

APPROVED MARCH 23RD

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

March 9, 2011

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, Chair
John Reed, Vice Chair
Kevin Clarke
Todd Cloutier
Kristiana Johnson
Valerie Stewart

STAFF PRESENT

Stephen Clifton, Community Services/Development Services Director
Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Jeanie McConnell, Engineering Program Manager
Mike Clugston, Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

VICE CHAIR REED MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 9, 2011 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER CLARKE SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

The Board placed their review of the downtown BD zones (Item 7b) before their continued discussion on amendments to the wireless communication facilities regulations (Item 7a). The remainder of the agenda was accepted as presented.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Doug Spee, Woodway, commented that negative comments were made at the Board's February 9th meeting regarding mixed-use development in Kirkland that includes a big-box store and a mixture of smaller commercial uses. He reminded the Board that mixed-use developments often start with a main tenant, with other commercial space built around it. For example, his proposed project would start with a main tenant, the post office. Having a long-term commitment from a main tenant allows mixed-use developments to be successful. He said comments were also made at the last meeting that if the existing building height in the downtown was good enough to support development in the 1990's, it is good enough now, too. However, it is important to keep in mind that the market and economy are very different now. While a two-story building in downtown would likely pencil out if the upper story was dedicated to high-end residential space, the market is screaming for affordable living options. It is not possible to develop affordable housing in downtown Edmonds given the current height limit, which only allows two stories of development. Mr. Spee summarized that, although it is fashionable to bash development in Kirkland, it is unfair. He suggested the Board look at other neighboring jurisdictions that are similar to Edmonds such as Winslow on Bainbridge Island, which is a small town with a ferry dock. They allow a height limit of 30 feet for mixed-use development, and up to 45 feet if underground parking is provided. He offered to drive the Board Members on a tour of Winslow.

PLANNING BOARD REVIEW OF DOWNTOWN BD ZONES

Chair Lovell encouraged the Board to discuss the issues and proposals identified in the Staff Report and provide direction about how broad an approach they want to take at this point, and how they can work with staff to amend the zoning

regulations to accomplish their identified goals. While full implementation of a form-based code will take a longer period of time, the Board can consider short-term changes that would expedite development proposals in downtown Edmonds.

Mr. Chave explained that the topics for discussion have been broken into four general topics. The Staff Report provides background information and options for the Board to consider for each topic. Staff is seeking direction from the Board regarding the options they would like to explore further so that action language can be prepared for the Board's next discussion on March 23rd. Staff anticipates that a public hearing could be scheduled as early as April 13th. If necessary, he noted that the Board could hold a hearing on more than just one option to solicit feedback from the public before making a recommendation to the City Council. He reviewed each of the topics of discussion as follows:

Development Agreements

Mr. Chave said the City Council and Economic Development Commission (EDC) have discussed the possibility of using development agreements to provide flexibility to encourage certain types of uses in the downtown. He explained that development agreements can provide flexibility in dealing with such features as setbacks, step backs, arrangement of uses, etc. on a given site in order to accommodate a desired use, to achieve desired levels of "green" development, encourage buildings that enhance the downtown streetscape, etc. He explained that development agreements are authorized in the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) and in City's Development Code (ECDC 20.08), but they are not directly authorized in any of the BD zones. He requested feedback from the Board on whether they support the development agreement concept. If so, do they want to identify specific criteria all development agreements would be required to meet at the onset? He noted that a development agreement would be a legislative process, which would include a public hearing before both the Planning Board and the City Council. The process would allow the Board and City Council to negotiate with a developer to obtain certain public benefits in exchange for allowing flexibility for certain code requirements.

Mr. Chave emphasized that, generally, development agreements cannot allow something that is not allowed by the underlying zoning. For example, if the height limit is 30 feet, the City would not be able to grant a 35-foot height limit as part of a development agreement, unless the code specifically states that this additional bonus could be applied via a development agreement. He said staff believes it makes sense to allow development agreements to vary at least some of the code standards. This could include flexibility for the height limit, or they could place a cap on the height limit at 30 feet. He suggested it might be appropriate to conduct a hearing on both options to solicit feedback from the public about whether they are interested in allowing the City Council to have this flexibility or if there should be an absolute height limit. Again, he emphasized that development agreements would be discretionary items, with hearings at both the Planning Board and City Council levels.

Board Member Cloutier said he supports the development agreement concept because it would give the City Council the means to respond quickly to development proposals. In addition, the public would have an opportunity to weigh in on development agreements proposal prior to their approval. Development agreements provide the City Council with more options to meet the City's economic development needs without opening the flood gates to unreasonable development proposals.

Board Member Clarke suggested that rather than having a specific height limit, a development agreement could allow development not to exceed three useable floors. This would allow flexibility for a developer to provide higher ceiling heights on the upper floors, vaulted ceilings, different window designs, etc. The development agreement could require a developer to provide a pitched rather than flat roof and to screen the HVAC equipment that is located on the roof in exchange for the additional height. This would encourage more creative and attractive architecture. Mr. Chave agreed the code language could be written in such a way to authorize this level of flexibility. In fact, the code could be amended to allow any of the standards to be varied via a development agreement. It would be the proponent's responsibility to convince the City Council and Planning Board that the changes are in the City's best interest. He explained that the development agreement goals could be specifically spelled out in the code language, or by default, development agreements could be evaluated relative to Comprehensive Plan goals and policies such as sustainability, economic development, etc. If the Board and City Council finds that varying the standards would result in a better project, a development agreement could be approved.

APPROVED

Board Member Clarke asked if the City could grant bonus options if a developer provides certain functions. Mr. Chave said this would make the development agreement process more complicated. He said he would bring back additional information to illustrate what a development agreement would look like if it is more open ended and what it would look like if the City identifies certain goals they want to achieve. He suggested they could advertise both options for the public hearing, or they could decide upon a single approach to pursue at the hearing.

Chair Lovell suggested the Board prepare a menu of goals they would like development agreements to meet. Mr. Chave suggested that language be added to the BD zones, outlining what standards could be varied via a development agreement. They could even go so far as to allow building heights that exceed the height limit of the underlying zone if a proposal meets the goals of the City. However, in order for the City to make these adjustments via a development agreement, the code language must specifically provide this level of flexibility. This could be done with a general statement that allows the City to vary any of the standards contained in the zone, or they could attach criteria that all development agreements would be required to meet. It would be up to the applicant to demonstrate how a proposal would further the City's goals, and the City Council has the ability to deny applications that are not in the public's interest. Chair Lovell suggested the statement be as general as possible, and that the criteria address issues such as sustainability, appropriateness for the character of the downtown, etc.

Board Member Stewart suggested the Board consider the following criteria for development agreements:

- Promote sustainable design and green building practices.
- Respect history of place and encourage respect for the history of the downtown.
- Provide public gathering spaces and easy access to non-motorized transportation.
- Designate a certain percentage of the development as affordable housing in exchange for a density bonus. Providing a variety of housing options will ensure the community remains vibrant with a good cross section of demographics.

Board Member Clarke said that in his experience, when cities attempt to socially engineer value systems into development agreements or zoning codes, developments typically fail. He recalled that he spoke out against the public space requirement for the mixed-use development at Firdale Village. He did not feel it was appropriate to require a 15,000 square foot development to provide a public space that would not likely be used. He said he recently did a mixed-use development on Bainbridge Island that required public space, which was developed but is not used. He noted that requiring that 10% of a development be dedicated for public space increases development costs with very little, if any, value to the community. He suggested that a better option would be to require developers to contribute to public art funds to provide art throughout the City for everyone to enjoy.

Board Member Clarke said he has done a lot of public subsidized multi-family developments that have been failures. He cautioned against requiring developers to create affordable housing. Although these components sound good, they do not typically work well. He suggested it is better to let developers figure out how to make projects that are economically viable without making affordable housing a mandate.

Board Member Clarke said he noticed that a development on Second Avenue has a plaque in front of the building commemorating the location of a historic building that was replaced by the existing condominium development in the 1970's. He cautioned against requiring a developer to maintain into perpetuity and build around a historic building. He expressed his belief that historic overlays diminish flexibility for building plans. He summarized that positive flexibility is the key to allowing market forces to react. He referred to a new development on Edmonds Way that is in the final stages of construction. While it is the newest building in the City, it is one of the most unimaginative. He expressed his belief that the code needs to be flexible enough to allow a variety of building materials, designs and facades to make developments unique and different.

Board Member Stewart said she can appreciate Board Member Clarke's comments about public space and said her comments were related more to open space and connections to buildings where people can share conversation and kids can play. Providing open space would not increase construction costs. She agreed, however, that requiring a developer to provide public space inside a building may not be appropriate. She said she would also like to encourage smaller, more durable

construction. They need to look at development long term. Building materials come from the earth, and they are rapidly losing their resources. They need to reuse materials and older buildings rather than starting from scratch. She noted that some historic buildings are not attractive and should not necessarily be preserved in their present form. However, she hopes the Architectural Design Board will have some input into design so that new construction fits with the character of the surrounding historic buildings. She agreed to provide information on the Town of Winslow's approach for providing affordable housing in the hope that she can inspire the Board to consider affordable housing as a possible goal.

Vice Chair Reed said it is important to make sure the code revisions related to development agreements are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Chair Lovell suggested the Board could utilize the language found in the Comprehensive Plan, which is quite flexible and meaningful. It provides the necessary flexibility, yet spells out what they are looking for without getting too specific. He cautioned that if the requirements for a development agreement are too specific and restrictive, they could end up with another development like Firdale Village. He suggested that the development agreement provision should reference the specific goals and policies in the Comprehensive Plan, specifically those related to the downtown/waterfront area. Mr. Chave questioned whether it would be necessary to innumerate the goals in the new language since each development agreement proposal would be evaluated based on the goals and policies found in the Comprehensive Plan.

Vice Chair Reed asked how the proposed development agreement provision would interact with the fairly extensive strategic planning process that will begin in the near future. Mr. Chave explained that strategic planning is much broader than code revisions and talks about the relationship between the City's various priorities. He cautioned against calling a halt to all other code revisions waiting for the strategic plan to be finished. To answer Vice Chair Reed's inquiry, Mr. Clifton advised that a Request for Qualifications for a strategic planning consultant has been prepared, and a copy of the document was forwarded to each of the Board Members for comment. Vice Chair Reed asked if reviewing and updating the entire downtown zoning code is the only alternative to development agreements. Mr. Chave agreed that development agreements are the only option available without updating the entire BD zoning code. He explained that the State of Washington has offered development agreements as an alternative to contract rezones, which are no longer allowed. He noted that the Planning Board and City Council would have an opportunity to negotiate the terms of a development agreement with the applicant to address various City goals and policies. Contract rezones were either approved or denied, and there was no opportunity to negotiate with an applicant.

Mr. Clifton said that from the perspective of someone who has written and administered codes, development agreements have the potential to result in more creative development than prescriptive zoning. Development agreements are reviewed by the Planning Board and the public is invited to react. It involves a negotiation process between the City and the developer, with the City Council making the ultimate decision. Development agreements allow for much more public process than the City's current prescriptive zoning. It is important for the community to have the opportunity to discuss development proposals collectively. He summarized that he views development agreements as an advantage rather than a disadvantage.

Board Member Johnson asked what staff is proposing for development agreements that is different than what is already authorized. Mr. Clifton said the code must identify the standards that can be negotiated as part of a development agreement. Mr. Chave added that while the current code language allows development agreements to restrict development, it does not allow the City to modify a standard beyond what the code allows. The language must specifically state that certain standards can be modified via a development agreement.

Board Member Clarke referred to Option 2, which would exclude the BD5 zone (4th Avenue Arts Corridor) from the development agreement provision. Since this zone would be addressed as part of a separate study, he agreed it would be appropriate to exclude it from the proposed revision. The remainder of the Board concurred. Board Member Clarke also suggested the development agreement provision should allow flexibility to accommodate up to three stories of development.

The Board directed staff to bring back code language to add a provision to the downtown BD zones, except BD5, that authorizes development agreements that can vary all BD zone standards.

Retail versus General Commercial Uses in the Retail Core

APPROVED

Mr. Chave explained that the BD1 zone represents the City's downtown retail core and runs generally for one or two blocks in each direction from the fountain. Because the regulations do not prohibit non-retail commercial uses, banks and various professional offices have located within the BD1 zone in recent years. He expressed concern that if the trend continues, it could erode and undermine the viability of the BD1 zone as a retail focus area. Staff is proposing an amendment that would restrict uses on the ground floor of buildings in the BD1 zone to only retail and restaurant/food service uses. They are also recommending that drive-through business be prohibited. He recalled that the Board originally recommended that drive-through facilities not be permitted in the BD1 zone. However, the City Council decided it would be appropriate to allow them as a conditional use.

Board Member Clarke expressed concern that many of the ground floor windows at Old Mill Town are screened to provide privacy for the professional offices, which discourages pedestrians from circulating throughout this area. He suggested the City's goal should be to encourage more people to explore the downtown/waterfront area in all directions by creating more retail synergy within the corridor. He also suggested the City consider opportunities to encourage developers to provide public restrooms within the downtown area as part of their proposals.

Board Member Stewart said it is also important that the downtown retail core is welcoming to people with children. She suggested that uses that are family friendly should be allowed to occur in the retail core in order to bring a variety of people to the area. She summarized that while retail uses are important, they should not prohibit other kinds of uses that could bring the downtown alive.

The Board directed staff to prepare a draft code amendment that would restrict uses on the ground floor of buildings in the BD1 zone to only retail and restaurant/food service uses. They also asked staff to remove the possibility of permitting drive-through businesses as a conditional approval.

Commercial Depth Requirements and Designated Street Fronts

Mr. Chave advised that the designated street fronts are mapped for the BD1 zones, but not for the other BD zones. At this time, the BD1 zone has a 30-foot commercial depth requirement, while elsewhere the requirement is 60 feet. Staff is recommending the provisions have a more consistent framework. For example, the mapping should expand to cover other BD zones, and the commercial depth requirement should not be greater in the BD zones outside of BD1. He reported that staff surveyed the existing commercial space in the BD1 zone and found that most is at least 60 feet deep. He recommended that the commercial depth requirement should be 45 feet in all BD zones. He referred the Board to a map showing the current designated street fronts for the BD1 zone. He also provide a map of potential street front designations for the remainder of the BD zones. He recommended the designated street fronts map be expanded to include all commercial zones except for the BD5 zone (4th Avenue Cultural Corridor).

Chair Lovell referred to an email the Board Members received from Council Member Petso regarding this item.

Chair Lovell asked if the street front map would identify the minimum commercial space requirement. Mr. Chave answered affirmatively. Chair Lovell asked if criteria is available to help the City determine the proper depth for commercial space in the BD zones. Mr. Chave noted that most of the commercial space in the downtown has a depth of 60 feet, but he acknowledged that some are smaller so the code must be flexible. Staff believes that a 30-foot depth requirement would be too shallow and 60 feet would be too deep. They are recommending a 45-foot depth requirement as a happy medium.

Board Member Cloutier asked if staff has raised this issue with the Downtown Edmonds Merchant's Association (DEMA) and the Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Chave said these groups would be included in the anticipated outreach program. Board Member Cloutier agreed with Mr. Chave that no designated street fronts should be identified for the 4th Avenue Cultural Corridor (BD5 zone).

Board Member Clarke observed that although Starbucks is currently celebrating 50 years in business, their location in Edmonds is too small and is constrained by the existing building size. He advised that the more shallow the depth of a commercial space, the more constrained it will be for future retail uses. He said he supports the idea of requiring something

more than 30 feet, but allowing enough flexibility to have something less than 60 feet. This would allow for market fluctuation. He invited Mr. Spee, who owns several properties in the downtown, to comment regarding the proposed change.

Doug Spee, Woodway, said there is more to the equation than just the minimum depth requirement. Because some development extends all the way to the alley, there is often the assumption that the alley is a street and the designated street front extends around the corner into the alley. That means that commercial space would be required on the ground floor along the alley, which is typically where the parking, garbage enclosure, etc. are located. He said it appears that expanding the designated street front map to include other BD zones would address this issue. He said he does not have a specific number for the appropriate depth requirement. In his buildings, a 60-foot requirement is too much for some types of uses.

Mr. Chave explained that staff has been exploring form-based zoning models over the past few years, and the BD zones have started edging into this method of coding. He said it would be fairly simple to focus a little more on the streetscape and relation of uses to the public street. In order to accomplish this goal, the City must define streets differently, and that is the purpose of the designated street front map.

The Board discussed the option of not designating a minimum depth requirement. Mr. Chave cautioned that this approach could result in numerous projects with very minimal commercial space along the street front, particularly if the commercial component is not driving the project. This can result in undesirable commercial space that is not rentable, which can erode the downtown retail core over time. Setting an appropriate minimum depth requirement would allow the City to remain steady throughout changing market conditions so that a viable downtown core can be maintained.

Board Member Clarke referred to several three-story buildings in the downtown where commercial space was constructed below grade, and pedestrians much go down stairs in order to access the ground level. He suggested these situations are a function of the current height restrictions and the developer's desire to design for residential instead of commercial space. He noted there is no commercial space on 2nd Avenue from Main Street north except the post office. Requiring retail space in this location does not make sense. It is challenging to designate commercial areas and what kinds of commercial uses should be allowed and encouraged, and a form-based zoning approach would allow the City to consider the unique character of the environment. Mr. Chave advised that the 4th Avenue Cultural Corridor would probably be the first area in the downtown where true form-based zoning is implemented, but this would not occur until the latter part of the year.

The Board asked staff to prepare code language that identifies a minimum commercial depth requirement of 45 feet for the BD1, BD2 and BD4 zones. They also asked staff to expand the designated street front map to include all BD zones, except BD5.

Street Design and Step Backs

Mr. Chave reviewed that a 15-foot step back is required in the BD2, BD3 and BD4 zones. On some lots, this large step back requirement can preclude interior courtyards or other building features that are desirable, particularly on north-south streets where lots are shallow. He suggested there are a number of other options for addressing this issue such as providing for a smaller building step back if certain criteria (streetscape improvements, green building features, etc.) can be met. Another option is to enable the step back issue to be addressed case-by-case using the development agreement process. The Board could also recommend reducing or eliminating the step back requirement entirely. Mr. Chave expressed his belief that a 15-foot step back requirement is too much, and a 5-foot step back would be adequate. He agreed to provide photographs at the next Board meeting to illustrate how a 5-foot and 15-foot step back requirement would be implemented.

Chair Lovell observed that in the process of creating redevelopment plans for Harbor Square, Five Corners, and Westgate, this issue is being addressed more as an item of building façade articulation as opposed to specific step backs. He said it is important that a building's façade is articulated both in depth and building materials to break it up, but this does not necessarily require step backs. He recommended the issue be addressed on a case-by-case basis as part of a development agreement.

Board Member Stewart referred to the 2005 study completed by Mark Hinshaw, which suggests a number of architectural approaches to differentiate the first floor of a development from the upper floors in an attractive way. Mr. Chave said the

step back approach was originally adopted by the City Council as a way to differentiate between 25 and 30-foot buildings. They settled on the step back approach as a compromise solution. However, he acknowledged there are other options that would accomplish the same goal and buildings can be attractively designed with no step back. He specifically referred to the Beeson and Chanterelle buildings, which provide good examples of other ways to address the issue.

Board Member Stewart suggested that rather than talk about height, the City could identify design goals that must be met as part of a development agreement. The City Council could then negotiate the final decision with the developer. They should focus on the function of a building rather than the specific height. Board Member Clarke agreed and suggested that most people have difficulty visioning height. Somehow the community has gotten stuck on a numerical figure to address the height issue rather than a visual understanding of what a development would look like. This approach must change if they want to promote a unique and attractive environment.

The Board directed staff to prepare draft code language that would enable the step back issue to be addressed on a case-by-case basis using the development agreement process.

Mr. Chave summarized that staff would prepare draft code language as directed by the Board. The draft proposal would be presented to the Board for additional review on March 23rd. It is anticipated a public hearing would be scheduled for April 13th.

THE BOARD TOOK A BREAK AT 8:35 P.M. THEY RECONVENED THE MEETING AT 8:45 P.M.

CONTINUED DISCUSSION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE (ECDC) 18.05 AND 20.15 CLARIFYING DEFINITIONS AND PROCESSES FOR REGULATION OF WIRELESS COMMUNICATION FACILITIES (FILE NUMBER AMD-2010-0004)

Mr. Clugston reviewed that the Board has held multiple meetings on this topic since April 2010, and their work has led to the creation of completely revised draft regulation, which was distributed for Board review on November 10, 2010. The Board discussed various refinements of the draft regulation in detail at their January 12, 2011 meeting. In addition, the Architectural Design Board reviewed the document on February 16, 2011. Overall, they were satisfied with the proposed language, but they offered some additional clarification. Using input from both the Planning Board and the Architectural Design Board, staff worked with the City Attorney to further refine the draft (Attachment 3). He specifically highlighted the following changes:

1. The term “ground-mounted facilities” was changed to “monopole facilities” for clarity since other possible ground-mounted facilities like lattice towers and guyed towers are specifically prohibited.
2. Upon the recommendation of the City Attorney, the definitions would be included with the chapter as opposed to placing them in a different title.
3. Section 20.50.050.N (landscaping and screening) was updated to better reflect existing landscaping code (ECDC 20.13).
4. The Planning Board’s recommended language for location and height of building-mounted wireless facilities was included in ECDC 20.50.090, and their recommended language for structure-mounted antennas was included in ECDC 20.50.100.
5. Table 20.50.080.2 was eliminated and monopole height and setbacks were aligned to Chapter 16 (zoning).

Mr. Clugston referred the Board to an email from Council Member Petso asking the Board to consider the fact that she has heard comments from neighbors about service vehicles parking on lawns and landscaped areas. He pointed out that ECDC 20.50.050.F states that any application must demonstrate there is sufficient space for temporary parking for regular maintenance of the proposed facility. Problems would be dealt with on a complaint basis. Vice Chair Reed asked if Council Member Petso’s concern is a result of access problems or just bad manners. Mr. Clugston said it is probably the latter. However, he noted that in some situations, private residential property owners have located landscaping or lawn area within public rights-of-way.

Board Member Clarke asked if it would be possible to address the problem by providing signage to identify the parking space for service vehicles. Mr. Chave pointed out that parking is generally located within the right-of-way and they typically try to pull the vehicles as far off the road as possible. He acknowledged that this can impinge on landscaping that has been planted by private property owners in the rights-of-way. He suggested this is an operational issue and property owners may have to remind service providers to be more careful in these situations. He said it would be difficult to use signage to designate parking within the right-of-way. However, if a wireless facility is located on private property, the private property owner would have to provide on-site parking for service vehicles. He summarized that without knowing more specific information about the case, it is difficult for staff to clearly understand the problem. Staff agreed to seek additional information from Council Member Petso.

Board Member Johnson referred to the monopole that is currently located on Bowdoin Way next to the water tower, which was previously behind the fire station. She noted that ECDC 20.50.040.B.3 would prohibit monopoles on public and open space zoned parcels. Mr. Clugston said that upon adoption of the new regulations, this monopole would become nonconforming. That means it would be allowed to continue, but no new pole would be allowed.

Board Member Johnson referred to the photographs provided in ECDC 20.50.110 to illustrate acceptable monopoles. She noted that the height of a monopole is not allowed to extend above the maximum height allowed in the zone, and the monopoles in the pictures appear taller than what the zone allows. Mr. Clugston agreed that monopoles would be permitted up to the height allowed by the zone with just a building permit. A conditional use permit would be required to exceed the height limit of the underlying zoning. Board Member Johnson expressed concern that the pictures do not clearly illustrate the intent of the proposed language. Mr. Clugston pointed out that the pole in the right hand picture is constructed near the Campbell Nelson dealership, which is zoned general commercial (CG). The maximum height allowed in the zone is 60 feet.

To clarify the height requirements for monopoles, the Board agreed that language should be inserted to require monopoles to conform to the height and setback requirements of the underlying zoning (ECDC 16). It was noted that this information is also available on the permit table (ECDC 20.50.060.B.1).

Board Member Johnson also referred to ECDC 20.50.110.B.1, which states that to the greatest extent possible, monopole facilities shall be located where existing trees, structures and other features camouflage the facilities. She suggested that better pictures could be provided to illustrate this concept.

Board Member Johnson observed that this is the eighth time the Board has reviewed the proposed revisions to the wireless communication facilities regulations, and she thanked Mr. Clugston for keeping the Board on track throughout the process. She also thanked him for keeping an open mind to the comments provided by the public and the Board and for creating language to address the concerns. Mr. Clugston said that, once approved, service providers will have a clear understanding of the City's expectations.

The Board agreed that a public hearing on the draft regulations should be scheduled for April 27th.

Board Member Clarke asked Mr. Clugston to contact Council Member Petso to learn more about the situation she referred to in her memorandum and then examine the proposed language to see if her concerns would be adequately addressed. Mr. Clugston agreed to accomplish this task prior to the public hearing. Vice Chair Reed noted that the proposed language in ECDC 20.50.010.A.3 encourages providers, to the extent possible, to locate facilities in areas where the adverse impact on the community would be minimal.

Rich Busch, outside Council for AT&T and President of the Northwest Wireless Association, congratulated the Board for moving from structure-based regulations to aesthetic-based regulations. This approach will encourage the industry to come up with the least intrusive design. Once adopted, he suggested the new regulations would provide a good example for other jurisdictions to follow. He announced that a new type of antenna is currently being tested that is about half the size of a letter-sized sheet of paper. Once the technology is available, it can be integrated into existing facilities, and the larger antennas can eventually be phased out. However, he cautioned that the new antennas would have a lower capacity than the current technology so more of them would be required. New facilities would have to be constructed to provide adequate coverage using the smaller antennas. He noted that even the smaller antennas require an equipment box of some kind.

APPROVED

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

The Board reviewed that a public hearing on proposed amendments to the downtown BD zoning provisions is scheduled for April 13th, and a public hearing on the proposed amendments to the wireless communication facilities provisions is scheduled for April 27th.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Lovell announced that a few weeks ago, he was appointed to serve on the Sound Transit Citizens Oversight Panel as a representative of Snohomish County.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Cloutier reminded the Board Members of the Five Corners and Westgate public design workshop that is scheduled for Saturday, March 12th, from 11 a.m. to 3:30 p.m. in the Edmonds Library Plaza Meeting Room.

Board Member Stewart announced that on March 12th from 10 a.m. to 4 p.m. the Sustainable Development Task Force of Snohomish County is sponsoring a public tour of small-scale commercial and residential sites in Snohomish County. The event will showcase projects and sites that have successfully integrated low-impact development technologies such as pervious pavement, rain gardens, wildlife habitat, green roofs, garden improvements, and rain catchment. She advised that her home is one of the featured sites. She explained that with their improvements, 100% of the rainwater from the roof is used for irrigation, with the overflow going to a rain garden. Board Member Cloutier agreed to add the event to Sustainable Edmonds' event calendar.

Board Member Clarke thanked the City Council and Mayor Cooper for participating in an effective joint meeting with the Planning Board. The meeting was positive and he hopes they have more of them. He said he particularly appreciated the City Council's guidance and perspective and he felt there was a positive environment for dialog to move things forward.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 9:17 p.m.