

**APPROVED OCTOBER 12<sup>TH</sup>**

**CITY OF EDMONDS  
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

**September 28, 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 – 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

Philip Lovell, Chair  
John Reed, Vice Chair  
Todd Cloutier  
Kristiana Johnson  
Neil Tibbott

**STAFF PRESENT**

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager  
Rob English, City Engineer  
Carrie Hite, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director  
Karin Noyes, Recorder

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT**

Kevin Clarke  
Bill Ellis (excused)  
Valerie Stewart (excused)

**READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**VICE CHAIR REED MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF AUGUST 24, 2011 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER TIBBOTT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA**

The agenda was accepted as presented.

**AUDIENCE COMMENTS**

There was no one in the audience.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN (CFP) ELEMENT UPDATE FOR 2012-2017 TO CITY'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP) FOR 2012-2017 (FILE NUMBER AMD20110006)**

Mr. English described the differences between the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) and Capital Improvement Plan (CIP). The CFP is mandated under the Growth Management Act and contains a list of projects that need to be expanded or will be new capital facilities in order to accommodate the City's projected population growth. Maintenance projects that preserve existing capital facilities are not included in the CFP. The CFP is updated annually to identify capital projects for at least the next six years and out to 2025 that support the City's Comprehensive Plan. The CIP is not mandated by State law and is done for budget reasons. The projects identified in the CIP are tied to the budget that will be presented to the City Council on October 4<sup>th</sup>. The timeframe for the CIP projects is six years. He also provided a diagram to illustrate the similarities and differences between the two documents.

Mr. English advised that the proposed CFP has three project sections comprised of General, Transportation and Utilities. The CIP has two sections related to general and parks projects, and each project list is organized by the City's financial fund

numbers. He referred the Board to Exhibit 3, which identifies the projects that are proposed to be added or deleted from the CFP and CIP. He specifically noted the following additions:

- The Sunset Avenue Walkway Project was added to the CFP. The purpose of the project is to provide a continuous non-motorized path for scenic views on the west side of Sunset Avenue from Main Street to Casper Street. The project is identified in the 2008 Parks Comprehensive Plan. It has also been included in the Transportation Improvement Plan (TIP) and some preliminary work has been done. The estimated cost of the project is \$917,000. It is identified in the CFP for design in 2015 and construction in 2016. Staff anticipates securing grants for this project, but no funding is available at this time. Staff will prepare a conceptual design for the sidewalk improvements associated with the project. A survey of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) and street rights-of-way indicates that a coordination effort will be necessary.
- A feasibility study of Edmonds Marsh/Shellabarger Creek/Willow Creek was also added to the CFP. This project is supported by the 2010 Stormwater Plan and falls under Phase 1 of the larger Edmonds Marsh Restoration and Willow Creek Daylighting Projects. The purpose of the study is to identify the scope of improvements that could be done to improve fish passage and water flow. The estimated cost of the study is \$200,000, and the City has applied for a \$100,000 grant from the Salmon Recovery Board in conjunction with People for Puget Sound. The City's matching funds would come from both the Stormwater Utility Fund and the Parks Fund. If grant funding is secured, the study should move forward in 2012.
- In November 2010, the City Council approved the 2011-2016 CIP with an amendment to add a public market facility in the downtown waterfront area as part of the 2012-2017 CIP process. However, no direction was provided on which capital fund the project should be added to, how much should be allowed for the project, or when the project should move forward. Staff has researched the best way to add this project to both the CIP and CFP and found that the project is actually identified in the 2008 Parks Plan under "regional park for the downtown waterfront." Staff believes this reference provides the nexus to add the project to the Parks CFP and the 125 Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) Park Improvement Fund in the CIP.

Mr. English advised that the CIP identifies both capital and maintenance projects. He referred to a chart outlining the various capital funds that are managed by the Public Works, Parks and Recreation and Community Services Departments. He specifically highlighted the following funds:

#### 112 Transportation Fund

- 226<sup>th</sup> Street Walkway Project. This 300-foot section of walkway has been completed.
- Shell Valley Emergency Road. This project is currently under construction and is anticipated for completion by the end of 2011.
- Dayton Street Overlay. This project is tied into a 2011 water main replacement project that is currently under construction. Once the water main project is finished, the roadway overlay project can commence.
- Main Street from 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue to 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The City secured grant funding for this project in 2010. The project is intended to improve Main Street by replacing sidewalks and adding street lighting, flower basket poles, and other amenities. The preliminary design phase has been initiated, and they anticipate construction will start in the fall of 2012.
- 228<sup>th</sup> Street Corridor Improvements. Design work for this project has commenced.
- Five Corners Roundabout. Design work for this project has also started.
- 212<sup>th</sup> Street and 76<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The City is nearly ready to issue a Request for Qualifications, and they plan to start the design process later in 2011.

#### 412-100 Utility Fund – Water

- The City has awarded two construction projects that will replace over 17,000 feet of water mains.
- Starting in 2012, 5,900 feet of water main will be replaced each year, which is a more typical replacement program going forward.
- The Alderwood Meter Improvement Project has been completed.

**APPROVED**

#### 412-200 Utility Fund – Stormwater

- The 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue Storm Drainage Improvement Project has been completed.
- The Dayton Street Storm Drainage Improvement Project is under construction. There are some sections of pipe where access is limited. Therefore, exposing and replacing the pipe is not feasible. Rather than replacing the infrastructure, the City will rehabilitate the pipe using a cured-in-place lining.
- The Talbot Road/Perrinville Creek Drainage Improvement Project is scheduled to start in 2012.

#### 412-300 Utility Fund – Sewer

- Upgrades to Sewer Lift Station 2 are currently under construction. It is anticipated the project will be completed by the end of 2011.
- Nine sewer lift stations would be rehabilitated in 2012 and 2013.
- Nearly 3,000 feet of sewer main will be replaced or rehabilitated starting in 2012.
- The Sewer Comprehensive Plan needs to be updated in 2012. The current version was adopted in 2006.

Ms. Hite highlighted the 2011 park projects that were funded by the 125 Park Fund (REET) as follows:

- The Yost Pool Repair Project was completed on time and under budget.
- Groundbreaking occurred for the Interurban Trail Project and significant progress has already been made. The project will continue into the fall, with anticipated completion by the end of 2011.
- As directed by the City Council, the Old Mill Town Project is underway, and a groundbreaking ceremony is scheduled for September 30<sup>th</sup> at 1:00 p.m.
- Francis Chapin has been working diligently with a consultant to design the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue Cultural Corridor Project, and they anticipate going into full planning in 2012.

Ms. Hite reminded the Board that, as requested by the City Council, staff is proposing that the Public Market Project be added to the CFP. She noted that this project could be classified as an additional waterfront feature, which is identified in the 2008 Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan. Adding the project to the CFP will acknowledge the City Council's decision and allow the City to start the planning process.

Ms. Hite said the City has also been working with representatives from the Edmonds School District, Mountlake Terrace, and Lynnwood regarding a potential regional athletic complex at the old Woodway High School site. They believe the project would be competitive for grant funding. She anticipates that community discussions will continue, and it is important for the City to allocate some funding for the project and to participate in future discussions.

Ms. Hite advised that the proposed CIP reprioritizes the projects identified in the Park 125 Fund, and a few new projects were added. The changes include:

- The 2011-2016 CIP identifies playground equipment replacement at City Park and completion of the Dayton Street Plaza in 2011. These projects were bumped to 2012.
- Funding for the Edmonds Marsh/Shellabarger Creek/Willow Creek Feasibility Study was added to provide matching funds for grant opportunities.
- A Park Impact Fee Study was added as a placeholder if the City Council chooses to move forward with the study. They will discuss the concept further before the end of 2011. If the City Council decides against the study, the money will be reallocated.
- \$120,000 was identified for the Yost Pool Boiler Replacement Project in 2012 rather than waiting three to four years as originally planned.

Next, Ms. Hite noted that the Park Construction Fund 132 does not have any revenues coming in other than those transferred from Park Fund 125 (REET) and grants. It is intended to be a construction fund to track capital projects. Projects identified in this fund include:

**APPROVED**

- Dollars from Park Fund 125 would be transferred to Park Construction Fund 132 to pay for the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue Cultural Corridor Planning Project. Grant money would also be placed in this fund.
- Money from Park Fund 125 was transferred to the Park Construction Fund 132 for the Dayton Street Plaza Project to match community grant funding that has already been received.
- Grant funding for the Interurban Trail Project was also added to Park Construction Fund 132.
- The City has applied for, but has not secured grant funding for the Spray Park Project and the Senior Center Improvement Project.

Mr. English distributed two revised pages: Page 44 of the CFP regarding the Sunset Avenue Walkway Project, and Page 58 of the CIP related to the Interurban Trail Project.

Mr. English reviewed that after the public hearing, staff would like the Board to forward a recommendation regarding the CIP and CFP to the City Council. He noted that a public hearing has been scheduled before the City Council on October 4<sup>th</sup>. Once approved, the CFP would be adopted as part of the 2011 Comprehensive Plan Amendments, which must take place by the end of December.

THERE WAS NO ONE IN ATTENDANCE TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PUBLIC HEARING. THEREFORE, THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Vice Chair Reed asked the correct procedure for forwarding Board Member comments regarding the proposed CFP and CIP to the City Council. Mr. English answered that staff would forward the Board's comments to the City Council for consideration as part of their review during the public hearing process.

Board Member Cloutier recalled that when the Stormwater Master Plan was reviewed and updated in 2010, projects related to the waterfront were intentionally given a higher priority. One of these projects was the 100-Year Floodplain Delineation Study. He asked if this study would be completed in the near future. Mr. English reported that the City decided not to move forward with the 100-Year Floodplain Delineation Study. Instead, the City plans to pursue the Edmonds Marsh/Shellabarger Creek/Willow Creek Feasibility Study, for which grant opportunities are available. This study would look at fish habitat and potential improvements to the marsh, as well as water flow.

Board Member Johnson referred to Page 3 of Exhibit 3, which states that the 100-Year Floodplain Delineation Study was abandoned. Instead, the funds were used to purchase the Karlsten property. Mr. English advised that the Karlsten property has been the subject of flooding issues for years. The City purchased the property as part of a settlement agreement. Board Member Johnson asked clarification of whether the floodplain delineation study had been postponed or abandoned. Again, Mr. English advised that the City is hoping to secure grant funding for a feasibility study that will focus on habitat and water passage through the marsh.

Board Member Cloutier expressed concern that the City has plans to move ahead with drainage projects in the downtown waterfront area before a floodplain delineation study has been completed. Mr. English clarified that no drainage projects have been proposed in the downtown waterfront area. The purpose of the feasibility study is to identify future projects to address the existing problems.

Chair Lovell expressed concern about projects such as fixing the drainage in the Senior Center parking lot and overlaying Dayton Street after the new water line has been installed. He suggested that these projects are cosmetic fixes that do not address the main issue of flooding that exists in the area. He emphasized that a floodplain delineation study must be completed before any significant redevelopment can take place in this area. Mr. English pointed out that the CIP identifies \$150,000 in 2012 and \$500,000 in 2013 for a Dayton Street and SR-104 Storm Drainage Alternatives Study and Implementation. He noted that this is the intersection where most of the flooding problems occur during heavy rains. He explained that this study would focus on how to get the stormwater out to the Sound during heavy storms. The floodplain delineation study would identify the elevation for flooding during a 100-year storm, but it would not offer any solutions. The City's goal is to identify solutions to reduce and eliminate flooding in the future.

**APPROVED**

Chair Lovell referred to the Main Street Pedestrian Lighting Project from 5<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> Avenues. He noted that \$83,612 was allocated for 2011, and \$890,388 was identified for 2012. He questioned why so much money would be allocated for a lighting project. Mr. English said this project would also include sidewalk replacement, street tree replacement, water main replacement and other amenities. The City is also interested in relocating the overhead utilities. He noted the City has received grant funding to add two electric vehicle charging stations at the intersection of 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Main Street. He summarized that the City has submitted an application to the Transportation Improvement Board for grant funding for this project, and they will also pursue a direct allocation from the State Legislature in 2012. The final project scope will be based on available funding.

Board Member Johnson requested more information about the potential of undergrounding the utilities on Main Street between 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> Avenues. Mr. English said underground utilities would be the City's preference, but he recognized the cost is significant and may not be feasible. The City's second choice would be relocate the utilities to the alley south of Main Street. Board Member Johnson asked if staff has considered using a local improvement district to fund the underground utility component of the project. Mr. English said staff has considered this option, but the cost of undergrounding utilities is extremely high, and the option would not likely be feasible given the low number of businesses that would be required to contribute to the fund. However, he agreed to research the option further.

Chair Lovell requested more information about the public market concept. Again, Mr. English advised that the City Council asked that this item be added to the CIP as part of the 2011 process. Staff is recommending that it be added to both documents. They will seek further direction from the City Council. Chair Lovell asked if a potential location for the market has been identified. Mr. English answered that no specific location has been identified, but the City Council indicated that it should be in the vicinity of the general downtown waterfront area.

Vice Chair Reed asked how the upcoming levy would impact the CIP and CFP. He noted that, as currently proposed, there would be no funding for street overlays over the next three years. Mr. English said potential funding associated with the levy was not programmed into the CIP. If the levy is approved by voters, the CIP would be updated to incorporate the additional \$1 million. He emphasized that the additional funding would be placed in the 112 Fund (Transportation), but the City Council has not made any decisions as to exactly how the money would be allocated.

Vice Chair Reed asked about the projects that were identified as part of the proposed transportation funding package that was voted down by the citizens of Edmonds. Mr. English answered that many of the projects in the proposed CFP were included as part of the transportation funding package, but no funding has been identified.

Vice Chair Reed observed that if the levy is approved, the Parks fund would receive an additional \$500,000, which would be used to fund maintenance projects that have been deferred. Ms. Hite agreed that the additional funding would be placed in a separate account to upgrade parks and address some of the City's deferred maintenance issues.

Chair Lovell asked how the Haines Wharf contractor's request for equitable adjustment is identified in the CIP. Ms. Hite answered that it was not identified in the proposed CIP because they do not have a projection for what this cost will be. When the City gets closer to closing the project and figuring out the claim for equitable adjustment, the CIP will need to be modified to identify where the money would come from.

Chair Lovell requested information about the scope of work associated with the Civic Center Complex Improvement Project. Ms. Hite explained that while the property is owned by the Edmonds School District, the City leases the property for the community's use. Therefore, the City is responsible for all maintenance costs, including turf repairs. The current lease expires in 2020, and staff is working with the school district to either negotiate a new lease or acquire the property. As currently proposed, \$5,000 has been identified in 2011 for minor improvements, and \$75,000 would be used in 2013 to replace the playground equipment. She noted that the CIP also identifies minor improvements and replacement of playground equipment at Marina Beach Park.

Chair Lovell asked if improvements to the Old Woodway High School playfield have been approved by the Edmonds School District. Ms. Hite answered that the project is in the conceptual stage, and City staff will continue to work

**APPROVED**

with Mountlake Terrace, Lynnwood and the school district to submit grant applications for funding. She noted that the property is owned by the Department of Natural Resources and controlled by the school district.

Board Member Tibbott requested additional information about the proposed improvements to the Boys and Girls Club. Ms. Hite advised that the property is located on the Civic Center Campus, which is primarily owned by the school district. However, the City does own the building and the ground it sits on. The CFP identifies future replacement of the building.

Chair Lovell referred to Page 23 of the CIP, which identifies total revenues for the 125 Park Fund. He asked if these numbers are only accurate if grant funding is secured. Ms. Hite answered that the numbers are only accurate if all of the anticipated revenues are obtained and all the expenditures are made. Chair Lovell asked if the ending cash balance gets carried over to the next year, and Ms. Hite answered affirmatively. Ms. Hite noted that some projects identified in the 2011 CIP were postponed because Real Estate Excise Tax (REET) revenues were less than projected. She explained that the City manages Park Fund 125 based on revenues. They will not ambitiously start all the projects identified in Park Fund 125 in early 2012. Instead, the projects will be started throughout the year as funding is available. The goal is to end with a positive cash balance.

Board Member Johnson pointed out that \$30,000 has been budgeted in 2013 for a Cultural Arts Facility Needs Study. While the CIP cross references this project to the CFP, it has not been included in the CFP. Ms. Hite advised that there has been some community discussion regarding an arts facility that brings a historical perspective to the arts. The \$30,000 amount was included as a placeholder to allow the planning effort to start. She agreed that the project should also be reflected in the CFP.

Vice Chair Reed asked if any of the projects identified in the 116 Building Maintenance Fund include staff salaries, or would third-party contractors be used to perform the maintenance work. Mr. English answered that Jim Stevens, Facilities Manager, is responsible for the projects identified in the 116 Building Maintenance Fund. Currently, three City employees perform facility maintenance, but he is not familiar with whether or not they bill their time to individual projects.

Vice Chair Reed observed that given the size, age and use of the City's facilities, it appears that not nearly enough money has been allocated to properly maintain the structures. This means the buildings will deteriorate sooner. It is always frustrating to see the large number of maintenance projects that need to be done and the lack of funding to move forward. He said he hopes this issue can be a topic of discussion during the Strategic Planning process to identify opportunities to obtain more revenue. He also cautioned that establishing local improvement districts to fund certain projects can appear to nickel and dime property owners in other ways than property taxes.

Vice Chair Reed noted that the current Civic Center lease expires in 2021, which is only ten years away. He emphasized that this property is a significant asset to the City, and they should start working now on a new lease or potential acquisition. Ms. Hite said that in her discussions with the school district, they have indicated they are not interested in selling the property, but they would likely support a long-term lease with the City. She advised that the City would likely need a 50-year lease at a reasonable rate to justify the expense of improving the facility. At this time, the school district does not have any plans to utilize the property for a school use.

Chair Lovell observed that recent events indicate there may still be some concern about the proposed roundabout at Five Corners. He noted that while some grant funding has been secured for design work, funding for construction would not be available for at least two to four years. Mr. English clarified that the City has secured grant funding for design and right-of-way acquisition in 2011 through 2013. He explained that the Transportation Improvement Plan requires that all projects identified for the first three years must have secured funding. Because the City has not yet secured funding for construction of the roundabout at Five Corners, the project is identified for construction in 2015. The City is not required to have secured funding for the projects identified for the last three years of the plan.

Chair Lovell said there appears to be some question as to the necessity of the roundabout at Five Corners. Mr. English explained that this intersection has a concurrency problem. The current Level of Service (LOS) F during the PM peak hour is below the City's standard. The Transportation Improvement Plan identifies a need to raise the LOS at this intersection, and a roundabout has been identified as an ideal fit for the situation. The other option would be a signalized intersection,

**APPROVED**

which would be difficult. Movement would be limited to one direction at a time because there are five streets intersecting in this one location. A roundabout would also allow for safer pedestrian crossings. He noted that the project design has been funded by a Federal Air Quality Improvement Grant. It has been found that roundabouts result in cleaner air because cars do not have to sit and idle while waiting to cross through an intersection. He emphasized the need to educate the public to help them understand the benefits of the proposed roundabout. Chair Lovell asked about the City's anticipated source of funding for the roundabout construction. Mr. English answered that once the right-of-way acquisition and design work is finished, City staff would submit applications for grant funding to construct the project.

Board Member Johnson said she appreciates Mr. English's explanation about the benefits of the roundabout, which appears to make sense from an engineering standpoint. However, her recollection from participating in the Transportation Plan update process is that the community is split 50/50 in support and opposition to the project. She suggested that the design and right-of-way acquisition phase provides a good time for the community to weigh in on whether or not they think the roundabout is a good project. If they wait until the project is ready for construction, it will be too late. She recalled that the Transportation Plan Update committee originally recommended that the consultant look at an interim project, but this idea did not get into the final approved Transportation Plan. She suggested it would be appropriate to look at other alternatives as part of the design and right-of-way acquisition phase, since the information could be used to either defend and/or explain the project.

Board Member Johnson observed that because of the geometry of this intersection, it has a low accident rate. She added that even when 220<sup>th</sup> Street was under construction and traffic was diverted to Five Corners, there was not a spike in the number of accidents even though the traffic nearly doubled. She suggested the City actually has three options for addressing the LOS requirement:

1. Make improvements to meet the LOS Standard.
2. Do nothing and require future developers in the area to pay for the needed improvement.
3. Change the LOS Standard, perhaps allowing an exception for this one intersection.

Board Member Johnson expressed her belief that in order to really evaluate the intersection properly, the City must measure the stop time delay. From her understanding, only the westbound approach to 212<sup>th</sup> has a delay problem at this time. She questioned if there are other alternatives to the way the intersection is utilized that could affect the average intersection stop delay. She summarized that the roundabout project is of great interest to the community, and she wants the City to be as prepared as possible to answer the questions that may come up in the future.

Vice Chair Reed said it would be helpful to provide graphic information to the public to illustrate how the roundabout might look and work in this location. Board Member Johnson advised that this information has already been presented to the public. Vice Chair Reed said it would also be helpful to illustrate how pedestrian traffic would move through the roundabout intersection. Mr. English agreed that this information would be helpful to educate the public on the benefits of a roundabout and how it would function. Because the design work is still in the preliminary stages, the actual layout of the roundabout has not been established yet. He emphasized that the proposed roundabout at Five Corners should not be confused with the existing traffic circle at the fountain area in downtown Edmonds. The fountain intersection is not considered an engineered roundabout.

Mr. English observed that the Board raised a lot of good questions and concerns. He asked that they summarize the concerns they would like staff to present to the City Council. The Board summarized their specific concerns as follows:

1. It is important to make sure money is not wasted in the area of drainage and infrastructure in the downtown waterfront area. These problems need to be resolved long term in order for redevelopment to take place.
2. The Five Corners roundabout is a reoccurring community concern. It was brought up during the Five Corners Neighborhood Activity Center Study. At that time, a video was provided to illustrate how a roundabout operates, and preliminary sketches were provided to illustrate the land that would need to be acquired to accommodate the roundabout. Even with the information provided, there was still a significant amount of controversy.
3. A public education program is necessary to help the public understand the benefits of a roundabout and to gain support for the project.

**APPROVED**

Board Member Johnson noted that \$20,000 was identified in 2012 for a Transportation Plan update. Mr. Chave explained that it is time for the City to review future land use patterns in preparation for the next Comprehensive Plan update. This money would be used to hire a consultant to help staff extend the projections in the Transportation Plan out to 2035 and perhaps beyond. However, the update will not involve reworking the policies.

**VICE CHAIR REED MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD THE DRAFT CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PLAN AND DRAFT CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN (FILE NUMBER AMD20110006) TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL BASED ON THE COMMENTS MADE BY THE BOARD. BOARD MEMBER CLOUTIER SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**PUBLIC HEARING ON POTENTIAL AMENDMENT TO THE CITY'S COMPREHENSIVE PLAN MAP ADJUSTING THE BOUNDARIES OF THE MEDICAL/HIGHWAY 99 ACTIVITY CENTER TO REMOVE EXISTING SINGLE-FAMILY DESIGNATED AREAS FROM THE ACTIVITY CENTER (FILE NUMBER AMD20100024)**

Mr. Chave reviewed that at the end of 2010, the City Council asked the Board to review the boundaries of the Medical/Highway 99 Activity Center during 2011. The issue was brought forward when a property owner proposed the idea of rezoning single-family zoned property along 220<sup>th</sup> Street. The subject property was located within the boundaries of the activity center, and nearby residential property owners expressed opposition to the change. These property owners mistakenly thought that because the subject property was located within the activity center, it was presumed that the zoning could be changed.

Mr. Chave recalled that at a previous meeting, the Board discussed that the intent of including nearby small-lot single-family areas in both the Downtown and Medical/Highway 99 Activity Centers was to emphasize that single-family areas could be considered to be part of walkable, pedestrian-oriented activity areas. The point was to indicate that wholesale changes are not necessary to zoning patterns in order to promote mixed-use and pedestrian-oriented activity. Downtown Edmonds is a perfect example of this concept in that there are numerous single-family residential homes clustered around the commercial and multi-family residential areas, and there is a lot of pedestrian activity. The City is hoping the same thing will occur in the Medical/Highway 99 Activity Center as redevelopment takes place.

Mr. Chave emphasized that including single-family residential properties in the activity center does not mean that the zoning is expected to change. In fact, he reminded the Board that the City Council recently made the decision to reclassify properties on 216<sup>th</sup> Street (within the activity center) from mixed-use to single-family residential. This action argues for the integrity of having single-family residential properties included in the activity center.

Mr. Chave said staff is recommending that the current activity center boundaries be maintained to include single-family residential properties. Instead, staff is proposing that the policy statements be amended to assure that the overall intent is clear. He reviewed the current activity center boundaries. Chair Lovell summarized that staff is recommending the policy statements be amended to make it clear that single-family residential properties can be located within the activity center without being threatened. The boundary would not be changed.

**NO ONE WAS PRESENT IN THE AUDIENCE. THEREFORE, THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.**

Chair Lovell noted that the policy statements talk about encouraging the appropriate mixture of uses and neighborhood cohesiveness. They also talk about pedestrian corridors and other elements to encourage walkability. However, none of these issues were addressed by the new Dick's Restaurant that was recently completed. Mr. Chave explained that not a lot can be done with a small project of this type, but the Highway 99 Task Force is currently talking about ideas for encouraging transit-oriented development for a larger area with connections to other areas of the activity center.

Chair Lovell asked if the hospital has indicated support for the current activity center boundaries and the proposed amendments to the policy statements. Mr. Chave said the hospital campus is already specifically identified in the activity center. If the hospital wants to alter surrounding uses, they would have to approach the City with a request to change the

**APPROVED**

Comprehensive Plan, just like any other property owner. He said he does not believe the proposed change would impact the hospital.

Vice Chair Reed observed that it is helpful to view the Zoning Map and Comprehensive Plan Map side by side so the sequence of zoning is evidence. He summarized that the zoning within the activity center is diverse. Mr. Chave agreed and explained that the hallmark of mixed-use development is that it does not mean a single type of development or zone. It means a mixture of zones and uses, with features and connections that work together to create the environment. It is important to emphasize that single-family residential uses are not exclusive of their surroundings, but are part of them. He clarified that changing the zoning of a single-family residential property would require not only a rezone, but a Comprehensive Plan amendment, as well. This would be true regardless of whether the property is located within the activity center or not.

Chair Lovell asked if residents of the Esperance area are allowed to comment on the proposed amendment. Mr. Chave answered that all citizens, regardless of whether they are residents of Edmonds, are allowed to comment at any public hearing.

Vice Chair Reed recalled that a huge crowd attended a Planning Board Meeting at which a property owner presented a proposal to rezone a pocket of single-family residential property located within the activity center. Mr. Chave clarified that he is not sure why the issue came before the Board because no rezone application was filed. The property owner was actually asking the City Council for an exception to the deadline for submitting Comprehensive Plan amendment proposals. The City Council denied the property owner's request, and the issue never came up again.

Board Member Tibbott asked why the Five Corners area was not included in the Medical/Highway 99 Activity Center. Mr. Chave answered that because of its location and its unique characteristics, staff believes it should be treated as its own activity center.

Board Member Johnson asked about the status of the Urban Center designation relative to Sound Transit's evaluation of routes. Mr. Chave explained that Urban Center is a regional planning designation that has extremely high criteria in terms of population density, employment density, etc. It is possible to consider an Urban Center designation for at least a portion of the Medical/Highway 99 Activity Center, but it would require extreme densities. He acknowledged that achieving an Urban Center density would give the City the ability to target regional transportation dollars; but at this point, the Highway 99 Task Force is considering taking a smaller step by looking at transit-oriented development in a couple of nodes along the Highway 99 Corridor. He added that it would be costly to perform the studies necessary to obtain an Urban Center designation. He concluded that while an Urban Center designation is not beyond the realm of possibilities, the Highway 99 Task Force believes that transit-oriented development makes more sense given the current demand.

**BOARD MEMBER CLOUTIER MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD THE POLICY AMENDMENTS CONTAINED IN EXHIBIT 1 (FILE NUMBER AMD20100024) TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL. BOARD MEMBER TIBBOTT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

#### **REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA**

Mr. Chave announced that Strategic Planning Meetings have been scheduled for the 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesday of each month during the City Council's regular meetings.

Mr. Chave reported that Mr. Lien is working to obtain a formalized response from the Department of Ecology that they will extend the deadline for completion of the Shoreline Master Program as long as the City can show they are making progress. He also announced that information related to the Shoreline Master Program can be accessed from the new City website, which will be up and running soon.

Vice Chair Reed reported that he is currently reviewing the draft article prepared by Board Member Stewart to describe the Shoreline Master Program Update process and identify how the community can get involved. Once he finishes his review,

**APPROVED**

the article will be published in the local newspaper. The Board suggested that the article also make reference to the City's website where additional information regarding the Shoreline Master Program can be found.

#### **PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS**

Chair Lovell recalled the Board's August 24<sup>th</sup> discussion about improving communication both by the Planning Board and the Citizens Economic Development Commission (CEDC). Vice Chair Reed said there was some discussion about forming a communications subcommittee. The Board also discussed the potential of having the Chair and Vice Chair of the Board meet regularly with the Council President and Mayor. This meeting could also include a representative from the CEDC. Vice Chair Reed suggested that the Board could also publish a short article in myedmondsnews.com and perhaps in the local newspaper after each Board meeting to provide a general synopsis of what the Board discussed and the actions that were taken.

Chair Lovell indicated that he has been meeting with Mayor Cooper every fourth Wednesday at 4:00 p.m. He suggested that this meeting could be expanded to include the City Council President, the Vice Chair of the Planning Board and the Chair of the CEDC.

Chair Lovell said he had some communication with Board Member Stewart regarding the concept of forming a "green initiatives" subcommittee. They would like this subcommittee to include a member of the Architectural Design Board (ADB). He indicated he would follow up with the ADB Chair regarding this request.

#### **PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

Vice Chair Reed recalled that at the last meeting he mentioned receiving an email from Council Member Bernheim regarding the concept of using resources from the American Institute of Architects for planning efforts. Council Member Bernheim did not feel the issue was being scheduled for discussion in a timely manner, and he asked him to help move it along. Council Member Bernheim withdrew his request when the issue was scheduled on the City Council's agenda.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Board meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

**APPROVED**