

Approved February 27th

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

February 13, 2013

Chair Reed 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

John Reed, Chair
Valerie Stewart, Vice Chair
Bill Ellis
Philip Lovell
Neil Tibbott

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Development Services Director
Karin Noyes, Recorder

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Kevin Clarke (excused)
Todd Cloutier (excused)
Ian Duncan (excused)

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

VICE CHAIR STEWART MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 23, 2013 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER TIBBOTT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

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

PUBLIC HEARING ON DRAFT PROPOSAL TO AMEND THE EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE (CDC) TO APPLY DESIGN STANDARDS TO THE BD2, BD3 AND BD4 ZONES TO REPLACE THE REQUIREMENT FOR BUILDING STEPBACKS. THE PROPOSAL ALSO INCLUDES A PROVISION EXEMPTING SMALL DECORATIVE “BLADE SIGNS” FROM SIGN CODE AREA CALCULATION LIMITATIONS

Mr. Chave reviewed that in 2011 the Planning Board recommended that the City Council remove the setback requirement from the Downtown Business (BD) zones as part its recommendation on a package of BD zoning amendments. The City Council reviewed the amendments and conducted a public hearing. They indicated an inclination to support the recommendation to eliminate the setback requirement but wanted to make sure adequate design standards were in place before doing so. They asked the Planning Board to recommend design standards for the BD zones. On January 9, 2013, the Planning Board and members of the Architectural Design Board reviewed the existing design standards for the BD1 zone

(retail core), which do not require setbacks. They determined that, with the exception of the BD5 zone, it would make sense to apply the same standards to the other BD zoning districts so that the setback requirement could be eliminated. He pointed out that no buildings in the BD zones have setbacks at this time, which suggests that good design has less to do with setbacks and more to do with architectural features.

Mr. Chave referred the Board to the draft amendment language for Chapter 16.43 (zoning provisions) and Chapter 22.43 (design standards), which was included in the Staff Report as Attachment 1. He advised that the amendment proposes to apply the design standards adopted for the BD1 zone to development in the BD2, BD3 and BD4 zones, with the incorporation of some minor improvements to the design standard language. He explained that Chapter 22.43 addresses a number of things, including massing, articulation, orientation to the street, façade details, pedestrian-friendly features and appropriate signage. It also addresses avoiding blank walls and windows, which are very important on retail streets to ensure the streetscape is attractive. There is also language regarding screening for mechanical equipment.

Mr. Chave said staff recommends the Planning Board forward a recommendation to the City Council to apply the existing BD1 Design Standards to the BD2, BD3, and BD4 zones, as well. He explained that the proposed amendment would not apply to the BD5 zone (4th Avenue Arts Corridor) where the setback requirement is consistent with the overall character of the street. Because development along 4th Avenue is intended to be smaller in scale, he suggested that further investigation is needed before establishing design standards for the BD5 zone. He reminded the Board that the City recently conducted a study of the corridor, which suggests that design standards for development closer to Main Street could be somewhat different than the design standards for properties further north on 4th Avenue where development is smaller and spaced further apart. He expressed his belief that the proposed amendment to apply the BD1 Design Standards to the BD2, BD3 and BD4 zones could go forward with the understanding that the Board would want to take another look at the BD5 zone at some point in the future based on the new information contained in the 4th Avenue Study. He reminded the Board that property owners on 4th Avenue were heavily involved in the Arts Corridor planning process, and they will likely have a strong interest in making sure the zoning follows through with what the plan says.

Chair Reed recalled that a very specific preliminary design plan for the 4th Avenue Arts Corridor was presented to the Planning Board over a year ago. He asked if this plan would be resurrected at some point in the future to address specific zoning issues related to 4th Avenue. Mr. Chave answered affirmatively and advised that the zoning should closely represent the plan.

Mr. Chave advised that due to a website glitch, the Staff Report and attachments were not posted on the City's website until late on Monday (February 11th). Therefore, the Board has agreed to continue the public hearing to February 27th to make sure all interested members of the public have had an opportunity to review and comment on the proposal.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS OPENED. AS NO ONE IN THE AUDIENCE INDICATED A DESIRE TO PARTICIPATE, THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE MEETING WAS CLOSED.

Board Member Lovell pointed out that the BD1 zone requires a ground floor height of 15 feet, and the ground floor height requirement in the other BD zones is only 12 feet. He referred to Figure 16.43-1, which illustrates how ground floor height would be measured. He noted that the figure identifies a 15-foot height requirement, which could lead to some confusion. He suggested the drawing could be relabeled to make the different ground floor height requirements clear. For example, the illustration could simply refer to Figure 16.43-2, which identifies the minimum ground floor height requirement for each of the BD zones. Board Member Ellis clarified that Figure 16.43-1 is intended to provide an example of how ground floor height would be measured, and it just happens to use the 15-foot height required in the BD1 zone. The Board agreed it would be appropriate for staff to add clarifying language in either Figure 16.43-1 (Page 6) or Footnote 4 under Table 16.43-2 (Page 4).

Board Member Lovell referred to Subsection 16.43.030(C)(2)(b) (Page 11) and asked if the term "setback" refers to the total building setback. Mr. Chave answered affirmatively. Chair Reed agreed that this language is confusing and could be further clarified.

APPROVED

Board Member Lovell pointed out that Subsection 16.43.030(C)(3) (Page 11) refers to a list in ECDC 21.40.030. Mr. Chave explained that this list is found in the definition for height, which is located elsewhere in the code. The list includes such things as stand pipes, elevator shafts, etc. He noted that no changes have been proposed to this section of the code.

Board Member Lovell pointed out that the title on the cover page of Chapter 22.43 needs to be updated to “Design Standards for the BD Zones.” Mr. Chave agreed. Board Member Lovell referred to Subsection 22.43.060(B)(1), which lists a number of architectural treatments that could be used on walls or portions of walls that abut streets or are visible from residential areas. He specifically referred to Item J (Green Walls) and the question raised by staff about whether the term “green walls” would include living walls in which the plants are rooted in a structural support fastened to the wall, green facades with climbing plants rooted in the ground, or both. Board Member Lovell pointed out that walls facing the street are supposed to be 75% glass on the ground floor. Mr. Chave explained that Subsection 22.43.060(B)(1) is intended to address blank walls on facades that abut streets or public ways or are visible from residential properties. No treatment would be required for facades that are not visible to the public. He suggested the language could be clarified by eliminating the words “street-facing.”

Board Member Ellis noted that the term “green walls” has also been used in other City documents, and it would be helpful to add a definition to clarify what a “green wall” is. Vice Chair Stewart suggested the Board consider incorporating the following definition: *“Living walls or green walls are self-sufficient, vertical gardens that are attached to the exterior or interior of a building. They differ from green facades (e.g. ivy walls) in that the plants root in a structural support, which is fastened to the wall itself. The plants receive water and nutrients from within the vertical support instead of from the ground.”* In answer to staff’s question regarding Item J, Vice Chair Stewart pointed out that “living walls” is another name for “green walls.” She recommended, and the Board concurred, that both “green walls” and “green facades” should be used in Item J.

Board Member Ellis questioned if the proposed new language in Subsection 16.43.060(C)(2)(b) (Page 11) is necessary. Mr. Chave explained that this subsection would only apply to the BD5 zone, as stepbacks would no longer be required in the other BD zones. He agreed to consider the impacts of eliminating this language and report back to the Board. Board Member Ellis pointed out that if Subsection 16.43.060(C)(2)(b) is eliminated, Subsection 16.43.060(F)(1)(a) (Page 12) should either be eliminated or cross referenced to the correct subsection that deals specifically with stepbacks in the BD5 zone.

Chair Reed referred to Table 16.43-2 (Page 4), which proposes a maximum height limit of 30 feet in the BD1, BD2, BD3 and BD4 zones. He recalled that the Board previously agreed that if the stepback requirement is eliminated, the provision for an additional five feet in height for development that meets the requirements enumerated in ECDC 16.43.030(B) would be irrelevant. Therefore, the maximum height limit for the BD1, BD2, BD3 and BD4 zones should be set at 30 feet, and the design standards should apply to all development in these zones, regardless of height. He asked if changing the maximum height to 30 feet would create a conflict with other sections of the Code. Mr. Chave answered that he does not anticipate any conflicts. The provisions for an additional five feet in height would still be applicable to the BD5 zone.

Board Member Lovell said he recently had an opportunity to review the background materials related to the proposed amendments. He reminded the Board that they spent a considerable amount of time and effort during the second quarter of 2011 reviewing the proposed change and forwarding a recommendation to the City Council. He expressed frustration that the issue still has not been resolved nearly two years later. Based on statements made by various City Council members at previous meetings, he said he is hesitant to endorse a further recommendation at this time. He said it is his impression that the City Council is in no hurry to change any provisions regarding zoning in downtown Edmonds. He specifically noted:

- On August 21, 2012 some Council members indicated a desire to defer a decision on the proposed amendments until the matter of development agreements could be concurrently addressed. It was stated that elimination of the stepback requirement for buildings 30 feet high, regardless of roof configuration, would essentially allow 30-foot high “boxy buildings” to be constructed in the downtown.
- On October 2, 2012, the City Council generally agreed that the design criteria should be similar throughout all of the BD zones. They emphasized that it was not the intent to increase allowable building heights, but only to eliminate the stepback requirement. However, some City Council Members suggested that the discussion about stepbacks and design

standards should be deferred until the matter of development agreements has been discussed and determined. Some City Council Members expressed a concern that eliminating the setback provisions would merely comprise a shortcut towards building 30-foot tall “boxes” in the downtown. While some members of the Council expressed their belief that “boxy buildings” should not be built in the downtown, an actual review of current building stock within the downtown zones confirms the fact that a large quantity of “boxy” buildings already exist. Some of them are even considered “historic.”

- On October 16, 2012, some City Council Members further expressed their desire that the matter of development agreements be undertaken before dealing with BD zone design standards. However, to his knowledge, the City Council has yet to determine the matter of development agreements.

Board Member Lovell questioned if the Planning Board should make a recommendation to the City Council regarding design standards for the BD2, BD3 and BD4 zones. He questioned the Council’s desire to resolve the issue at this time. If the Board recommends that the BD1 Design Standards be applied to the BD2, BD3 and BD4 zones and the City Council rejects the recommendation, would that decision imply that they no longer support the BD1 Design Standards? He noted that no public comment was received during the hearing, and he is hesitant for the Board to go through the extra work of forwarding a recommendation to the City Council when he believes the recommendation the Board put forth in 2011 is perfectly adequate.

Chair Reed reminded the Board that the City Council did take action on some of the elements contained in the Board’s 2011 recommendation. In addition, they generally agreed to eliminate the setback requirement, but they wanted to have adequate design standards in place before adopting the change. The Board has discussed that the BD1 Design Standards, with some minor modifications, would provide adequate and enforceable standards if applied to the BD2, BD3 and BD4 zones. While he understands Board Member Lovell’s frustration, he felt it would be appropriate for the Board to continue the hearing to February 27th, and then formulate a recommendation to the City Council.

Mr. Chave reported that the City Council has met with the City Attorney to discuss development agreements and incentive zoning. He also reminded the Board that the majority of City Council Members appear to support the proposal to eliminate the setback requirement, but they are hesitant to do so absent strong design standards in the code. He agreed with Chair Reed that it would be appropriate for the Board to respond to the City Council’s direction by forwarding a recommendation for their consideration. He clarified that the City Council’s decisions regarding the setback requirement would not be predicated on their future discussions about development agreements and incentive zoning. Therefore, the Planning Board’s recommendation regarding design standards for the BD zones could be presented to the City Council in March.

A MEMBER OF THE AUDIENCE REQUESTED AN OPPORTUNITY TO ADDRESS THE BOARD, AND THE BOARD AGREED THAT WOULD BE APPROPRIATE.

Doug Spee said he owns property in the BD2 zone, and he has been following the setback and design standard issue closely. He said he supports the City Council’s desire for adequate design standards before eliminating the setback requirement, and the proposed amendment is fair and easy to understand. He commented that the City Council appears to be terrified of approving any change that is complicated, and they use their fear and paranoia to delay decisions. While he finds this inexcusable, the fact is that any proposal that comes before the City Council must be simple and easy to understand. He expressed his belief that the current proposal meets this requirement and does not include anything new or complicated.

Mr. Spee voiced frustration that the City Council does not have confidence in the City staff’s ability to interact with developers to address issues and come up with good design. They also do not acknowledge the capabilities of the Architectural Design Board. The architectural design review process is grueling and a major component of approval. He encouraged the Board to stay positive. The proposed amendments are fair, easy to follow, and needed right now.

Mr. Spee commented that the Designated Street Front Map that was recently incorporated into the ECDC is fabulous and helps both staff and developers understand exactly what is required. However, he is disappointed that the City Council still has not taken action on the Planning Board’s recommendation related to development agreements, which was forwarded to them more than 18 months ago. He felt the City Council tabled the issue too easily. He summarized that the setback issue

is critical for anyone wanting to try new design. He encouraged the Board to continue to move forward with a recommendation to the City Council.

Regarding the Board's earlier discussion about Subsection 20.43.060, Mr. Chave suggested that if the transparency (window) requirement is specifically tied to the street level on the designated street front, which is where transparency really matters, it would be clear that the language in this subsection would apply to the portions of the street front façade that are not part of the pedestrian designated street front. The Board concurred.

Once again, Chair Reed advised that the public hearing would be continued to February 27th.

DISCUSSION ON WESTGATE PLAN AND FORM-BASED CODE

Mr. Chave referred the Board to the document titled, "Revising Westgate: A District Plan and Form-Based Code" dated August 29, 2012. He advised that the plan has not changed in recent months. While staff believes the form-based code approach is appropriate to apply to zoning in both Westgate and Five Corners, it is also important to address the differences between the two locations. For example, the Five Corners plan could focus more on external orientation, and the Westgate plan could be more internally oriented. He explained that while there is some pedestrian activity on SR-104, 9th Avenue and 100th Avenue, there is more opportunity for walking within the quadrants rather than between the quadrants. This is particularly true when crossing SR-104. Going forward, staff believes it would make sense to reconfigure the Westgate material to place more emphasis on internal circulation elements. While maintain a connection between the sidewalk and the building is important, locating buildings against the sidewalk may not be as important. Connections within the quadrants will be more important than connections between the quadrants.

Although different in scale, Mr. Chave referred to University Village as a good example of the concept staff is proposing. There are different activity areas within the large development. It is easy to walk between buildings in each of the activity areas because there are good internal connections. While there is also access to the wide and busy streets, the external access is less important. The strong internal connections provide an opportunity for pedestrian-friendly access for people to walk within the activity areas. He suggested this same concept would make sense for Westgate where orientation towards the perimeter of the development is important, but less important than strong internal connections.

Mr. Chave recalled that the University of Washington team had some concern about using the same approach for both Five Corners and Westgate. They did their best to provide good ideas that can apply to both areas such as incentives tied to height, Green Factor elements, and guidelines related to building design, building orientation, frontage improvements, etc. However, the plan calls for buildings to be located at the street front. Staff is recommending that setbacks of up to ten feet be allowed in the Westgate area to take into account the speed and quantity of traffic on the roadways. He reminded the Board that the larger setbacks identified in the current code result in planting strips along the sidewalk with an expanse of asphalt between the building and sidewalk to accommodate parking. Retailers and developers typically want buildings to be more visible from the streets rather than set back behind parking lots. When buildings are set too far back, larger signs are necessary in order make the business visible for people passing by on the street.

Chair Reed asked if staff's recommendation is to address the four quadrants differently to emphasize certain elements that are different. Mr. Chave answered affirmatively. He pointed out that building type options are different, depending on the quadrant. In addition, the maximum height limit should vary, depending on the topography of the area. He also noted that while there is significantly more developable land in the northwest and northeast quadrants, there is significantly less depth in the southwest quadrant, and space in the southeast quadrant is severely limited. Internal orientation will be less important in the southeast quadrant, but it will be critical in the northeast and northwest quadrants.

Mr. Chave invited the Board Members to provide feedback and direction for staff to begin to prepare a more detailed plan for the Board's consideration. He reminded the Board that the hallmark of the proposed plan and form-based code is to provide both predictability and flexibility. While the plan includes a lot of detail, it also provides a lot of options. This is important so that development does not all look the same. If the Board agrees with the direction proposed by staff, the language and diagrams could be modified accordingly.

APPROVED

Board Member Tibbott said he likes staff's recommendation that the plan should focus on internal connections. However, it will also be important to provide some safe pedestrian connections between the quadrants, particularly between the northeast and northwest quadrants. Mr. Chave agreed that connections between the quadrants is also important, particularly connections at locations other than the busy intersections. He recalled that the University of Washington team provided some cross sections to identify potential alternatives for external connections. The Engineering Department has recommended that while it is important to take these ideas under advisement, they should not be adopted as part of the plan at this point. A more detailed traffic analysis will be needed to make this decision. Board Member Tibbott asked if an SR-104 study would be required to identify potential pedestrian connections. Mr. Chave explained that if the City goes in the direction of a more internally-oriented plan, what happens in the right-of-ways will not be central to what happens in the quadrants. The plan and form-based code could move forward, as its relationship to the right-of-way would not be as critical.

Vice Chair Stewart agreed with staff's recommended approach of focusing on internal circulation for Westgate. She also likes the diversity of housing proposed in the plan, particularly the inclusion of affordable housing. She agreed that internal circulation is important, particularly in the northern quadrants. She said she also likes the Green Factors score sheet. She agreed that the built-to lines need to be greater, particularly on SR-104. While bikes are not recommended on SR-104, she felt that bike lanes could be accommodated on 100th Avenue. She suggested the Board discuss option of providing space for a bike lane on the west side of 100th Avenue. However, the bike lane must be located safely so that people parking on the street do not clip bicyclists when opening their car doors. She expressed her belief that a traffic study for SR-104 will be extremely important at some point in time given that 10,000 cars use the roadway each day and the rate of speed is high. Mr. Chave explained that as development occurs over time, turning movements and other safety issues will be addressed on a case-by-case basis. He recalled that the recent transportation analysis indicated that the capacity on SR-104 would not be a problem.

Board Member Ellis referred to Figure 7.5-3 (Page 58), which is supposed to identify opportunities for cycling improvements in the Westgate area. He noted that the illustration actually depicts the Five Corners area, instead. Mr. Chave agreed to make this correction.

Board Member Ellis pointed out that the proposed form-based code approach would be much different than the current zoning code. He asked if staff believes a form-based code would be useful and enforceable. Mr. Chave answered affirmatively and noted that some of the ideas embodied in the plan make it more user friendly than the current code language. However, certain elements of the existing code will need to be integrated into the new form-based code. For example, the allowed uses will need to be clarified. In addition, the proposed weighting of the various Green Factors will need to be adjusted to reflect what the City wants the end result to be. Staff is currently reviewing the language to determine the appropriate weight to give each of the items. He reminded the Board that the current code contains a parking standard that is based on use. This approach can be problematic as uses change, and it can result in excess parking because it is predicated on worst case scenario. Tying the parking standard to uses does not recognize that parking demands can be different, even for similar uses. Businesses know how much parking they need, and they will not likely locate on a site with insufficient parking space. Parking tends to be self-regulated.

Board Member Ellis said that in reading through the Westgate Plan, it seems to be predicated on having certain types of uses in certain areas. He questioned if this approach would be flexible enough to address all four quadrants, which might have different requirements. Mr. Chave said it will be important to pay close attention to the section regarding building types and the maps that identify where each building type can be located. This is a critical piece that sets up a lot of the flexibility.

Chair Reed said he has struggled with the issue of how form-based codes would be applied. He recalled that presentations were made where it was suggested that a hybrid form-based code would be a good option. He expressed his belief that a hybrid form-based code approach for the Westgate area would be appropriate. Mr. Chave pointed out that the Westgate area is zoned primarily Neighborhood Business (BN) at this time, and a setback for each lot is required. A form-based code would give a general development area, but the types of development and how the buildings are fit on the site would be more flexible. He summarized that form-based codes are intended to provide flexibility where appropriate, while giving sufficient guidance to result in the type of development the City wants. Important elements include building design, connection requirements, and the relationship of the building to the street. Form-based codes do not worry so much about setbacks between lots, etc. They look at the overall development pattern rather than lot-by-lot development.

Board Member Lovell asked if the University of Washington team would be involved in the future. Mr. Chave answered that they may be asked to make an additional presentation, but they would not participate in drafting the code language. The document is now a City document that can be modified. Board Member Lovell asked how staff perceives the project will move forward. Mr. Chave said that staff will sort through the document and identify the elements that will be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan and the elements that would end up in the zoning code.

Board Member Lovell said he supports the staff's recommendation to emphasize the quadrants and internal circulation. However, he also supports the idea of providing a pedestrian crossing between the northeast and northwest quadrants at some point in the future. Mr. Chave said the Engineering Department's take on the issue is that while turning lanes are needed closer to the intersection, there may be opportunities for connections to occur further away.

Board Member Lovell pointed out that the form-based code language will be much different than the existing code. The public has provided a lot of input, and there will be more opportunities for public comments. However, he is concerned that people will oppose the document because it represents a change. He agreed with Chair Reed that the best approach would be a hybrid code that includes both traditional codes and form-based codes. It should be emphasized that the hybrid form-based code would be applicable only to the Westgate area.

Board Member Lovell noted that the extended agenda includes a review of the Edmonds Way BC-EW and RM-EW zoning classifications, which was referred to the Board by the City Council. He asked how this issue would relate to the Board's work on the Westgate Plan and form-based zoning. Mr. Chave said this issue came about from concerns raised about the Compass development that occurred on SR-104. The City has received both positive and negative comments regarding the development, and some City Council Members have expressed concern about whether the zoning is appropriate. Questions have been raised about whether they want to allow similar development elsewhere in these two zones. He noted that staff would present the item to the Board for initial discussion on February 27th. However, he emphasized that this is a separate issue from the Westgate Plan. Mr. Chave said the Board would also have an initial discussion about the time frame for short plats on February 27th. He explained that State law recently changed to allow short plats more time before they expire. Some cities have made the change, and the City Council would like the Board to consider the option and forward a recommendation to them.

Board Member Ellis said he is baffled by some of the descriptions for landscaping and amenities. Vice Chair Stewart pointed out that turning in and out of the PCC Market is already a dangerous situation. Mr. Chave agreed that the current configuration is less than ideal.

Chair Reed suggested that perhaps it would be appropriate to form a subcommittee of Board Members to assist staff in rewriting the Westgate Plan and form-based code based on the Board's discussion with staff. Vice Chair Stewart indicated she would like an opportunity to review the document further, based on the new direction recommended by staff, and then submit her written comments to staff. Mr. Chave invited all the Board Members to submit their additional comments and questions to staff. This will help narrow the focus as they put the document into a format that makes sense and is not so different from the existing code. He said he envisions that the Westgate area would have its own zoning designation, as well as a separate chapter in the zoning code that integrates some form-based zoning concepts but retains some of the standard zoning look and feel.

Chair Reed reminded the Board that the Westgate Plan was initiated by the Economic Development Commission (EDC), who solicited help from the University of Washington team. The document has been in the Board's hands since early 2012. He questioned if it would be appropriate to have additional interaction with the EDC at some point. It might also be appropriate to have a work session with the City Council to discuss the change in approach recommended by staff. Mr. Chave agreed it may be helpful to have a work session with the EDC. However, he is hesitant to recommend a work session with the City Council at this point. Instead, the Board could report the change in direction as part of their periodical reports to the City Council. Chair Reed expressed concern that, oftentimes, the City Council remands items back to the Board for further consideration because the Board's recommendations are not what they anticipated. They should consider opportunities to soften this interaction.

Chair Reed observed that Westgate is a traffic-intensive area, and the Comprehensive Plan for the Edmonds Way Corridor talks a lot about traffic volumes. He questioned if it would be appropriate to consider options that would allow for expansion

of the SR-104 right-of-way. Mr. Chave pointed out that expanding SR-104 would cost a substantial amount of money. In addition, the City must keep in mind that this is a well-used corridor, and it may not be desirable to encourage a wider roadway that provides opportunities for even more traffic.

Chair Reed referred to Figure 3.1-2 (Page 16), which is an illustrative site plan showing an example development with building heights and uses. While he recognized that the Westgate Plan was built around this illustration, he questioned if including the document in the plan would limit flexibility. Vice Chair Stewart said the illustration helps show what could be at Westgate, and it particularly depicts the diverse set of housing types. Mr. Chave said that as the Board considers changes to make the plan more internally oriented, they will have to decide if the illustration reflects the changes they make. If not, it could be eliminated. The illustration will only be helpful to the extent it reflects the vision for Westgate. Board Members Lovell and Ellis expressed concern that including the illustration may provoke negative reactions from citizens who do not read the entire document. For example, they may interpret the illustration to mean that the QFC would eventually be eliminated.

Chair Reed advised that the Westgate Plan and form-based code will come before the Board again on March 27th. Mr. Chave said this would give staff time to make appropriate changes based on the Board's discussion. Again, he invited them to email their additional comments to him.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Chair Reed reviewed that the Board's February 27th agenda would include a continued hearing on the BD zone amendments, an introduction of the Edmonds Way BC-EW amendments, and a discussion about the time requirements for short plats. The Board's retreat is scheduled for March 13th at 6:00 p.m.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Reed reported that on February 4th, he met with Mr. Chave, Mr. Clifton and Commissioners Pierce and Witenberg of the EDC. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss common issues that both the EDC and the Planning Board are working on such as the BD1 zones, Five Corners, Westgate, and implementation of the Strategic Plan. They discussed the need to coordinate the efforts of both groups so they do not work at cross purposes and double up on efforts. Board Member Clarke, the Board's liaison to the EDC, and Commissioners Pierce and Witenberg, the EDC's liaisons to the Board, have been asked to keep apprised of the work that is taking place and report back to their respective groups.

Chair Reed said he also met with Mr. Chave to discuss potential agenda topics for the Board's upcoming retreat. Topics include:

- Edmonds Community Development Code reorganization
- Updates to Vision 2040 and the Growth Management Act and how they fit in with what the City is doing.
- Isolating the Strategic Plan items assigned to Development Services and Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Departments to determine which ones will fall into the Board's hands for additional work.
- Budget changes and how they will impact the Planning Board's work schedule.
- Development agreements and incentive plans.

Chair Reed invited Board Members to share their additional thoughts about potential agenda items. The Board discussed that there might not be sufficient time to address all five items. Mr. Chave agreed, particularly since the discussion regarding development agreements and incentive plans could be lengthy. However, he noted the budget discussion would likely be short. Chair Reed said he envisions the Board will spend 30 minutes on each of the first three items, and the remaining items will be discussed as time allows.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Lovell asked what role the Strategic Plan Subcommittee, of which Board Members Ellis and Clarke are members, would have as the plan is moved forward to the City Council. Board Member Ellis answered that, in his mind, the subcommittee has completed its work. Its purpose was to provide feedback to the consultants regarding the City's position

APPROVED

and how the issues are framed. This has been done and incorporated into the draft plan that the consultant presented to the Board and EDC on January 23rd. Chair Reed recalled that at the end of the January 23rd meeting, there was some discussion about rewriting the introduction to the plan based on comments from the Board, Commission and staff. Mr. Clifton agreed to take on that task. It was suggested that it might be appropriate for the subcommittee to meet one more time to review the final draft before it is forwarded to the City Council. Board Member Ellis said the subcommittee was intended to be a sounding board to affirm staff's input to the consultant and resolve the differences between the two. The subcommittee did not make any substantive changes to the items that appeared in the original plan or the relative rank of the items, but they made sure it was organized in a way that was easy to understand.

Vice Chair Stewart reported that there are currently three legislative items related to stormwater management. She encouraged the Board Members to submit comments regarding the proposals and noted that a lobby day is scheduled for February 19th. She reviewed the three items as follows:

- House Bill HB 1235 would prioritize state investments in stormwater control.
- House Bill HB1237 is regarding the creation of a stormwater compliance pilot project to evaluate the net environmental effects of alternative approaches to stormwater management.
- Senate Bill SB 5326 would delay the implementation of stormwater requirements.

Vice Chair Stewart reminded the Board of their previous discussions about having a representative from the Planning Board attend City Council Meetings when Planning Board recommendations are scheduled on the agenda. This could help move items forward more efficiently in the future. Mr. Chave advised that no Planning Board items are scheduled on the Council's February 19th agenda.

Vice Chair Stewart reported that she and Board Member Duncan received a request from the Architectural Design Board to make their presentation regarding Sustainable Development. It has been suggested that they present to the City Council, as well, preferably before the City Council takes up their discussion regarding the Harbor Square Master Plan again. This may help broaden the City Council's thinking as they consider projects that come before them in the future. She acknowledged the suggestion that the presentation should provide case studies that are more relevant, as well as a cost benefit analysis. Mr. Chave suggested that the presentation before the City Council would need to be condensed. He advised that Vice Chair Stewart should contact Council President Petso to schedule the presentation on the Council's agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 9:02 p.m.

APPROVED