

**APPROVED AUGUST 14<sup>TH</sup>**

**CITY OF EDMONDS  
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

**July 10, 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 – 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

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

**STAFF PRESENT**

Rob Chave, Development Services Director  
Mike Clugston, Senior Planner  
Karin Noyes, Recorder

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT**

Kevin Clarke  
Ian Duncan

**READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**BOARD MEMBER CLOUTIER MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JUNE 26, 2013 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. VICE CHAIR STEWART 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 comment during this portion of the meeting.

**PUBLIC HEARING ON UPDATES TO THE COMMUNITY BUSINESS-EDMONDS WAY (BC-EW) AND MULTIPLE RESIDENTIAL-EDMONDS WAY (RM-EW) ZONING CODE IN EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE (ECDC) 16.50 AND 16.30 (FILE NUMBER AMD2013003)**

Mr. Clugston reviewed that several months ago, the City Council asked the Planning Board to review the BC-EW and RM-EW zoning codes in the wake of the Compass Development that occurred on Edmonds Way. He provided an aerial photograph of the Compass Development site and noted that the southern portion is zoned BC-EW and the northern portion is zoned RM-EW. He explained that the two new zones were created and applied to the property in 2007, but no development occurred on the site until 2011. No other parcels along the Edmonds Way Corridor are zoned RM-EW, but there are three other sites that are currently zoned BC-EW.

Mr. Clugston recalled that when the mixed-use Compass Development was constructed, the City Council and members of the community expressed a number of concerns. They asked the Board to provide additional refinement to the language to make sure the next development is more in line with what the community wants to see on Edmonds Way. He advised that the Planning Board has discussed proposed amendments to the BC-EW and RM-EW zoning code on four separate occasions, the last being May 22<sup>nd</sup>. In an attempt to address the concerns expressed by both the City Council and the public, they asked that the following changes be incorporated into the code language:

- The current code language does not include any design standards. To address the issue of design, the Planning Board directed staff to extract applicable design standards from the BD zones and incorporate them into the BC-EW and RM-EW zoning code. The purpose of the design standards is to create a more interesting street front.
- The current BC-EW code does not have a base street setback requirement, which means that buildings can be located at the property line. The Board is recommending a 5-foot street setback so that buildings are setback from the street a little more and provide additional space from the sidewalk. This setback would be consistent with the setback that is currently proposed for the Westgate area.
- The properties zoned BC-EW and RM-EW are unique in that they are topographically constrained by a slope. The intent of the two zones is to provide more height to addresses the topographic challenges. When the two zones were initially created, the base height in the BC-EW zone was 35 feet. Additional height (up to 45 feet) was allowed if a developer provided certain incentives. However, the incentives were not well written. The purpose of this exercise is to make them clearer. The Board is proposing a base height of 25 feet in the BC-EW zone, with a 5-foot setback. In addition, minimum LEED Certification would be required for any development in the BC-EW zone. As proposed, the height could be increased up to 40 feet if a developer meets certain criteria (incentives), which includes increased LEED Certification or equivalent, additional setback up to 15 feet, low-income housing units, public amenities along the street front, and bicycle parking and/or storage areas.
- To further address design-related issues, the Board is recommending that a list of preferred building materials be added to the language. The Board also discussed the idea of requiring at least 55% of the building materials to be salvaged or recyclable content. However, they did not make a final recommendation on where this new requirement should be located in the code language.
- The Board is recommending a base height in the RM-EW zone of 25 feet, as well. A developer could obtain additional height (up to 35 feet) by offering similar techniques proposed for the BC-EW zone such as LEED Gold Certification, low-income housing, bicycle parking, etc. The Board is also recommending the same building façade characteristics as those proposed for the BC-EW zone so that future development will have more street appeal.

Board Member Lovell noted that staff provided two options (Attachment 2) for incorporating a requirement that at least 55% of the building materials must be salvageable recyclable content, recyclable bio-base or indigenous. He pointed out that if the language is incorporated into Footnote 4.d under Table A in ECDC 16.50.020 it would apply to building façade materials only. If it is incorporated into Footnote 4.e under Table A in ECDC 16.50.020 it would apply to materials for the entire building. He also questioned the definition for the term “indigenous.” Vice Chair Stewart suggested that the term “indigenous” means locally sourced. She noted that the term is used and likely defined in the International Green Construction Code. She suggested that perhaps the proposed code language should make reference to the International Green Construction Code for clarity.

Board Member Lovell recommended that the requirement related to building materials would be most appropriately placed as Footnote 4.d under Table A in ECDC 16.50.020, making it applicable to the building façade only. He said he is not sure it would be feasible or even achievable to place the requirement on the entire building (exterior and interior). The Board agreed to discuss the issue further after the public hearing.

Vice Chair Stewart suggested that the building material requirement should be adjusted to be consistent with the wording found in the International Green Building Code. ***The Board agreed that the language should read, “At least 55% of the building materials must be salvaged, recycled content, recyclable, bio-based, or indigenous.”***

Board Member Lovell asked if Footnote 4.c.4 under Table A in ECDC 16.50.020 would require one bicycle parking space or storage area per vehicular parking space provided on the site. Mr. Clugston answered affirmatively, but noted that the provision allows a developer flexibility as to how the bicycle spaces would be provided.

Chair Reed recalled that when the BC-EW and RM-EW zones were created, they were intended to apply to small parcels with steep topography. He asked if topography is one of the criteria a property owner must demonstrate in order to achieve one of the two zones. Mr. Clugston said the way the language for the two zones is written does not specifically tie the zoning to topography. Mr. Chave agreed that was the original intent of the BC-EW and RM-EW zones, and that is why some of the original incentives were tied to topography. He said the Board could reexamine the purpose section for the two zones as part of the current proposal and clarify the intent of the BC-EW and RM-EW zones as appropriate.

Chair Reed pointed out that the original base height limit in the BC-EW zone was 35 feet, but criteria was included to allow the height to increase to 40 and 45 feet. The proposed language starts with a base height of 25 feet, with the ability to increase the height to 35 and 40 feet if certain criteria can be met. He summarized that the proposed change would result in a decreased maximum height limit of five feet, as well as an increased setback requirement.

Vice Chair Stewart referred to Footnote 3 under Table A in ECDC 16.50.020 and suggested the language should be changed to make it clear that a minimum LEED certification or equivalent would be required for all development in the BC-EW zone.

**Natalie Shippen, Edmonds**, said she considers the Board's current process a two-step procedure. This is the first step; the boot will fall when the Westgate Study comes before the Board at some point in the future. She said her comments deal with both issues. She expressed her belief that any planning that creates an appearance that displeases the residents is poor planning, and any planning that knowingly creates a town appearance that residents do not like is very poor planning. She cautioned that the Edmonds Planning Board is about to make that mistake. Residents do not like the two new buildings that were developed recently on Edmonds Way anymore than they like the proposed new building at Point Edwards. She said these two developments are the product of incentive zoning, and the proposal before the Board would increase the number of incentives that could be swapped for additional height. This change will result in future construction that residents do not want.

Ms. Shippen explained that incentive zoning replaces legislative certainty with the whims of the executive branch. The Board should strip the incentive zoning that allowed the Compass and Point Edwards Developments and mandate the changes offered now as negotiable. She stressed that Edmonds is a successful town and does not need an overhaul. Residents are proud of the City and are interested in its future. They have asked for no major code changes of the kind proposed now. She asked that the Board not abandon the traditional zoning code that has worked well for over a century for an irresponsible reaction to financial panic. Edmonds should not be sacrificed to a frenzy that is based on a cheap slogan of economic development.

NO ONE ELSE IN THE AUDIENCE INDICATED A DESIRE TO ADDRESS THE BOARD, AND THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Chair Reed clarified that the City Council specifically asked the Board to review the BC-EW and RM-EW zones after concerns were raised related to the Compass Development. The Board has met three times previously to discuss potential changes to the code language, and the proposed amendments are intended to be responsive to the concerns that were raised by both the citizens and the City Council.

#### **Board Discussion on BC-EW Zone Amendments**

Board Member Ellis expressed concern about Footnote 3 under the table in ECDC 16.50.020, which would require all development in the BC-EW zone to obtain a minimum LEED certification. He thought the Board had agreed not to require a minimum LEED Certification as a base requirement in the BC-EW zone, but to leave it as an incentive for additional height until the City has addressed the issue of whether to make LEED Certification a requirement of development in all zones throughout the City. Board Member Lovell agreed that the majority of the Board concurred that the LEED Certification should be included as an incentive option but not as a base requirement for all development in the BC-EW zone. Board Member Ellis noted that, as currently written, LEED Certification would be a base requirement for all development in the BC-EW zone regardless of height.

Board Member Lovell pointed out that requiring LEED Certification as a base requirement would place an unfair constraint on owners of property zoned BC-EW because no other zone in the City has a similar requirement. Mr. Chave recalled that

the majority of the Board concluded that it would not be appropriate to require a minimum LEED Certification as a base standard, but a greater LEED Certification requirement could be inserted as an incentive option in order for a developer to obtain a greater height. However, they agreed that the option should be presented at the hearing for public comment. He noted that the proposed RM-EW zoning language includes LEED Certification as one of the options to get more height.

Vice Chair Stewart reminded the Board that they discussed dropping the language that would have required low-impact development in exchange for requiring a base LEED Certification. As currently written, the language does not require a developer to incorporate low-impact development techniques. She noted that the new stormwater code will not be adopted for three years, and including a base LEED Certification requirement would force developers to at least consider the minimum requirements, which are not difficult to meet.

Again, Board Member Ellis said he is not opposed to requiring developers to meet a base LEED standard, but he expressed concern about implementing the requirement on a zone-by-zone basis. Instead, the concept should be applied citywide. Vice Chair Stewart suggested that perhaps the Board should ask the City Council to consider applying the requirement citywide. However, she voiced concern that simply removing the base LEED Certification requirement would give too much leeway to developers to avoid considering stormwater impacts. Board Member Ellis questioned if requiring base LEED Certification would ensure that a developer incorporates stormwater retention or other low-impact development techniques. Vice Chair Stewart acknowledged that a developer could meet the requirements for base LEED Certification without addressing stormwater issues. However, staff could encourage developers to incorporate low-impact development techniques related to stormwater.

Board Member Cloutier said that while he supports LEED Certification and low-impact development, it would not be appropriate to require it for just the BC-EW zone. He agreed with Board Member Ellis that the concept should be applied citywide. The rules should be consistent throughout the City so that a select group of property owners are not placed at a disadvantage. Vice Chair Stewart expressed her belief that a base LEED Certification requirement could actually attract developers to the area who are looking forward to doing LEED Certified projects. Board Member Cloutier agreed that low-impact development can have an ongoing impact on infrastructure that will pay off year after year, but he said he cannot support implementing more stringent base standards for just one zone. If the Board would like low-impact development and LEED Certification to be a standard requirement in all zones, they should forward this recommendation to the City Council, but he cannot support a requirement that is unfair to just one set of property owners. Vice Chair Stewart agreed that perhaps the Board should propose that the City Council adopt the change citywide rather than just applying the concept to one zone.

Chair Reed suggested that perhaps the minimum LEED Certification could be included in the BC-EW code language as a suggestion rather than a mandate. Board Member Ellis said he would not be opposed to including the concept as a suggestion, but the City would have no ability to enforce it as a requirement. He suggested that the Board either include LEED Certification as an incentive or eliminate the requirement entirely. Vice Chair Stewart pointed out that, by reading the Planning Board's minutes, the City Council Members will have a clear understanding of their desire to consider the concept for citywide application.

***The majority of the Board agreed to remove Footnote 3 under the table in ECDC 16.50.020.*** They agreed that if the City Council feels strongly about making LEED Certification a base requirement for all zones in the City, they can direct the Board to consider an amendment that would apply citywide.

Board Member Lovell referred to the two options for incorporating a requirement that 55% of the building materials must be salvageable recyclable content, recyclable bio-base or indigenous. Once again, he recommended that the requirement should be applicable to the building façade only and not to the entire building. ***The Board agreed that the requirement should be incorporated into Footnote 4.d under Table A in ECDC 16.50.020 and that the word "façade" should be inserted between "building" and "materials."*** Vice Chair Stewart asked if the term "natural" would allow a developer to use materials that resemble natural stone, wood, etc., or if the materials must be natural. The Board agreed that materials that resemble natural products would be acceptable. Board Member Lovell advised that the purpose of this section is to give the Architectural Design Board more tools when reviewing projects so they have the ability to demand better-designed buildings.

Board Member Tibbott pointed out that the BC-EW code language (ECDC 16.50.020.B) currently requires commercial uses on the ground floor to a minimum depth of 30 feet. He asked how this compares to other mixed-use and commercial zones in

the City. Mr. Clugston said the Downtown Business (BD) zones require a commercial depth of 45 feet, and the Commercial Business (BC) zones have a commercial depth requirement of 30 feet. There is no depth requirement for the Neighborhood Business (BN) zone. He summarized that the concept of having a commercial depth requirement is consistent with the BC and BD zones, although the actual distance is different. Board Member Lovell suggested that the depth requirement is greater in the BD zones because lots are more narrow and deep.

***Chair Reed suggested that ECDC 16.50.020.C should be reworded for clarity. For example, the reference to ECDC 17.50 should be placed after “parking” and the reference to ECDC 20.10 should be placed after “design review.” The remainder of the Board concurred.***

Mr. Chave noted that there has not been a lot of public input regarding the proposed amendments. He suggested the Board may want to continue the public hearing to a date certain to make sure that every owner of property that is currently zoned BC-EW or RM-EW is individually notified of the proposed changes and has an opportunity to address the Board. That Board agreed that would be appropriate.

Chair Reed pointed out that although the proposed language identifies a minimum 5-foot setback for the BC-EW zone, the actual structure might be setback even further, depending on the situation. ***He suggested, and the Board concurred, that an illustration of the street setback requirement would be helpful.***

Vice Chair Stewart referred to Footnote 4.c under Table A in ECDC 16.50.020, which lists four techniques a developer can incorporate into a project in order to obtain additional height. She specifically referred to Item 4.c.4, which would require one bicycle parking space or storage area per vehicular parking space provided on site. She noted that the City of Kirkland also allows for a reduction in the number of parking spaces required if a developer provides more covered bicycle storage spaces. She suggested the City could consider this concept, as well. She observed that parking space are more costly to construct than bicycle storage spaces, so this option could be offered as an incentive choice. Mr. Chave agreed that this concept makes good sense when bicycle facilities like bike trails are in close proximity to a development. However, there are no good bicycling facilities along Edmonds Way at this time. Vice Chair Stewart agreed that Edmonds Way is not a safe street for bicycles, but it is possible for people to bicycle to Edmonds Way and then use a bus that has a bike rack. This is one option for getting people out of cars.

Board Member Cloutier expressed his belief that having bicycle spaces as an incentive for greater height would not necessarily encourage bicycle use, but it would encourage developers to use bicycle spaces as a way to avoid more costly requirements. Edmonds is not a bikeable city so they should not pretend that adding bicycle racks will encourage biking. Safer and wider bike paths is what will encourage biking. Vice Chair Stewart noted that many cities are offering electrical car charging stations as incentive choices, as well.

Board Member Cloutier suggested that the incentive related to bicycle racks (Footnote 4.c.4 in ECDC 16.50.020) should be replaced with an incentive related to low-impact development as an ingredient for additional height. Mr. Chave pointed out that low-impact development techniques could include such things as electric vehicle charging stations, but bicycle spaces may not be as important to getting the additional height. He suggested that if the Board is interested in substituting the bicycle storage incentive for a low-impact development incentive, staff could work with the Engineering Department to come up with appropriate language to insert. He reminded the Board that one of the identified problems with the existing code is that the requirements for additional height are unclear. The Engineering Department could come up with objective and measurable low-impact development standards. Vice Chair Stewart said she has a good example from the City of Bellingham that she could forward to staff. ***The Board agreed to replace Footnote 4.c.4 under Table A in ECDC 16.50.020 with new low-impact development language to be proposed by staff.***

Vice Chair Stewart asked for clarification about what is meant by “public amenities” in Footnote 4.c.3 under Table A in ECDC 16.50.020. Mr. Clugston explained that the proposed language would require public amenity space that is 25% of the length of any required street setback. The actual size of the public amenity space would depend on the width of the lot. The public amenity would be focused on the street side of the building. Vice Chair Stewart questioned if a street side location would be a desirable place for a public amenities to be located. She also questioned if the size of the required public amenity space would be adequate enough to be an actual public benefit. Board Member Cloutier expressed his belief that people living in the new development, as well as other members of the community, would benefit from having a place to walk that is

more peaceful and further away from the street. He pointed out that the Compass Development provides more space for pedestrian activity than anywhere else along the Edmonds Way Corridor, and everyone seems to agree that even that amount of space is not adequate. Requiring more public space would provide safer places for people to walk. Vice Chair Stewart clarified that the public amenity space is intended to be for everyone in the community and not just the residents of the new project, and locating the public space behind the building defeats its purpose. However, she wants to ensure that the public space is an appealing place for the public by including features such as landscaping, a fountain, etc.

Board Member Tibbott asked if the developer would be responsible for maintaining the landscaping that is placed in the setback area and in the public space. Mr. Chave answered that the property owner would be responsible for maintaining all privately owned areas. Board Member Tibbott asked if the code offers guidance as to the type of landscaping required in the public spaces. Board Member Cloutier answered that Type III Landscaping would be required as per code.

### **RM-EW Zone Amendments**

*Board Member Cloutier suggested, and the Board concurred, that Footnote 4.3 under Table A in ECDC 16.30.030 related to bicycle spaces should also be replaced with low-impact development language as developed by staff.*

*The Board also agreed that ECDC 16.30.030.B.1 should be changed by inserting language identical to that already discussed for the BC-EW zone (Footnote 4.d under Table A in ECDC 16.50.020).*

Board Member Ellis asked if there was any reason to treat the building material requirement any differently in the RM-EW zone compared to the BC-EW zone. Board Member Lovell pointed out that there is only one property currently zoned RM-EW and it was recently developed. Chair Reed agreed that there is only one RM-EW zone property at this time, but another property owner could submit a request to rezone a property to RM-EW at some point in the future.

*The Board concurred that ECDC 16.30.030.B should also be changed as the Board previously discussed for ECDC 16.50.020.C.*

The Board directed staff to prepare a clean version of the proposed amendments to the BC-EW and RM-EW zones, with the most recent changes highlighted and/or identified in change bars within the margin.

**BOARD MEMBER CLOUTIER MOVED THAT THE BOARD CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING FOR FILE NUMBER AMD2013003 TO JULY 24, 2013. BOARD MEMBER LOVELL SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

The Board agreed to continue their discussion about developing a separate “green” development code on August 14<sup>th</sup> and then report their findings to the City Council as part of their next quarterly report.

### **STRATEGIC PLAN IMPLEMENTATION – DISCUSSION AND PRIORITIES**

Mr. Chave reported that Chair Reed and Board Member Lovell, along with three members from the Citizens Economic Development Commission (CEDC), met with the representatives from the Highway 99 Task Force to discuss various initiatives for Highway 99. The discussion included transit-oriented development, parking standards, reconfiguring the mixed-use zones, and revisiting the zoning in the area around the hospital. He recalled that several years ago the Board considered a proposal that would have rezoned the properties to Business Residential (BR), but the proposal was not tuned right for the neighborhood and was never adopted. Now that Swedish Edmonds is looking at potentially updating their Master Plan in the next few years, it will be important for the City, particularly the Planning Board, to engage in another discussion about what the appropriate zoning should be.

Mr. Chave reported that the Highway 99 Task Force has agreed to meet on a monthly basis to continue discussions, and representatives of the Planning Board and CEDC will be invited to participate, as well. The Highway 99 Task Force intends to present recommendations to both the Planning Board and the CEDC as appropriate. He noted that all present at the joint meeting were in favor of the concepts discussed, and they must now figure out how to coordinate their efforts to push items forward.

**APPROVED**

Chair Reed pointed out that the two zones bordering Highway 99 are General Commercial (CG) and CG2, which allow height limits of 60 and 75 feet respectively. The CG and CG2 zoning also designates primary and secondary uses that are allowed. In addition, the Comprehensive Plan refers to some areas as “high-rise node,” where additional height is allowed. He summarized that there is a lot of flexibility for developing along Highway 99. Mr. Chave said there are some limitations in the existing zoning that presents some obstacles to fully developing the area such as a requirement in the CG zone of commercial development only on the first two floors. While the code exempts properties that are more than two acres from the requirement, it is important to not that there are very few properties along the Highway 99 Corridor that are significant in size. He said developers have expressed interest in increasing the intensity of development on properties along Highway 99, but the commercial requirement has gotten in the way. He said now is the time to clean up the code language to allow feasible development to move forward.

Chair Reed commented that the Highway 99 Task Force has a tremendous amount of knowledge; and he is convinced that with the combined effort of all three groups (Planning Board, Highway 99 Task Force and CEDC), they will be able to move forward with positive changes. He said he and Board Member Lovell will continue to attend Highway 99 Task Force meetings as often as possible.

Chair Reed referred the Board to the spreadsheet he prepared to illustrate the various Strategic Plan actions, strategies and goals that will involve the Planning Board in some way. He noted that the items are listed in order of priority, based on public feedback. The spreadsheet also identifies the timeframe for which each item should be completed, who the lead agencies will be, and the complexity of the items. In addition, it identifies other participants, such as the CEDC. The Board reviewed each of the actions, strategies and goals included on the spreadsheet as follows:

- **Item 68 – Permitting processes.** *Consolidate and simplify the business license, land use and building permit review process to incorporate electronic application procedures, pre-submittal workshops, and concurrent reviews.* Chair Reed advised that this item will primarily involve the City Council and staff. Mr. Chave explained that any code amendments needed to consolidate and simplify the permitting process would have to come before the Planning Board for review and a recommendation. Chair Reed noted that it is hoped that this item can be dealt with in the next 12 months.
- **Item 40 – Anderson Center.** *Refine long range strategy to enhance, maintain and update life cycle maintenance, repair requirements and functional program needs.* Chair Reed said that any issues related to this item would come to the Board via the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Department.
- **Item 35 – Greenways.** *Develop a system of coordinated open spaces, conservation corridors, and greenways with trail access along the shoreline, waterfront, wetlands, hillsides and parks to preserve the natural setting and increase awareness and access.* Chair Reed noted that the Board has already dealt with the Shoreline Master Program, and wetlands were addressed as part of that proposal. Mr. Chave recommended that the Board should consider opportunities to implement this objective when they review elements of the Comprehensive Plan such as the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan, the Bicycle and Walkway Plan, etc. Board Member Cloutier noted that this item, along with Item 48 relates to the need to have a holistic and coordinated plan for both pedestrian and bicycle paths and trails.
- **Item 23 – Swedish Hospital.** *Update the Hospital District Master Plan to meet hospital needs while mitigating impacts to adjacent nonmedical land uses.* Chair Reed noted that Swedish Edmonds Hospital has indicated their plan to update their Master Plan in the near future. Mr. Chave said that representatives from the hospital have requested an opportunity to make a presentation to the CEDC, and they recently submitted an application for a major expansion of their parking structure and emergency room. He said the Planning Board would be invited to attend any presentation that is made to the CEDC.
- **Item 38a – Yost Pool.** *Create and implement a long-term financial and operational strategy for the updating/upgrading, refurbishment and retrofitting of the current Yost Pool facility.* Chair Reed recalled that the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Department has a plan for upgrading Yost Pool, and the plan will likely be presented to the Planning Board for review and a recommendation to the City Council at some point in the future.
- **Item 10 – Promotion.** *Initiate and expand retail sales and other events and activities including sidewalk cafes and vendors within the business districts of downtown, Westgate, Firdale Village, Five Corners, Perrinville and Highway 99.* Chair Reed recalled that the Board has already dealt with amendments that encourage sidewalk cafes and vendors. In addition, they have discussed potential plans for Westgate, Five Corners and Highway 99. They will likely have an opportunity to reevaluate the Firdale Village Plan in the near future, as well. Mr. Chave noted that any proposed changes to the Firdale Village Plan must be put forward by the property owner.

- **Item 48 – Trails.** *Complete an off-road multipurpose trail network linking the shoreline and waterfront, Edmonds Marsh, downtown, business districts, parks and open spaces, bus and rail transit connections, and the Interurban Trail in Edmonds.* Chair Reed noted that the Board has had a lot of discussion about the need to connect pedestrian and bicycle trails to transit opportunities, the waterfront, downtown, etc.
- **Item 54 – Highway 99.** *Create transportation improvement program and project for Highway 99 to improve traffic flow, transit connections, pedestrian streetscape and to encourage mixed-use project developments similar to what has been recently completed in Shoreline and is planned in Everett and Lynnwood.* Chair Reed noted that the Board is currently working with the Highway 99 Task Force and the CEDC to address this item.
- **Item 65 – Public View Preservation.** *Identify public view corridors and view sheds in the Bowl and create appropriate public view protection overlay districts, ordinances, and other measures to preserve and protect them.* Chair Reed pointed out that the Comprehensive Plan identifies three specific view corridors that must be maintained. He said he is not sure what else can be done to address this item.
- **Item 66a3 – Development Regulations Highway 99.** *Amend mixed use development standards to allow higher, mixed use density in the Highway 99 area.* Again, Chair Reed noted that the Board is in the process of addressing this item in conjunction with the Highway 99 Task Force and the CEDC.
- **Item 38b – Yost Pool.** *Develop and/or expand Yost Pool to include outdoor and indoor leisure pool elements, therapy pool, party rooms and concessions, and possibly other recreation physical conditioning, courts, and gymnasium uses.* Chair Reed noted that this item is identified as a one to five-year project.
- **Item 66b – Development Regulations.** *Address ground floor retail requirements to reflect demand in different retail corridors and locations.* Chair Reed reminded the Board that the CEDC is currently working on draft amendments to address this item.
- **Item 39a – Civic Field.** *Address long term property ownership and upgrade field, stadium, lighting and other features to support competitive play including tournaments.* Chair Reed noted that this is a four-year project, and he is not clear on what the zoning implications, if any, will be.
- **Item 67 – Design Standards.** *Illustrate site, building, landscape and signage design objectives using examples to achieve public quality design objectives.* Chair Reed noted that the Board recently forwarded a recommendation that was adopted by the City Council to add design standards to the BD 2, 3 and 4 zones. They are also considering a recommendation that will add design standards the BC-EW and RM-EW zones.
- **Item 66a2 – Development Regulations.** *Amend mixed use development standards to allow higher-mixed use density in the Westgate area.* Chair Reed advised that the Board is currently in the process of considering a Westgate plan.
- **Item 66a1 – Development Regulations.** *Amend mixed use development standards to allow higher, mixed use density in the downtown/waterfront area.*
- **Item 66a5 – Development Regulations.** *Amend mixed use development standards to allow higher mixed use density in the Perrinville area.*
- **Item 66a6 – Development Regulations.** *Amend mixed use development standards to allow higher, mixed use density in the Firdale Village area.* Chair Reed noted that in a recent presentation, Mr. Clifton suggested that proposed changes to the Firdale Village Plan may come forward in the near future.
- **Item 18 – Affordable Housing.** *Promote the creation of rental and sale workforce housing for moderate income working households through incentive that may include additional density, reduced parking requirements, reduced permit fees and/or other measures.* Chair Reed pointed out that the Board is considering an amendment that would add affordable housing as an incentive for additional height in both the BC-EW and RM-EW zones.
- **Item 39b – Woodway Fields.** *Address long term property ownership and upgrade field, lighting, and other features to support competitive play including tournaments.* Chair Reed noted that this is a long-range item, and he is not yet clear as to what the Board's role will be.
- **Item 66a4 – Development Regulations.** *Amend mixed-use development standards to allow higher, mixed-use density in the Five Corners area.* Chair Reed advised that the Board is currently considering a plan for the Five Corners area.
- **Item 36 – Dog Park.** *Identify a suitable relocation site and develop a dedicated dog park consisting of fenced social yards with spectator seating and amenities and off-leash exercise areas and trails.*
- **Item 41b – Senior Center.** *Relocate the Senior Center to another location.*

Chair Reed reviewed that the items listed above are those in which the Planning Board was named as a potential participant. He encouraged the Board Members to carefully review the entire list of actions, strategies and goals prepared by Mr. Clifton and identify any others that might require Planning Board assistance.

Vice Chair Stewart thanked Chair Reed for preparing the spreadsheet that identifies the actions, strategies and goals that lists the items that involve the Planning Board in an easy to read and illustrative format.

Board Member Lovell reminded the Board that the actions, strategies and goals identified in the Strategic Plan do not necessarily have to be done in order of priority. The Board can move forward with items that are fairly easy to accomplish or that they feel are important. In addition, several of the items on the list are already in progress. Where there is synergy, such as on Highway 99, the Board should move forward with the items regardless of their ranking. He said it is clear that the public supports greater density on Highway 99 to allow more development options. Much of the work has already been done to address this issue so the City should be able to make headway quickly.

Board Member Lovell announced that he has been asked to participate in the long-term Strategic Planning Committee for the Senior Center. The purpose of the committee is to discuss the options of upgrading or relocating the facility. In the two meetings held to date, it is clear that committee participants are not interested in studying potential relocation. However, he said he pointed out that enough people felt the facility should be relocated that the possibility needs to at least be studied.

Board Member Lovell said it appears the City will be doing just enough work at Yost Pool to keep it running until funding is available to redevelop the property as per the recent study.

Board Member Cloutier thanked Chair Reed for the spreadsheet he prepared to help the Board make sense of the Strategic Plan. It is helpful to have a clear understanding of the items the Planning Board will be involved in. He specifically referred to Item 68 (Permitting Processes) and asked if it would be appropriate for the Planning Board to recommend that staff review the permitting processes and identify potential code changes. Mr. Chave said staff is already working on this project and anticipates having all land use applications available on line in the near future.

Board Member Cloutier pointed out that most of the items on the spreadsheet will not be initiated by the Planning Board. Mr. Chave agreed. He suggested that the Board move forward with amendments to the Highway 99 zoning, particularly related to mixed use development and affordable housing. In conjunction with this work, the Board could also work on low-impact development and efficiency standards that could be used as potential incentives for increased density. Board Member Cloutier added that the Board could play a significant role in creating stormwater and energy-efficiency standards.

Vice Chair Stewart reminded the Board that the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Department has indicated that a draft Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan will be available for review by the end of the year. The Planning Board will be brought into that process as the plan moves forward.

Board Member Tibbott said he would be interested in the Board pursuing greenways and trails (Items 35 and 48 on the spreadsheet) so that various developments such as Westgate can be interconnected to the transportation node on Highway 99. Trails should include both bicycle and pedestrian paths. He recalled that as a participant on the Transportation Committee, he learned that there are many sidewalks in the City that have missing links and there is no reason for this to continue. He asked if it is the Planning Board's responsibility to bring this issue forward. He suggested that bicycle and pedestrian trails are something the Board should consider relative to any of the zoning issues that come up in the future. He recommended that the item be placed on the Board's extended agenda for future discussion. This would at least make the City Council aware that the Board considers the issue important. Vice Chair Stewart pointed out that there are various opportunities for sidewalk funding, and the missing links within the City are identified in the City's Transportation Plan. She suggested the Planning Board meet with the Transportation Engineer to get something positive moving forward.

### **REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA**

Mr. Chave advised that at a recent meeting of the City Council's Parks, Planning and Public Works Committee there was a discussion about the inconsistencies between the City's Best Available Science (BAS) Report and the Critical Areas Regulations pertaining to allowed activities. Staff believes that some of the items in the BAS Report were not correctly translated into the Critical Areas Ordinance. These discrepancies have resulted in some problems. For example, the City's plan to install a spray feature at City Park cannot move forward because of the wetland buffer that crosses the parking lot and access road. He said he believes the intent of the BAS Report is that when you have a buffer area that is clearly separated

from the main thing you are trying to protect and a development footprint already exists, you should be able to continue to develop that area in exchange for enhancement of the remaining buffer area.

Mr. Chave said issues related to the BAS Report and the Critical Areas Ordinance discrepancies also came up in relation to the American Brewing Company's proposal to expand their business at Harbor Square to add a silo in the parking lot. Because the parking lot is identified as a marsh buffer, the expansion would not be allowed. Again, he explained that the intent behind BAS in critical areas is that property owners should be allowed to add a structure in a developed area, but would be required to enhance the remaining buffer area. BAS acknowledges impacts to buffers and how they can be enhanced and improved while allowing reasonable development to occur in an area that is already essentially developed. He said the City Council committee has asked the Planning Board to discuss this issue further starting on July 24<sup>th</sup>.

The Board reviewed that their July 24<sup>th</sup> meeting will include:

- A continued public hearing regarding changes to the RM-EW and BC-EW zoning standards (File Number AMD2013003)
- Continued work on the Westgate/Five Corners Plans based on City Council feedback about priorities. Absent of City Council feedback, the Board can proceed with the two plans as they wish.
- A discussion about potential code amendments to clarify the discrepancies between the BAS Report and the Critical Areas Ordinance.
- A discussion and potential code amendments regarding wireless communication regulations.

Mr. Chave advised that the Board's August 14<sup>th</sup> agenda could include a public hearing on potential amendments related to BAS and the Critical Areas Ordinance could be moved forward to a public hearing if there is enough time between the July 24<sup>th</sup> and August 14<sup>th</sup> meetings and the Board is in agreement. The Board could also continue their discussion regarding the Westgate Plan. In addition, they could have a discussion about green development and low-impact development requirements. This would enable the Board to highlight the issue to the City Council in their next quarterly report. He suggested that there may be opportunities to introduce green building and low-impact development through mitigation measures via the State Environmental Protection Act (SEPA) process.

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

Chair Reed complimented the Board on how they handled their last meeting when they changed what was being recommended by staff in a logical and well thought out manner. The end result was good. He also commended the Board, and particularly the Park Naming Subcommittee, for the way they dealt with the park naming process, which was a somewhat controversial and sensitive issue.

Chair Reed announced that the City Council will consider the Board's recommendation for a name for the SR-104 Mini Park on July 16<sup>th</sup>, and they have requested that a member of the Planning Board present the Board's recommendation and explain the logic of the Park Naming Subcommittee. Board Member Tibbott agreed to make this presentation, and the remaining Board Members were encouraged to attend the meeting, if possible. He advised that the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director is currently researching other potential locations for a Veteran's Memorial.

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

Board Member Cloutier said he was grateful for input from other Board Members about proposed changes to the BC-EW and RM-EW that he had missed during his review. He said he appreciated the viewpoints provided by all members. He said he would not be present at the next meeting when the public hearing regarding the proposed amendments is continued, but he voiced his support for the proposal as discussed by the Board.

Vice Chair Stewart encouraged Board Members to either attend or watch the July 23<sup>rd</sup> City Council meeting where representatives from the University of Washington will provide an education presentation on the Five Corners and Westgate Plans. Also at that meeting will be an educational presentation on stormwater management using rain gardens by the professional who helped launch the 12,000 Rain Gardens Campaign.

**APPROVED**

Board Member Lovell asked if the City Council has made any decisions on whether or not to proceed with a Comprehensive Plan amendment related Harbor Square. Mr. Chave said no decisions have been made to date, but the item is scheduled on the City Council's upcoming agenda. Board Member Lovell also asked about the status of the Shoreline Master Program Update. Mr. Chave answered that he is not sure when this item is scheduled to come before the City Council again.

**ADJOURNMENT**

The Board meeting was adjourned at 9:22 p.m.

**APPROVED**