

APPROVED MAY 28TH

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

May 14, 2014

Vice Chair Tibbott called the meeting of the Edmonds Planning Board to order at 7:01 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Public Safety Complex, 250 – 5th Avenue North.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Neil Tibbott, Vice Chair
Ian Duncan
Bill Ellis
Philip Lovell
Carreen Nordling Rubenkönig
Valerie Stewart
Daniel Robles

STAFF PRESENT

Shane Hope, Development Services Director
Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Karin Noyes, Recorder

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Todd Cloutier, Chair

Vice Chair Tibbott welcomed new Planning Board Members Carreen Rubenkönig and Daniel Robles.

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER LOVELL MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF APRIL 23, 2014 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, WITH BOARD MEMBERS DUNCAN, RUBENKONIG AND ROBLES ABSTAINING.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Natalie Shippen, Edmonds, expressed concern that the City's sign code is only enforced on a complaint basis. She provided the Board with a copy of the code section outlining the types of signs that are permitted in each of the zoning districts. She also provided a copy of the complaint form. She pointed out that although sandwich board signs are not permitted in the Westgate area, there are numerous signs of this type. The only way they will ever be removed is for citizens to file complaints with the City. She encouraged Board Members to contribute to making Westgate better by filing complaints related to the illegal signs.

Ken Reidy, Edmonds, reviewed that prior to August 5, 1998, a wireless communication facility was installed on the Commodore Condominium Building without a permit, and the facility was not legal under the City's wireless code. On December 11, 2013, the Planning Board conducted a public hearing and recommended approval of AT&T's proposal to amend the City's code to treat AT&T's facility as a legal nonconforming use regardless of compliance with the City's code at the time the facility was installed. All that would be required is conclusive evidence that the facility existed on or before

August 5, 1998. At a public hearing on January 21, 2014, the Edmonds City Council unanimously approved the Planning Board's recommendation.

Mr. Reidy recalled that, several years earlier, after a public hearing on August 28, 2008, the City Council unanimously approved the Planning Board's recommended language related to accessory buildings that existed on or before January 1, 1981. He referred to two emails with attachments that he sent to the Board. One attachment, dated November 17, 2009, shows that during its code enforcement efforts against his accessory building, the City was fully aware that if his accessory building existed on or before January 1, 1981, the related setbacks would be grandfathered. The second attachment contained an audio clip during which the former City Attorney tells the former Hearing Examiner that "grandfathering applies to legally initiated uses, not illegal uses." However, the City Attorney failed to tell the Hearing Examiner the complete law related to accessory buildings that existed on or before January 1, 1981. The Hearing Examiner later ruled in her findings that "the testimony addressing the duration of the existing accessory structure was not relevant and was not relied on." Mr. Reidy stated that "the duration of his existing accessory structure was extremely relevant and had to be relied upon under the City's own laws."

Mr. Reid said it is important for the Planning Board to understand that their advisory work can be undermined by the City as evidenced by the City's code enforcement against his accessory building that was built in the 1960's. He pointed out that the City's code is clear. Edmonds City Code 2.01 states that "the Mayor shall see that all laws and ordinances are faithfully enforced and that law and order is maintained in the City." He emphasized that enforcement of the laws is neither his nor the Planning Board's responsibility. He commented that when a mayor is fully aware that the City laws and ordinances have not been faithfully enforced and still refuses to correct the City's conduct, innocent citizens of Edmonds can be harmed and their trust can be greatly impaired. He encouraged the Board to recommend that the City Council task them to address Chapter 2.01 of the Code because of its connection with faithful enforcement of the City's ordinances. He expressed his belief that Chapter 2.01 must be promptly updated and improved upon. Such would lead to improved performance by the City's mayors and more accountability. He noted that the majority of Chapter 2.01 was adopted in 1983.

CONTINUED DISCUSSION ON WESTGATE PLAN AND FORM-BASED CODE

Mr. Chave recalled that this is a follow up discussion to the public hearing that was held on March 12, 2014. He referred to Attachment 1, which contains an updated draft of the plan and code as per the Board's direction following the public hearing. He reviewed the changes as follows:

1. ECDC 16.110.010 was updated to provide for 2, 3 and 4-story building limits, and the map was moved from the end of the document to this section so that it accompanies the height discussion.
2. ECDC 16.110.010(C) was amended by changing the word "preferred" to "shall" to be stronger about building location. The intent is for buildings to be placed closer to the periphery of the properties, but the understanding is that the last sentence of the paragraph still provides discretion to vary building siting when there is a good reason.
3. Most of the height/story references were removed from the building type summaries beginning on Page 11. Because heights are specified in 16.110.010, it seems that talking about "3-story buildings" throughout the building type discussion will only confuse the issue, particularly if 2 and 4-story buildings are also specified. The language was also modified in a few locations where the descriptions did not seem to make sense given the potential for different height limits.
4. The Height Bonus Score sheet was adjusted to reflect the Planning Board's discussion following the hearing.

Mr. Chave noted that, in addition to the updated draft Westgate Plan and Code (Attachment 1), the Staff Report also included Planning Board minutes from the March 12th Public Hearing (Attachment 2), the Transportation Analysis (Attachment 3) and a reduced development scenario (Attachment 4). He explained that the Transportation Analysis was based on 4 and 5-story buildings, and the current plan talks about 2 to 4-story buildings. At the request of the Board, staff prepared an estimate of how lowering the building height might affect the ultimate build-out for Westgate (see Attachment 4). Assuming a broad reduction in heights from 4 to 5 stories to 3 to 4 stories, it is estimated there will be 18% to 20% less development than what was anticipated in the original draft. This will equate to 18% to 20% less traffic, as well. Because the Transportation

Analysis indicated that Level of Service (LOS) would not be impacted by the higher level of development, it is safe to say that LOS would not be impacted by the lower level of development proposed in the current plan, either.

Board Member Lovell said it appears from the Transportation Analysis that, even with future build-out of Westgate, acceleration and deceleration lanes will not be needed at the intersection of SR-104 and 100th Avenue West. Mr. Chave explained that there is already a tremendous amount of background traffic on the corridor, and development at Westgate only contributes a small fraction of the overall traffic. It is anticipated that additional development will not contribute more to what is already occurring.

Vice Chair Tibbott referred to Item 6 of the Transportation Analysis (Page 11), which talks about reducing vehicle capacity on 100th Avenue West, causing LOS to go from Level D to Level F. Mr. Chave recalled that the University of Washington Team recommended reducing the number of lanes on 100th Avenue West. However, the City's Traffic Engineer indicated that a more thorough study would be needed to proceed with this concept. Because the City does not have funding to move forward with a detailed study, the concept was removed from the plan. However, it can still be considered at some point in the future. Vice Chair Tibbott asked how eliminating the concept would impact bicycle and pedestrian access. Mr. Chave pointed out that closer to the intersection, there is not enough space for additional bicycle lanes without making substantial changes to the entire configuration. However, there may be opportunities for bicycle lanes further north as you approach the cemetery. He noted that bicycle and pedestrian circulation within the four quadrants would be strong, but he cautioned against adopting a formal configuration for SR 104 and 100th Avenue West until a more detailed study has been done. Board Member Stewart pointed out that opportunities for internal circulation in the quadrants would offer bicyclists safer opportunities to get around.

While she does not want to discourage the use of LOS as a measure and standard at this time, Board Member Stewart suggested that as communities become more bicycle and pedestrian friendly, updated measurement methods will not only look at the flow of vehicles, but the movement of pedestrians and bicycles.

Mr. Chave reminded the Board that they could revisit potential changes to 100th Avenue West and SR-104 as part of their upcoming review of the City's Transportation Master Plan. He also reminded the Board that the City recently adopted a Complete Streets Ordinance, which gets as bicycle and pedestrian access, as well.

Board Member Lovell referred to the Height Bonus Score Sheet on Page 34 and 35 and pointed out that obtaining LEED Platinum or Passive Housing Standard is very difficult. He questioned if it is realistic to expect that developers will utilize these difficult to achieve standards, and if they will result in odd-building designs. Board Member Stewart commented that the younger generation will not likely see LEED Platinum buildings as odd. They will see them as progressive and having all of the sustainable benefits they are looking for. Builders who construct these types of buildings want them to be something other communities look to for examples of sustainable development. While the Edmonds community has been slow to accept this concept, it is important to at least offer the opportunity to developers.

Vice Chair Tibbott asked if the Board is interested in recommending a fundamental level of green development for all development in the Westgate area. Mr. Chave said that, as per the proposed plan, all development in the Westgate area would be required to meet at least Built Green or basic LEED certification. All additional points would be offered as incentives for additional building height. Board Member Robles commented that most developers are prepared to at least meet basic LEED certification. Board Member Duncan added that Seattle's "Green Factor" program is more customized for the area, and the City may want to lean that direction in the future.

Board Member Stewart pointed out that "Salmon Safe" is another green building program that has been used for projects in the community. She suggested that the language be amended to allow the City to consider other green building programs, as long as they require third-party verification.

Board Member Ellis pointed out that the terms "amenity space" and "open space" are used throughout the draft plan. He asked staff to describe the differences between the two terms. Mr. Chave said there is some discussion in the plan about open spaces and amenity spaces. Amenity spaces are areas that are more actively used and open spaces are less actively used. He agreed to review the two terms again and perhaps recommend changes to make their meaning clearer.

Board Member Ellis noted that the heading in Table 16.110-1 should be changed from MWU to WMU. He asked if marijuana related uses should be added to the list of permitted uses. Mr. Chave answered that marijuana uses are addressed in an entirely separate section of the code.

Board Member Ellis pointed out that each description of the various buildings types (Section 16.110.010.D) requires that at least one large tree be provided or an existing tree be maintained in each rear yard for shade and privacy. He questioned whether this requirement would be appropriate for all building types or if there is another way to address the intent. Mr. Chave agreed that a statement of intent would be a better approach.

Board Member Ellis asked if the term “woonerf,” which is used in Section 16.110.050.B, is a commonly used term. Mr. Chave said it refers to a specific type of street design, but he is not sure the term is useful in the proposed plan. Board Member Ellis pointed out that the term is not used elsewhere in the code.

Board Member Ellis expressed concern that Step 3 in Section 16.110.070.B would require a landscape professional to certify under both financial and perjury penalty that the Landscape Improvement Checklist meets or exceeds the minimum Green Factor Score or other requirements for the property. Mr. Chave said this language likely came from Seattle’s code, and he agreed that certification should be sufficient, without adding financial and perjury penalties.

Board Member Ellis referred to Section 16.110.070.C, which allow new development to use a portion of the sidewalk area within the public right-of-way for outdoor seating, temporary displays or other uses provided that pedestrian movement is accommodated. He expressed concern that using the word “accommodated” does not really establish a clear standard. Mr. Chave suggested that rather than the word “accommodated” they could say “consistent with City code.” There are code sections that are very specific as to what is allowed in sidewalks, etc. Board Member Ellis said he would rather reference other sections of the code than carve out a different standard for Westgate.

Board Member Lovell observed that building height seemed to be a significant concern at the last public hearing. He reminded the Board that the Economic Development Commission (EDC) feels very strongly that public support for the plan at the next public hearing would be greatly enhanced by providing more graphic representations of what could be developed at Westgate. He recalled that many people expressed concern that taller buildings at Westgate would look into their private backyards. He said he contacted an associate who showed him how Google Earth could be used to enhance a graphic by adding translucent layers at both 35 and 45 foot heights. This would help the public understand how the proposed height limits would relate to the existing buildings and surrounding elevations.

Board Member Duncan cautioned against committing to a concept and presenting it early in the process without thinking about the building form and style. People get terrified when you show mass without breaking it down properly. Board Member Lovell agreed and clarified that he was not proposing to illustrate buildings, but just a translucent layer to illustrate how high 35 and 45 feet would be. Mr. Chave agreed to work with the City’s GIS Specialist to create an illustration as per Board Member Lovell’s suggestion. Board Member Duncan said it could be as simple as a contour map.

Board Member Stewart recalled that, at the previous hearing, adjacent residential neighbors were concerned about how they would be impacted by development in the northeast and southwest quadrants. She reminded the Board that Chair Cloutier addressed the concerns of the adjacent property owners in the northeast quadrant by pointing that that the current code allows for development at a greater height than what is being proposed in the draft plan. Mr. Chave agreed and added that the slope in the southwest quadrant is higher than any of the proposed buildings. Board Member Stewart suggested that staff make these two facts clear prior to opening the next public hearing.

Board Member Rubenkonig asked if the internal roadways within the four quadrants would be privately owned. Mr. Chave answered affirmatively. Board Member Rubenkonig asked if developers would be required to provide charging stations as part of a project. Mr. Chave referred to the Height Bonus Score Sheet and noted that a developer would receive 1 credit for providing an electric car charging station.

Board Member Tibbott asked if there are any areas in King or Snohomish County that have been developed similar to what is proposed in the Westgate Plan. He specifically asked how compatible local and regional uses would be in this area. The plan seems to anticipate a neighborhood center with a local flavor and pedestrian activity on a roadway that serves regional

transportation. He asked if the required parking would be adequate to cover both regional and local uses. Mr. Chave explained that the parking requirement is dictated by the use (commercial and residential), and the standard does not differentiate between regional and local uses. He agreed that the highway makes it difficult to think of the Westgate area as one unit, and the plan was modified to divide it into four quadrants with distinct characteristics. While people will not likely park in one quadrant and walk across the street to another, one purpose of the plan is to improve circulation within the quadrants so they are more pedestrian friendly and encourage people to park and walk to their various destinations.

Vice Chair Tibbott asked if it is anticipated that the residential developments will have gated and/or secured parking areas. Mr. Chave reminded the Board that, as currently proposed, there would be different parking standards for residential versus commercial uses, but it would be up to the developer to decide what works best. In recent years, developers have tended to separate the parking for residential and commercial uses, but there are some situations of shared parking, as well.

Board Member Duncan recommended that rather than making the plan too specific, the Board should focus their attention on the more significant issues. For example, instead of focusing on specific parking standards based on use, they should deal with the larger issue of traffic impacts. They should leave it up to developers to ensure a project is feasible, and this includes providing adequate parking to serve both residential and commercial uses. Mr. Chave pointed out that developers must still comply with the parking requirements, but he agreed that developers have a vested interest in making sure the residents are happy and the people patronizing the businesses can get in and out.

Board Member Lovell observed that the plan is intended to encourage mixed-use development with a residential component that is targeted towards less automobile use. He noted that SR-104 is a major public transportation thoroughfare and the plan should encourage transit use. The goal is to apply land use flexibility to the Westgate area, and it will be up to the market place to determine how the area will be redeveloped.

Board Member Robles noted that other countries have resolved conflicts between pedestrians and automobile traffic by providing connecting walkways. Board Member Lovell said that was the initial thought with the Westgate Plan, but there is no funding to provide overpasses from one side of the highway to the other.

Board Member Rubenkönig observed that the regional traffic that flows through the area is most likely to stop at the gas stations, fast food restaurants and espresso stands, all of which are drive-through businesses that do not require patrons to park. The plan supports a more neighborhood type of development at Westgate. Mr. Chave clarified that the Comprehensive Plan considers the Westgate area to be more of a community and neighborhood commercial center. Regional traffic does not typically stop at Westgate, so it would not significantly contribute to the parking demand. However, people from a wider community area come to Westgate to shop at the grocery and drug stores.

If the plan is intended to focus on local and community commercial development, Vice Chair Tibbott was suggested that Item C on Page 1 should be changed. It currently states that commercial development would serve a dual purpose by providing services and shopping for both local residents and regional traffic. While he supports allowing flexibility in the plan and leaving the details to developers, he cannot think of where blending local and regional commercial uses has worked especially well.

Board Member Stewart pointed that people come across on the ferry to shop at the PCC. If there are more businesses put in by creative developers, the area will become more unique and attract people from around the region. The plan should be realistic and allow developers to be creative, and parking must be part of their plans.

Mr. Chave agreed to update the draft plan as per the Board's comments in preparation for the public hearing, which is scheduled for May 28th.

REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF HIGHWAY 99 LAND USE AND ZONING OPPORTUNITIES

Mr. Chave reviewed that members of the Planning Board had an informal discussion with members of the Highway 99 Task Force on February 26th (Attachment 7) and a joint meeting with the City Council occurred on April 22nd (Attachment 8). Following the joint meeting, the City Council requested that the Planning Board review Highway 99 zoning and recommend potential changes. He recalled that during the Board's joint meeting with the City Council, it was apparent that Highway 99

is a high priority, and much of the discussion focused on what could be done short term versus items that would need more work. He referred to Attachment 1, which outlines simple changes to the CG and CG2 zones to streamline regulations and encourage mixed-use development. They include:

- **Dropping the 2nd story commercial requirement or scaling back the dimensional requirement for commercial space.** The current requirement of commercial space on both the 1st and 2nd floors of most development (the requirement would not apply to properties larger than 2 acres) in the CG and CG2 zones hampers the goal of enhancing Highway 99 for its development potential and encouraging residential uses. The City has received several inquiries from developers who are interested in constructing multi-family buildings along Highway 99. However, no one has pursued development after learning that two stories of commercial space are required.
- **Establish a consistent parking standard for all commercial development at Westgate regardless of use.** The parking standard in the current code varies depending on the type of commercial use. This is problematic because the number of required parking spaces for a development changes each time a use is changed. The current requirement creates an obstacle for businesses moving into new locations, yet it has very little impact on the supply of parking after a property has been developed.

Mr. Chave said longer-term opportunities include:

- **Create transit-oriented development nodes.** This would be particularly appropriate in areas near the Swift bus stops. However, a more detailed study and significant public outreach would be required before this option could be implemented.
- **Complete a Planned Action.** The planned action would look at a potentially larger area along Highway 99 to come up with a coordinated plan. Doing the environmental, traffic study and other regulatory work up front will make it easier for developers to know what the rules are and what they need to do. It streamlines the process and makes redevelopment more attractive.

Mr. Chave recommended the Board move forward with the easier items (commercial space and parking requirements) and then move into the longer-range items that will require more work. Board Member Lovell observed that not all Councilmembers want to encourage residential development on Highway 99. Some expressed a desire that development focus on commercial uses. He said he supports moving forward quickly with the simpler changes and gauging how the market place responds. However, the Board may be spinning its wheels by addressing the long-term solutions before there is meaningful interest from developers for Highway 99. He reminded the Board that both State and regional public transit is strained right now. Community Transit previously cut back on service and is working to restore some of what was lost. The Swift line has been very successful and there is no question that Sound Transit will construct light rail to Lynnwood. He recognized that development around the light rail stations could change, but he suggested the City would be well served to wait until Sound Transit has specified the exact locations for stops.

Vice Chair Tibbott asked if there would be any negative impacts associated with reducing or eliminating the requirement for commercial development. Board Member Lovell pointed out that eliminating the commercial requirement for the second floor would allow businesses to place at least one floor of residential development above their commercial space, and some property owners have expressed a desire to have this capability. Board Member Robles pointed out that the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) requirements are greater for commercial uses versus residential uses. The Board agreed that there would be few negative impacts associated with the change. Mr. Chave reminded the Board that the Highway 99 Task Force has expressed a desire for flexible standards that allow developers to introduce more residential uses, which will generate more demand for the businesses.

Mr. Chave asked the Board to provide direction on the options of eliminating the commercial requirement entirely and opening it to whatever kind of development happens or retaining a minimum level of commercial space. For example, rather than the vertical mixed-use model used in the downtown, the required commercial space could be spread throughout the development. He reminded the Board that properties along Highway 99 that are at least two acres require the equivalent of one story of commercial space, but the commercial space can be spread throughout the development.

Board Member Duncan pointed out that properties without good street frontage would not be appropriate locations for retail uses. He said he is leaning towards eliminating the commercial requirement altogether. Mr. Chave expressed his belief that eliminating the commercial requirement would result in very little risk that Highway 99 would suddenly change into a residential street. Vice Chair Tibbott pointed out that providing more opportunities for residential development on Highway 99 could result in fewer retail and commercial uses, which would equate to a loss of tax revenue for the City.

Board Member Stewart pointed out that although demand for apartments is strong right now, there will also be a need for commercial space on Highway 99. While she supports flexibility for developers to meet the market demand, it is important to keep in mind that demand will change over time. She suggested that it would be appropriate to require that buildings be constructed in such a way that allows for their adaptive reuse at some point in the future.

While she expressed support for moving forward with adjustments to the commercial space requirement and the parking standards, Board Member Rubenkönig said she does not want the Board to postpone their work on other opportunities such as transit-oriented development nodes. She pointed out that the Highway 99 Task Force has expressed support for this concept, which could be considered as part of the upcoming Transportation Master Plan update. Mr. Chave clarified that he was not suggesting that the long-term options be placed on the back burner, but he wanted to make it clear that they will take a longer period of time to implement.

Board Member Rubenkönig asked if transit-oriented development locations have been identified in Edmonds. Mr. Chave answered that the Comprehensive Plan identifies transit-oriented development locations within a ¼-mile walking radius around the Swift Stations.

Board Member Ellis asked if eliminating or altering the commercial requirement would have any impact on the existing car dealerships. Mr. Chave answered no. He emphasized that the change would not prohibit commercial buildings that are more than one story, but it would not require a second story of commercial space in order to place residential above.

Board Member Ellis agreed with Board Member Lovell's earlier statement that the City Council is not of one mind on this issue. Some want to make Highway 99 more residential friendly, and others want to leave it as commercial. Mr. Chave recommended that the draft amendment that is presented for public hearing include two options: one that would eliminate the commercial requirement entirely and another that would scale it back but not eliminate it. The Board agreed that would be appropriate.

Mr. Chave invited the Board to share thoughts regarding potential changes to modify and/or relax the existing parking standard. He reviewed that one option would be establish a standard, streamlined commercial parking requirement regardless of the type of use. Another option would be to include a provision that allows developers to conduct project-specific studies to determine the appropriate amount of parking for a project. He cautioned that a one-size-fits-all parking standard does not allow developers to address difficult situations.

Board Member Lovell pointed out that the Highway 99 Task Force has recommended a different setback standard for car dealerships to allow them to display their products. Mr. Chave explained that the current parking standard does not reflect the fact that cars sitting on a lot should be considered "display of merchandise" and not "parked." While car dealerships must provide parking spaces for customers, the parking spaces are not the same as displaying cars on lots. He suggested that clarifying this issue in the code would be useful.

Board Member Stewart said she supports the idea of including a provision that allows developers to present project-specific studies to support a proposal for fewer parking spaces. For example, fewer parking spaces may be needed based on the location of a development near a Swift station and given the trend in the younger generation to enjoy not having cars and living in smaller units. If a developer feels that is something the market would support, approval should be left to the discretion of staff.

Mr. Chave referred to the table on Page 6 of Attachment 1, which identifies a greater parking requirement for sites with street frontage adjoining any zone other than CG and CG2. He explained that a more relaxed and streamlined parking requirement would make sense for properties that focus on Highway 99 because there would be very little chance for spillover parking into the neighborhoods. However, a stricter standard might be appropriate for properties located on the periphery and closer

to neighborhoods. He specifically asked the Board to comment on whether or not they wanted to differentiate the parking standard based on a property's location.

Board Member Robles commented that it doesn't make sense to have different standards based on types of commercial uses. Mr. Chave agreed and said reviewing business license applications would be much easier using a standard parking requirement for all commercial uses. While they agreed that further discussion was needed regarding potential amendments to the parking standards, the Board indicated general support for modifying or relaxing the requirement as discussed by staff. They asked staff to prepare a draft ordinance that would create a standard parking requirement for all commercial uses, including a provision that would allow a developer to submit a site-specific study showing how fewer parking spaces would meet the anticipated demand.

Board Member Ellis requested more information about the Draft BR Zone (Attachment 2). Mr. Chave explained that the Highway 99 Activity Center actually calls for a mixture of different zoning. Although many of the sites are developed with medical uses, the current zoning is primarily multi-family. The original idea was to change the zoning from RM to BR to recognize the fact that the medical facilities are already there and eliminate the need for medical uses to obtain conditional use permits. While this concept needs further study, it should not be forgotten as a potential option.

Board Member Lovell requested more information creating a CG3 Zone (Attachment 3). Mr. Chave said the Highway 99 Task Force discussed the idea of creating a new CG3 zone, which would be applied to the back side of the CG zone where multi-family zoning is currently located. The CG3 zone would better address the issue of transition, too. He suggested the Board keep this concept in mind for future consideration.

Vice Chair Tibbott asked if the current code includes provisions relative to maintaining median or landscape strips between the parking lots and sidewalks. Mr. Chave answered that landscaping is addressed in a separate section of the code.

Board Member Rubenkönig asked how the public has responded to the concept of form-based codes. While form-based design is a shift away from traditional zoning, she suggested that it may not be necessary to specifically recognize proposed changes as form-based. Rather than being a driving force, form-based standards could be considered as one option when proposing design standard changes. Mr. Chave clarified that the City's general approach is not to do full form-based zoning, but instead use a blend of form-based and traditional zoning. The term form-based code has been used by the City for years, and they haven't heard a lot of push back on the concept. The apprehension is more closely related to the impacts created by more development.

Vice Chair Tibbott said that some people have requested more information about form-based codes, but as the Board has discussed zoning changes over the past three years, the phrase has become part of their vocabulary. Those who have been involved in the process have a clear understanding of its meaning. Mr. Chave recalled that at the last public hearing on Westgate, he provided a lengthy presentation about the form-based code approach, and he could do the same at the upcoming public hearing.

Mr. Chave left the meeting at 9:00 p.m.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Ms. Hope reviewed the extended agenda, noting that a public hearing on the Westgate Plan and form-based code is scheduled for May 28th, along with continued discussion on Highway 99 zoning. A discussion on the Development Code rewrite is also tentatively scheduled for May 28th. The June 11th meeting agenda will include a continued discussion on legal lot issues and potential code amendments in preparation for a public hearing that is tentatively scheduled for June 25th. The Board would also continue their discussions about the code rewrite and Highway 99 zoning at the two meetings in June.

Board Member Lovell requested an update on the Development Code rewrite project. Ms. Hope advised that staff plans to outline the proposed work plan in a workshop discussion with the Board in May or June. She reported that some work has been done to identify legal and procedural issues and where there are conflicts and overlaps in the code. However, there is still funding to hire a consultant to help with a bigger part of the update.

APPROVED

Vice Chair Tibbott pointed out that the Board has not yet scheduled its annual retreat. Ms. Hope suggested the Board schedule a retreat in June, which would provide an opportunity for the staff and Board to have a thorough discussion about the code rewrite project. The Board agreed that would be appropriate. Vice Chair Tibbott agreed to contact Chair Cloutier to discuss a date for the retreat, perhaps in place of one of the regular June meetings.

Board Member Stewart requested an update on the draft Shoreline Master Program (SMP). Ms. Hope said there is no firm date for when the City Council will take up their review of the SMP again. She noted that the primary staff person involved with the update has had other priorities to deal with, but expects to get back to the SMP later this year. Board Member Stewart asked if the Critical Areas Ordinance would also be revised in 2014. Ms. Hope answered that the process may get started in 2014, but it would not be completed until 2015. It was noted that the Planning Board completed its work on the SMP, and it is now before the City Council for review and approval.

Board Member Stewart thanked Ms. Hope for the planning newsletter that will be published by the City on a monthly basis.

DIRECTOR/PLANNING MANAGER REPORT

Ms. Hope reviewed her written report, highlighting the following items:

- Two new members, Carreen Rubenkönig and Daniel Robles, were appointed to the Planning Board.
- A consultant has been hired to help the City establish a mechanism for implementing the Strategic Action Plan (SAP). Currently, the consultant is interviewing representatives of the lead organizations and assessing the status of each of the objectives identified in the plan. The oversight group will meet periodically to provide advice and direction to the facilitator. Throughout the course of the year, there should be a strong sense of how the plan can continue to be implemented. Board Member Lovell announced that the first report by the facilitator to the City Council is scheduled for June 20th. He reported that he attended a meeting of the oversight group earlier in the day as a representative of the Planning Board. He originally indicated he would be unable to participate regularly on the oversight group. However, upon learning that there would only be a few more meetings, he agreed to continue as a member of the group to provide continuity.
- The Edmonds Historic Museum reopened on May 3rd, following an extensive renovation.
- The City Council approved a minor amendment to the interlocal agreement regarding the Alliance for Housing Affordability, which simply allows the City of Arlington to join more than a dozen other jurisdictions, including Edmonds, as a member.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Vice Chair Tibbott did not have any items to report.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

The Board welcomed Board Members Rubenkönig and Robles, and Board Members Robles and Rubenkönig thanked them for the opportunity to serve.

Board Member Stewart referred to information she emailed to Board Members regarding the Northwest Ecobuilding Guild's "Code Innovation Database Project." She explained that the database will serve as a resource for code officials, builders and others to share information about successfully permitted green and high-performance building innovations. The website provides access to case studies of how jurisdictions proceeded through the process and what changes happened as a result of their projects. Also on the website are examples of green codes and initiatives that are being developed on local, state and national levels. She said she would hone down the initiatives to those that pertain to jurisdictions in Oregon, Washington and Vancouver, British Columbia, which may contain language that helps the City as it rewrites its Development Code. One of the people orchestrating the website has offered to help the City, as well. She encouraged the Board Members to watch the

video, which provides an overview of what the program is about. She suggested the video might also be a candidate for the City's new "Green Resources Room."

Board Member Lovell recalled that he is the Board's Liaison with the Economic Development Commission (EDC), and he will attend their upcoming meeting on May 20th. He reminded the Board that the EDC is still interested in producing a white paper on Westgate. While the EDC is generally supportive of the Westgate Plan, they feel it is very important to provide graphic illustrations of how the area might be redeveloped based on the plan. However, he agreed with Mr. Chave and Board Member Duncan that it would be a mistake to show illustrations of make-believe buildings at Westgate.

ADJOURNMENT

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

APPROVED