

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

January 25, 2012

Vice Chair Stewart 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

Valerie Stewart, Vice Chair
Todd Cloutier
Kristiana Johnson
John Reed
Neil Tibbott
Bill Ellis

STAFF PRESENT

Kernen Lien, Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Philip Lovell, Chair (excused)
Kevin Clarke (excused)

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Board Member Tibbott provided the following statement to clarify his comments on Page 7 of the draft January 11, 2012 Planning Board Minutes:

“In the future, we may want to clarify whether we are naming a park for a person who has had a significant and historical relationship with the City versus naming a park after a foundation through which we expect to have a long and meaningful partnership. In this case, I’m not entirely clear which one it is. However, I am looking forward to seeing how the relationship between the City of Edmonds and the Hazel Miller Foundation blossoms into a significant partnership.”

Board Member Johnson also referred to the fourth bulleted item on Page 7 and clarified that rather than a “two-part grant,” it was really a single grant for \$88,000.

BOARD MEMBER REED MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 11, 2012 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED AND CLARIFIED. BOARD MEMBER JOHNSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Bob McChesney, Executive Director, Port of Edmonds, referred to the recent brochure the Port of Edmonds mailed to all residents of Edmonds and Woodway. He explained that the brochure contains an artful collection of thoughts and ideas for redevelopment of Harbor Square, which were brought together by a steering committee consisting of representatives from

throughout the community. It is representative of the Harbor Square Master Redevelopment Plan the Port will ultimately present to the City of Edmonds as a proposed amendment to the Comprehensive Plan. He noted that a few graphic errors were made by the printer when the document was published. These errors will be corrected and the document will be redistributed. He emphasized that no substantive changes would be made.

REVIEW OF SHORELINE MASTER PROGRAM (SMP) UPDATE

Mr. Lien referred the Board to the memorandum dated November 9, 2011, which was prepared by staff to outline the questions and suggested changes that have come up during the Board's review of the Shoreline Master Program (SMP). He recalled that the Board did not have sufficient time on November 9th to consider all of the items in the memorandum, and they continued their discussion to a future meeting. He announced that, since the November 9th meeting, the City received a memorandum (dated December 21, 2011) from Friends of the Edmonds Marsh (FOEM) indicating support for the Port of Edmonds' Harbor Square Redevelopment Master Plan and the City's proposed new Urban Mixed Use III land use designation.

Parking Setback for Urban Mixed Use III Environment

Mr. Lien advised that staff is seeking feedback from the Board regarding the proposed parking setback requirement for the Urban Mixed Use III Environment. He reviewed that existing and proposed parking setback for both the Urban Mixed Use I and Urban Mixed Use II Environments is 60 feet. However, the parking setback in the Urban Mixed Use II Environment can be reduced to 40 feet if a walkway or publicly accessible open space is provided. The proposed SMP identifies a 25-foot parking setback for the Urban Mixed Use III Environment. He recalled that the Board discussed this issue earlier, and there was some interest in making the parking setback for the Urban Mixed Use III Environment the same as for the Urban Mixed Use I and II Environments. The Board has spent considerable time discussing the differences between the Urban Mixed Use environments, and staff suggested they maintain the proposed 25-foot setback for the Urban Mixed Use III Environment; or alternatively, adding language similar to the language in the Urban Mixed Use II Environment to allow for a reduced parking setback.

Mr. Lien specifically referred the Board to Section 24.40.090 (Page 54 of the draft SMP), which outlines the bulk and dimensional standards for each of the shoreline environments. He suggested the Board may also want to consider a different standard for surface parking versus structured parking for the Urban Mixed Use III Environment. He noted that the proposed setback requirement for structures in the Urban Mixed Use III Environment is 25 feet. He pointed out that redevelopment at Harbor Square may include a parking structure, which would not likely be the case in the Urban Mixed Use I and II Environments. He said that because the proposed structure setback in the Urban Mixed Use III Environment is 25 feet, staff felt it would be appropriate to make the parking setback consistent. Board Member Cloutier pointed out that if the parking setback is greater than the structure setback, a developer may decide to build a parking structure that is two feet off the ground to avoid the greater setback required for parking.

Board Member Cloutier asked staff to share the basis for the current parking setback requirements for the Urban Mixed Use I and II Environments. Mr. Lien explained that the Urban Mixed Use I and II Environments include navigable waters and parking is not a preferred use as outlined in the Shoreline Management Act (SMA). While the Urban Mixed Use III Environment is considered to be within the shoreline jurisdiction, there are no navigable waters, and that is why staff is comfortable proposing a lower parking setback requirement.

Vice Chair Stewart said surface water runoff is a major concern with ground level parking, and that is why it is appropriate to have a greater setback for parking than for structures. She said she would prefer a more conservative parking setback given that the marsh could expand if and when Willow Creek is daylighted in the future. She asked what Best Available Science says about parking setback distances from shorelines and marshes. Mr. Lien referred to the wetland buffer requirements on Page 38 of the draft SMP (Section 24.40.020), which were taken from the Critical Areas Ordinance and the Department of Ecology (DOE) guidelines, both of which consider Best Available Science. He pointed out that a 75-foot buffer is standard for a Category 1 Wetland. However, it is important to keep in mind that because Harbor Square is developed up to 25 feet from the edge of the marsh, it is not a Category I Wetland. He recalled previous discussions that the marsh would not expand towards the Harbor Square property because of the existing dike. Instead, any future expansion would move towards SR-104.

APPROVED

He also pointed out that a buffer exists where there is currently no development near the marsh, and future development would not be allowed to encroach into this buffer. The Port has indicated their plans to enhance this buffer area, but the proposed SMP would still allow them to redevelop within the already developed area. He concluded that, as per Best Available Science, existing development must be taken into consideration when determining buffers.

Vice Chair Stewart summarized that, once developed, the current rules allow redevelopment to occur within the same footprint. However, that does not mean that allowing development to encroach so close the marsh was the right thing to do in the first place. Again, she said she would like the setback to be more conservative.

Board Member Cloutier asked how far the existing parking areas and structures are setback from the marsh. **Mr. McChesney, Executive Director, Port of Edmonds**, said he is not sure what the setback requirements were when the Harbor Square site was originally developed. However, there is currently an unpaved parking area located along the inboard side of the dike. Ultimately, vehicles encroach into the south side slope of the berm and within a few feet of the walking surface that is located at the top of the berm. Board Member Reed noted that there is a walkway and some drainage ditches located along the dike, so the current parking area is roughly 15 to 20 feet from the edge of the marsh. Mr. McChesney agreed that there is a ribbon of stormwater controls along the dike, which were likely code requirements. As the Port moves forward with redevelopment of Harbor Square, they hope to improve the entire functionality of this area in terms of public access, parking, and stormwater control to make the situation significantly better than it is now.

Vice Chair Stewart suggested the City establish a greater parking setback requirement for the Urban Mixed Use III Environment, but then allow the setback to be reduced to 25 feet if a developer proposes to incorporate pervious pavement, bioswales, rain gardens or other low-impact development (LID) techniques. Using this approach, she would have more confidence that future development would not impact the area negatively. Board Member Cloutier recalled the Board discussed this option at an earlier meeting and concluded that the City cannot prescribe certain LID solutions without first completing a study showing that the techniques are appropriate for the area. For example, pervious pavement might not be an appropriate solution for the Harbor Square site, depending on the type of fill that is present. Mr. Lien suggested that rather than referencing specific LID techniques that could be offered as incentives, the SMP could allow the parking setback in the Urban Mixed Use III Environment to be reduced to 25 feet if LID techniques are employed. Board Member Cloutier expressed concern that this approach would make City staff responsible for determining whether LID standards are met. If the Board chooses to go this route, the language must provide enough guidance to staff to make the requirement useful and meaningful.

Board Member Johnson recalled that she previously raised a concern about the quality of the stormwater runoff that flows into the marsh before pollutants are extracted. Vice Chair Stewart pointed out that the natural hydraulic function of a wetland is to filter pollutants.

Board Member Ellis referred to the letter from FOEM, which indicates support for the proposed Urban Mixed Use III Environment, with the understanding that when redevelopment occurs at Harbor Square, the stormwater management system will be better than what currently exists and will actually improve the situation. He also pointed out that the greater parking setback standards for the Urban Mixed Use I and II Environments have nothing to do with protecting the marsh from stormwater runoff. Instead, the parking setbacks are greater to discourage parking, which is not a preferred use in either of the two environments. He summarized that the greater parking requirements in the Urban Mixed Use I and II Environments should not be used as a standard for addressing stormwater runoff and marsh protection issues in the Urban Mixed Use III Environment.

For additional clarification, Mr. Lien reviewed the differences between “setback,” “buffer,” and “shoreline jurisdiction.” A shoreline jurisdiction is a measurement and not an ecological distance. It is measured 200 feet from the ordinary high-water mark. Any development within the shoreline jurisdiction must comply with the SMP, which is a zoning overlay that is applied as another layer of development regulations. However, the shoreline jurisdiction should not be considered a buffer that prevents development. A buffer is meant to protect ecological function, and a setback is used to address issues such as safety.

Board Member Johnson asked Mr. Lien to describe how the buffer requirement would be applied at Harbor Square. Mr. Lien said there is a buffer requirement between the edge of the pavement and the marsh, and no development would be allowed in this area. There is also an undeveloped area that has been identified as a critical area buffer, and development would not be allowed within this area, either. He acknowledged that the buffer area at Harbor Square is less than the minimum required because of existing development. He pointed out that because of the way the SMP and the Growth Management Act (GMA) work together, there are different standards for critical areas within the shoreline jurisdiction. The SMP buffer requirements would apply to the portion of the wetland within the shoreline jurisdiction, and the CAO buffer requirements would apply to the portion of the wetland that is located outside of the shoreline jurisdiction.

Board Member Ellis asked if the shoreline jurisdiction would expand towards SR-104 if the marsh boundaries expand over time as a result of daylighting Willow Creek. Mr. Lien agreed that is possible. He recalled the Board discussed this issue previously, and he particularly referenced Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 90.58.580, which allows local governments to grant relief from SMP development standards and use regulations within urban growth areas in certain circumstances. He advised that the City has three options for addressing this issue:

- Include language in the SMP to state that if Willow Creek is daylighted and the marsh expands, the shoreline jurisdiction identified in the SMP would be the extent of the shoreline jurisdiction.
- When a specific restoration project is proposed, the City could state that the shoreline jurisdiction would not expand as a result of the project.
- Allow the shoreline jurisdiction to expand as a result of a restoration project, which would in turn expand the Urban Mixed Use III Environment.

Board Member Ellis observed that the buffer requirement for the critical area outside of the shoreline jurisdiction is greater than the proposed buffer requirement within the shoreline jurisdiction. Mr. Lien agreed that a 200-foot buffer requirement would be apply to the critical area located outside of the shoreline jurisdiction.

Board Member Johnson commented that over the next several years, much more information about the marsh will come forward as a result of the various studies and projects that are planned. It is likely that the new information could either expand the marsh boundaries or determine that it is no longer a salt water marsh because it does not support certain wildlife. She cautioned that the City needs to be prepared to deal with the outcome of the studies. Mr. Lien agreed that the City would likely have substantially more information about the marsh when the SMP is updated again in seven years.

Board Member Reed commented on the following statements from the FOEM letter dated December 21, 2011:

- *Where compatible with redevelopment, expand existing buffers to enhance habitat for small mammals and migratory birds and increase the capacity of buffers to filter stormwater.* Now that the buffer locations are clear, the FOEM has indicated that redevelopment of Harbor Square would not be incompatible with the marsh.
- *Design the redevelopment to increase shoreline setbacks where possible to allow for expanded buffers.* The FOEM uses the generic term “buffer” to refer to the distance between the dike and wherever a structure is located.
- *Utilize setback areas between the ordinary high-water mark and buildings or parking for buffers that support wildlife habitat and promote infiltration of stormwater.* It appears that FOEM is suggesting that setbacks could be expanded and enhanced where possible when redevelopment occurs.

Board Member Ellis said his interpretation of FOEM’s letter is that they support redevelopment of Harbor Square under the proposed Urban Mixed Use III Environment, with the assumption that the Port will follow through on the items listed in the letter. Mr. McChesney explained that the Port’s Harbor Square Redevelopment Master Plan is fairly ambiguous at this point. They do not have a final site plan, and the master plan is intended to be a statement of intent and purpose. The Port will accommodate greater buffers where possible; and at the minimum, existing buffers would be enhanced by changing the vegetation and quality of habitat. He commented that they have tried to capture a mutual understanding between the Port and FOEM that the Port will do everything possible to come up with the best site plan to maximize buffers. However, they cannot specify what the buffers will be at this point because they do not know what the final site plan will look like.

Board Member Reed pointed out that the bulk and dimensional standards for the Urban Mixed Use III Environment are based on current zoning, but the Port's Harbor Square Redevelopment Plan anticipates a height greater than the existing 35-foot limit. He asked if the SMP would have to be amended at a later date to accommodate a development agreement or rezone that identifies greater height limits and/or lower setback requirements. He questioned if it would be easier to incorporate the anticipated changes now based on the Port's conceptual drawings. Mr. Lien agreed that the bulk and dimensional requirements are based on what the current zoning allows. As currently proposed, a reduction in the setback requirement would not be allowed. However, nothing would prohibit a developer from increasing the setback distance. He noted that the height issue would be discussed later in the meeting.

Board Member Cloutier said he supports the proposed 25-foot parking setback requirement for the Urban Mixed Use III Environment. Vice Chair Stewart said she would support a 25-foot minimum setback, but only if it is tied to a requirement that developers utilize LID techniques whenever possible. Mr. Lien pointed out that both City and State regulations are moving towards LID techniques, and the new Phase II National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit will require LID techniques where feasible. Vice Chair Stewart suggested the City's SMP should encourage LID techniques (i.e. pervious pavement, bioswales, rain gardens, etc.) wherever possible as a model for other jurisdictions to follow. Mr. McChesney advised that opportunities for LID are imbedded in conversations related to redevelopment of Harbor Square. The Port's intent is to achieve the highest possible quality in the design to benefit the environment, and stormwater is part of the equation.

Board Member Ellis said he also supports the proposed 25-foot setback requirement for parking in the Urban Mixed Use III Environment. He observed that all sides have cooperated in the Harbor Square Redevelopment Master Plan process. It appears that all parties have come to an agreement that this is the best they can do, considering all the criteria and the existing situation.

Vice Chair Stewart expressed concern about setting the parking and structure setbacks at 25 feet without the ability to incentivize with LID guarantees. Once again, she said she would like the City to establish more conservative setback requirements. She pointed out that a 75-foot setback would be required for the undeveloped portion of land that is adjacent to the wetland.

Mr. Lien clarified that, as currently proposed, the parking setback requirement would be 25 feet. The setback for commercial and residential structures would be 25 feet, with a 15-foot setback requirement for recreational structures. He said the City defines a structure as anything that is built permanently on the ground. Recreational structures would include boardwalks, bird watching platforms, etc. that allow the public to get closer to the marsh. Board Member Reed pointed out that there is already a boardwalk and bird watching platform near the marsh.

Board Member Tibbott said he would like the Urban Mixed Use Environment setback requirements to be consistent across the board, and then allow a developer to adjust the setback requirement through a development agreement or rezone. He said he supports Vice Chair Stewart's recommendation for conservative setback requirements, allowing for a setback to be reduced if LID techniques are utilized. On the other hand, he noted that the 25-foot setback requirement for the Urban Mixed Use III Environment appears to be supported by FOEM and is more than what currently exists in many cases. He said he sees no reason to make the setbacks more restrictive than what has been proposed. He emphasized that the Urban Mixed Use III Environment would be applied to urban areas where the habitat has already been impacted by the existing development. Vice Chair Stewart commented that doesn't mean the existing development cannot be replaced with something that is more compatible with the marsh.

Board Member Reed observed that the proposed language for the Urban Mixed Use I and II Environments is consistent with the existing SMP language, with the exception of additional footnotes. Mr. Lien agreed that the proposed standards came directly from the current SMP, but all the footnotes are new and are intended to provide clarification and reference.

Board Member Johnson referenced Footnote 16 (Page 56 of the draft SMP), which states that "the maximum height limit shall be determined by the underlying comprehensive planning document and zoning designation. Height limits greater than 35 feet shall be supported by view analysis and structures designed to minimize impacts on public view." Similar to Board Member Reed's earlier question, she asked if the City would have to amend the SMP in order to approve a development

APPROVED

agreement that called for height limits greater than 35 feet. Mr. Lien explained that the SMA and DOE Guidelines identify a 35-foot height limit for all shoreline jurisdictions, but greater heights can be allowed if supported by a view analysis to minimize impacts on public views.

Board Member Reed observed that the first sentence of Footnote 16 makes it clear that the zoning criteria would ultimately determine the height limit. A request for additional height through a rezone or development agreement would require a public process to amend the Comprehensive Plan and zoning code. No change to the SMP would be required, since the additional height would be consistent with the newly amended (current) Comprehensive Plan and zoning code. The exact number in Footnote 16 could be amended the next time the SMP is updated. Mr. Lien said the purpose of Footnote 16 is to avoid the need to update the SMP to accommodate a rezone or development agreement. He said the DOE is well aware of Footnote 16 and its intent.

Board Member Johnson pointed out that the results of the Port of Edmonds' View Shed Analysis would likely meet the requirement outlined in Footnote 16. Mr. Lien agreed but emphasized that, at the request of the Board, the footnote would apply to all environments, and not just the Urban Mixed Use III Environment. As currently proposed, all rezone and development agreement applications within the shoreline environment would come before the Board and City Council as amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and/or zoning regulations. However, a SMP update would not be required.

Vice Chair Stewart requested a definition for "shore setback." Mr. Lien said "shore setback" is defined as the minimum distance between a structure or use and the shoreline (ordinary high-water mark). Vice Chair Stewart suggested that staff review the draft SMP again to make sure the terms "buffer" and "setback" are used consistently throughout. Board Member Reed pointed out that the reference in Footnote 9 (Page 56 of the draft SMP) should be ECDC 24.60.080. In the table on Page 38 of the draft SMP, the term "wetland scares" should be "wetland scores."

Vice Chair Stewart summarized that it appears the majority of Board Members are comfortable with the proposed 25-foot setback requirement (parking and structure) for the Urban Mixed Use III Environment, particularly in light of FOEM's recent letter of support.

Board Member Johnson said she would like the Board to discuss the issue again at a future meeting. Board Member Ellis cautioned that if the Board wants to consider a setback greater than 25 feet, they must identify a reason for the change. Board Member Johnson said that ecological impacts on wildlife in the marsh would cause her to reconsider the setback requirement. Board Member Cloutier reminded the Board that setback requirements do not determine ecological impact. Ecological impact is determined by the buffer, which would not only be expanded but improved by the proposed Urban Mixed Use III Environment. Improving habitat would require an expansion of the buffers, which has nothing to do with setbacks. Board Member Johnson observed that the buffers cannot be expanded because of the existing built environment. The only thing that can change is the setback requirement. Board Member Cloutier cautioned against using setback as a defacto method of expanding buffers. While he supports improving wildlife habitat, increasing the setback requirement would not be the right approach.

Board Member Cloutier said it would be helpful for staff to provide a diagram to illustrate how far the existing buildings and parking areas are setback from the edge of the marsh. Board Member Johnson said additional feedback from FOEM would also be helpful. The Board agreed to continue their discussion regarding setbacks at a future meeting.

Mr. Lien reminded the Board that the standard for the SMP Update is "no net loss," and a restoration plan will be included as part of the SMP to accomplish this goal. The restoration plan includes several elements related to the marsh, and there may be opportunities to add additional language. Vice Chair Stewart commented that regardless of the definition of "buffer" and "setback," encroaching upon the marsh takes away potential habitat. Mr. Lien referred to the Cumulative Impacts Analysis, which indicates that the proposed SMP, as drafted, would result in "no net loss," which is the requirement of the SMA.

Aquaculture

Mr. Lien recalled the Planning Board discussed the option of prohibiting aquaculture at their first meeting on the SMP. Since that time, staff has learned that other jurisdictions have had their SMP's returned by the DOE for changes when they

prohibited aquaculture, which is considered a water-dependent use. Upon further discussions with the DOE, staff learned that the City may consider prohibiting certain aquaculture activities because of the amount of boat traffic that takes place off the Edmonds shoreline. However, he cautioned against prohibiting aquaculture altogether because the Willow Creek Fish Hatchery currently places rearing pens at the fishing pier every spring, and this is considered a form of aquaculture. He suggested the Board may wish to keep minimal regulations regarding aquaculture within the SMP to address this existing use.

Mr. McChesney said the Port has supported the Willow Creek Hatchery for a number of years by allowing them to place their net pens inside the marina next to the fishing pier. This activity is well-established, well-managed, low-impact and a necessary part of supporting the Willow Creek Hatchery.

Mr. Lien said the current SMP language allows large net pens. He explained that the Edmonds Shoreline is not conducive to aquaculture because of extensive boat traffic and its close proximity to the railroad tracks. He suggested that the restriction on aquaculture be tightened, but that the current hatchery use be allowed to continue.

Board Member Johnson said she would like to know more about aquaculture before making a final recommendation regarding the use. She recalled that in December, Governor Gregoire announced an initiative for aquaculture in an attempt to create jobs and to restore Puget Sound. In her announcement, Governor Gregoire recognized that aquaculture is a \$107 million industry, and she authorized a certain amount of money for the combined clean up of Puget Sound and the promotion of aquaculture. She asked if there are locations along the Edmonds shoreline where it might be possible to grow mussels, oysters, etc. Again, she said she does not know enough about the subject to make a determination at this time.

Mr. Lien pointed out that the shoreline located north of downtown Edmonds is within close proximity to the railroad tracks, and Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) would not likely allow access over the railroad tracks for aquaculture uses. Parks and the Port facility are located to the south where access to the shoreline is available. Locating net pens in the southern locations might not be viable because there is a significant amount of boat traffic. He agreed to contact the Department of Natural Resources for additional information about aquaculture, specifically as it relates to opportunities along the Edmonds shoreline.

Vice Chair Stewart stressed the importance of making sure aquaculture is well managed so that diseases are not passed on to existing natural species. Mr. Lien added that view issues must also be considered. He reminded the Board that members of the public have already expressed concern about the buoys that are used to identify the boundaries of the underwater dive park.

Board Member Reed asked if there is potential for aquaculture to occur along the shoreline north of the dive park. Mr. Lien once again reminded the Board that BNSF has tight restrictions for access across the railroad tracks. Board Member Johnson pointed out that some aquaculture activities are accessed from water rather than land, in which case the railroad tracks would not be an impediment.

Board Member Tibbott said he would like more information about where there are opportunities for aquaculture expansion throughout Puget Sound. Board Member Johnson said the Coalition to Protect Puget Sound Habitat has done an exhaustive study of where aquaculture could be located, and she is intrigued by the sustainable aspects of aquaculture that can be done safely. She agreed to forward this information to the Board and staff.

Miscellaneous Items

Mr. Lien briefly reviewed the other changes that were made to the SMP based on Board feedback as follows:

- The Willow Creek outlet was added to Section 24.30.050.C as one of the areas designated as Urban Conservancy.
- References were corrected in Section 24.30.070.B.1 to change “west of the railroad track” to “east of the railroad track” in the section discussing the differences of the Urban Mixed Use Environments.
- Section 24.40.040.B.11.b.1 was updated as per the Board’s recommendation on August 24, 2011.
- A requirement was added to Section 24.50.010.B.5 that all reports prepared in support of a shoreline project shall be developed using Best Available Science.

APPROVED

- A climate change/sea level rise policy was removed from Section 24.50.030.C.11 as per the Board's direction on August 24, 2011.
- Maximum coverage and impervious surface standards for recreational development were added to Section 24.40.090 consistent with Section 24.60.060.D. In addition, the maximum height for recreational development in the Aquatic I and II Environments was set at 15 feet, consistent with the Planning Board's recommendation on August 24, 2011.

Mr. Lien recalled that questions have been raised about what happens if the shoreline jurisdiction expands as a result of daylighting Willow Creek. He reminded the Board that RCW 90.58.580 allows local governments to grant relief from SMP development standards and use regulations within urban growth areas in certain circumstances. Applying this provision would not require the City to include any language in the SMP update.

Mr. Lien summarized that he would review the minutes from all Board discussions regarding the SMP Update to prepare a new draft for the Board to consider in a workshop discussion. He recalled that the Board previously indicated it would be appropriate to postpone their recommendation regarding the SMP Update until the Port of Edmonds has submitted their application for a Comprehensive Plan amendment, and the DOE has indicated their support for this schedule. However, the SMP must be adopted by the end of 2012. Board Member Cloutier asked that staff prepare a block diagram showing the buffers and setbacks for the Board's next discussions. Mr. Lien agreed that would be possible.

Board Member Reed asked if staff anticipates that the Port's Comprehensive Plan amendment proposal for Harbor Square would require additional changes to the SMP. Mr. McChesney reported that the Port recently distributed brochures outlining conceptual plans for Harbor Square to all residents of Edmonds and Woodway. In addition, they are currently undertaking a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) review, which is required before the Port Commission can formally adopt the Harbor Square Redevelopment Master Plan. They expect the public comment period for SEPA to be completed by the end of February, with final approval of the plan by the Port Commission in March. Once the plan is formally adopted by the Port Commission, the Port will make formal application to the City for a Comprehensive Plan amendment. The Port anticipates that this process will be completed by mid year.

Board Member Reed noted that the SEPA process could take significantly longer if an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is required. Mr. McChesney explained that the Port is proposing a programmatic, non-project action to amend the Port's existing Master Plan, which does not require an EIS. The Port will complete a SEPA checklist that will include some amount of detail beyond what was included in the public brochure to address issues such as traffic, existing soil conditions, etc. Ultimately, the final SEPA outcome is expected to be either a Determination of Non-Significance (DNS) or a Mitigated Determination of Non-Significance (MDNS). He summarized that Port staff has been working closely with the City's Planning Department staff to make sure the SEPA process passes the test of adequacy, and they do not believe an EIS will be required. Board Member Tibbott asked if the SEPA review would include Port property all the way to SR-104. Mr. McChesney answered that it would include the entire property being contemplated for redevelopment by the Port. Board Member Tibbott asked if the SEPA review would include a floodwater element, and Mr. McChesney indicated he could not answer that question at this time.

Board Member Johnson pointed out that because the footnotes contained in the draft SMP adequately address potential future changes in zoning, she is not sure why the two processes (Harbor Square Redevelopment Master Plan and SMP Update) need to take place simultaneously. She questioned the benefit of postponing the SMP update process. Mr. Lien recalled that the Board previously indicated concern about moving forward with a recommendation on the SMP Update before they have a clear understanding of what the Port is planning for Harbor Square. However, he agreed that Footnote 16 would allow changes in zoning through a development agreement or rezone application without amending the SMP, which would require approval from the DOE. Mr. Lien said he does not anticipate any changes to the SMP as a result of the Port's application for a Comprehensive Plan amendment. Potential zoning changes would be addressed later as part of a development agreement or rezone application.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Vice Chair Stewart reported on her attendance at the Strategic Plan Stakeholders Meeting on January 24th where a report was provided on trends collected from the consultant's external scan and from the 419 people who have responded to the survey

APPROVED

thus far. She said she was struck by the amount of leakage the City experiences because citizens go outside of the City to spend their money. She encouraged the Board Members to attend future stakeholder meetings and provide input.

Vice Chair Stewart briefly reviewed the schedule for upcoming Strategic Plan Focus Group Meetings and indicated that she and Commissioners Cloutier and Tibbott would attend the Economic Development meeting. Board Members Johnson and Tibbott would attend the transportation meeting. Both of the meetings are scheduled for February 1st. Board Member Johnson pointed out that Board Members are invited to attend all of the focus group meetings, but they each can only participate in one. Board Member Reed suggested that, as the Parks Board, at least one member should also attend the park meeting on January 31st. Vice Chair Stewart agreed to ask Board Member Clarke to attend on behalf of the Board. She said she would try to attend the meeting if Board Member Clarke is unable to do so.

Board Member Johnson summarized her belief that the focus group process offers a tremendous opportunity to interview many people, and she encouraged the Board Members to participate as much as possible. It was noted that a Strategic Planning and Visioning Retreat has been scheduled for February 28 from 6:30 to 8:30 p.m.

Vice Chair Stewart announced that the City Council Retreat is scheduled for February 2nd and 3rd, and Mike Bailey, Finance Director, City of Redmond, will provide a presentation titled, "Budgeting for Outcomes" on Thursday (February 2nd) at 11:30 a.m. She briefly reviewed the Board's extended agenda, particularly the retreat that is scheduled for February 22nd. She said she and Chair Lovell met with Mr. Chave to identify other potential 2012 agenda items as follows:

1. Shoreline Master Program Update
2. Rewrite of the Development Code
3. Neighborhood Center Plans and Zoning Implementation
4. Further Implementation of Highway 99 Plan
5. Quarter Report and Code Amendments Dealing with Wireless Facilities
6. Report on Critical Areas Ordinance Implementation
7. Update to the Economic Development Plan
8. Comprehensive Plan Policy regarding Land Use and Urban Design
9. Port of Edmonds Master Plan
10. Title 16 (Zoning Classifications) and Title 17 (Zoning Standards)

Board Member Johnson suggested that Item 8 should be expanded to include transportation design. It is important to consider transportation when reviewing urban design and land use issues.

Vice Chair Stewart said she would also like the Board to review the current accessory dwelling unit (ADU) regulations. She noted that other municipalities have revised their ADU codes to allow additional opportunities to construct a second structure on a single-family residential property. These amendments are intended to address the changing housing needs, particularly as the population ages.

Vice Chair Stewart noted that the following items recur each year:

1. Annual Adult Entertainment Report
2. Election of Officers
3. Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Quarterly Report
4. Wireless Facilities Report

The Board discussed potential agenda items for the Planning Board Retreat that is scheduled February 22nd at 6:30 p.m. in the Brackett Room of City Hall. Vice Chair Stewart advised that she and Chair Lovell met with Mr. Chave to identify the following potential topics for the retreat:

1. Discussion of Priorities for 2012
2. Presentation and Education on Form-Based Codes
3. Technology Improvements (providing additional Planning Board information as a link on the City's website)

APPROVED

4. Budget Sustainability and Service Delivery
5. Comprehensive Plan Update
6. Buildable Lands
7. Affordable Housing
8. Edmonds Crossing
9. Transit-Oriented Development on Highway 99
10. Parking Standards
11. Subdivision and Multi-Family Zones
12. Trends in Other Municipalities and Where the city Should be Going
13. Department Organization
14. Update on Green Team's Efforts
15. Mayor's Climate Protection Committee Update
16. City Energy Plan
17. Building and Engineering Standards
18. Administrative Initiatives
19. 2012 Comprehensive Plan Amendments

Board Member Reed agreed that all of the items on the list are important. However, he questioned the Board's ability to get through all of them at an evening retreat. He recalled that, in the past, the retreat discussions have focused on two or three items. The retreat offers an opportunity for the Board to be educated on topics such as form-based zoning, how to make Edmonds more affordable, etc. Perhaps it would be appropriate to invite someone from another jurisdiction to share their expertise with the Board.

Vice Chair Stewart suggested the Board invite David Hymel, Stewardship Partners, to provide information on his success in helping waterfront municipalities obtain funding for stormwater improvements. Perhaps this presentation could be made at a regular Board meeting so that Engineering staff could participate, as well. She said she would also like to provide a brief presentation to the Board regarding sustainable design.

Board Member Reed recalled that the Board has struggled in recent years when making a recommendation regarding the Capital Improvement Plan because there has not been enough money to fund all the projects identified. He suggested that staff lead a discussion with the Board about how they can create a Capital Improvement Plan that identifies projects that can actually be accomplished with available funding. It is important for the Board to have a better understanding of this issue so they can explain it to the public and perhaps find a way to accomplish the identified projects.

Board Member Johnson said she looks forward to the annual retreat as an opportunity to talk informally, get to know each other better, and find out more about each person's areas of interest. This exercise can improve the Board as a whole. She suggested that updated Planning Board rules would be a good place to start this discussion. She expressed her belief that many of the other topics identified on the list could be discussed during regular meetings. It is appropriate to discuss subjects of general interest in open public meetings so that staff can be invited to participate and official minutes can be taken. Discussions that are intended to give a better understanding to the Board are appropriate retreat topics.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Vice Chair Stewart did not provide any comments during this portion of the meeting.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no additional comments from Board Members.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 9:25 p.m.

APPROVED