GHG emissions must be reduced 36% by 2020, 52% by 2035 and 68% by 2050. She advised that the goal of the action plan is to work on various programs to reduce GHG emissions a little at a time.

Ms. Blair referred the Board to a detailed spreadsheet, which provides calculations and assumptions to begin tracking on a going-forward basis to tackle the issues one at a time. The proposed document fits in well with the City's new Community Sustainability Element and is something that many of the committee members are enthusiastic about pursuing. They would like the Board Members to review the proposed document and provide comments and suggestions.

Board Member Reed inquired if the Mayor's Climate Protection Committee also worked on the Community Sustainability Element. Ms. Blair answered that they did not specifically work on the document as a group, but many of their members participated in the process, and most have read the document.

Board Member Stewart commended the committee on their hard work to prepare the Climate Change Action Plan. She expressed her belief that the document is excellent and will provide an effective tool for the City to move forward with positive progress. Ms. Blair said the committee believes it is important for the City to have a clear way of tracking GHG emissions.

Ms. Blair advised that the document would be presented to the City Council in January, and the committee would request the City Council support the document. They would like the Board to partner in the effort, as well. Board Member Clarke questioned how the Board could best offer their support for the action plan. Ms. Blair answered that it is important that each of the Board Members particularly review the specific recommendations related to on-going planning efforts. She summarized that awareness is a key element of the plan's success.

Board Member Reed inquired if the City Council has budgeted funding to educate the public regarding the issue of GHG emissions. Ms. Blair answered that it is not likely the committee would receive funding from the City for education at this time. However, the committee is working closely with non-profit organizations for this purpose, and there are members of the community who are interested in moving the plan forward, as well.

Mr. Chave reminded the Board that the Climate Change Section of the Community Sustainability Element point towards the Climate Change Action Plan, as well. It specifically indicates the City's desire to come up with a way to measure GHG emissions. The action plan is intended to be the practical, day-to-day, going-forward compliment to the Community Sustainability Element regarding climate change. The committee and staff would likely bring initiatives forward in the near future that would have an impact on current codes, and the Board would have an opportunity to address these issues as they come up. He emphasized that the action plan is intended to be an active document, and the committee has made it clear that it is not in its final form. The document will continue to evolve over time.

Vice Chair Lovell recalled that the Board has had previous discussions about monitoring the GHG emissions from facilities and buildings that are currently owned by the City. He asked if this effort is identified in the action plan. Ms. Blair answered that each of the five segments of the plan call out what the City has already done to address GHG emissions.

Mr. Chave suggested that at some point in the near future, the Board could have a discussion about the action plan and identify specific items they would like the committee to work on. Ms. Blair added that as the Board reviews the Transportation and Land Use Sections they will quickly see which ones will require Planning Board involvement. Mr. Chave agreed. He said that although the Board is not required to act on the plan, they could make a formal statement of support.

BOARD MEMBER STEWART MOVED THE BOARD ENDORCE THE CLIMATE CHANGE ACTION PLAN AND THE ACTIONS IMBEDDED WITHIN IT. BOARD MEMBER WORKS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION WAS TABLED UNTIL ALL BOARD MEMBERS HAVE HAD AN OPPORTUNITY TO ADEQUATELY REVIEW THE DOCUMENT.

DISCUSSION OF STEPS AND PROCEDURES TO NAME THE NEW PARK BEING BUILT AT 162nd STREET IN NORTH EDMONDS

The Board agreed that the Park Naming Committee would meet to recommend three or four choices for the Planning Board to consider at a public hearing in January. After the public hearing, the Board would forward their recommendation to the City Council for a final decision. They tentatively scheduled a public hearing on January 27, 2010.

Approved

ISSUES AND CONCEPTS TO HIGHLIGHT IN THE JANUARY REPORT TO THE CITY COUNCIL

Mr. Chave advised that the Citizens Economic Development Commission (CEDC) has formed three subcommittees to continue their efforts, and a representative from each of the subcommittees has been invited to meet with the Chair of the Commission to craft conclusions and/or statements for the full Commission's consideration. He suggested the Board could use a similar process to prioritize their thoughts prior to the next joint meeting with the Commission.

Vice Chair Lovell reported that he attended the last CEDC meeting at which time the subcommittees provided a brief outline of what the report to the City Council should include. He recalled that he previously provided a potential outline for the Board's report, and he suggested the Board form a subcommittee to put together a draft report for the entire Board to review at their January 13th meeting. He reminded the Board that the report to the City Council is intended to be preliminary in nature, and a final report would not be submitted until the end of 2010.

Board Member Reed expressed his belief that the Board is not prepared to provide anything more than a status report of the information the Board has collected and some of the main points that have stood out throughout the process. The Board needs more time to prepare a detailed report to the City Council. The remainder of the Board concurred.

Vice Chair Lovell summarized that there were some common themes in each of the presentations provided to the Board and the CEDC. First, the City Council should be asked to specifically provide items in the budget to address economic development. Second, funding will be needed to broaden and expand how the City approaches redevelopment in the future. He reported that at the last CEDC meeting, Council Member Plunkett recommended that the Commission's report should include very specific direction to the City Council that they place an issue on the ballot that would raise the levy lid next year to support a larger budget for the City in order to get things done. Otherwise, it will be difficult to move forward with economic development activities.

Vice Chair Lovell summarized that the Board's subcommittee (Chair Bowman, Vice Chair Lovell and Board Member Clarke) would work with the chair of the CEDC to prepare a draft report for the Board to review on January 13th. Mr. Chave reminded the Board that they are scheduled to meet jointly with the CEDC on January 6th. He suggested that, in the meantime, individual Board Members forward their comments and ideas to Vice Chair Lovell for consideration by the subcommittee.

Vice Chair Lovell particularly invited Board Member Stewart to share her thoughts about the language relate to sustainability. Mr. Chave reminded the Board that the Community Sustainability Element ties short-term planning into the sustainability goals. He noted that the presenters (representatives from Bothell, Mountlake Terrace and Lynnwood) at the earlier joint meeting were clear in their message that the City should tie all issues together and push forward.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

No additional comments were made regarding the extended agenda.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Vice Chair Lovell did not provide additional comments during this portion of the meeting.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Guenther said it has been wonderful to work with Board Members Works and Young, and he would miss their participation on the Board. Board Member Works said she enjoyed working with everyone on the Board, and she wished them the best in their future projects.

Board Member Clarke noted that none of the three presenters (Lynnwood, Mountlake Terrace and Bothell) at the earlier joint meeting would comment on the economic aspects of their projects and none put forth evidence showing the economic results of their efforts. He expressed his belief that the financial world is very different as far as financing large real estate projects.

Approved

A level of reality must be brought into discussions about whether or not economic growth would be produced as a result of the City's efforts. While their work may lay the foundation for future economic development, it is important to understand that the current financial recession will continue for some time.

Board Member Works pointed out that all three presenters made it clear that the economy must reach a point where projects can pencil out before redevelopment would likely occur. Vice Chair Lovell said he recently attended an Edmonds Port Commission meeting at which their consultants presented scenarios for redeveloping the Harbor Square Business Complex. The report included the initial findings of a financial consultant who shared financial numbers for each of the scenarios. It was emphasized that while redevelopment of the site could be viable, many of the items that community members would like to have would not ever be feasible. He suggested that at some point in the process, the Board and Commission must recognize the options that will absolutely not be feasible for the City of Edmonds, as well.

Mr. Chave cautioned the Board that economic development requires patience. It is important to take advantage of the down cycles to plan for the future.

ADJOURNMENT

The Commission meeting was adjourned at 9:55 p.m.