

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
August 10, 2005**

Chair Young called the regular meeting of the Planning Board to order at 7:03 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Public Safety Complex, 250 – 5th Avenue North.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

James Young, Chair
Janice Freeman, Vice Chair

Virginia Cassutt
Judith Works
Don Henderson

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

John Dewhirst
Cary Guenther

Jim Crim

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Jennifer Gerend, Economic Development Director
Brian McIntosh, Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services Manager
Karin Noyes, Recorder

Board Members Dewhirst, Guenther and Crim were excused from the meeting.

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER WORKS MOVED TO APPROVE THE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF JULY 27, 2005 AS CORRECTED. BOARD MEMBER FREEMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BOARD MEMBER FREEMAN MOVED TO APPROVE THE REGULAR MEETING MINUTES OF JULY 13, 2005 AS CORRECTED. BOARD MEMBER WORKS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

No changes were made to the proposed agenda.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

There was no one in the audience who expressed a desire to address the Board during this portion of the meeting.

ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR'S UPDATE ON WORK PROGRAM FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT ELEMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Jennifer Gerend, Edmonds Economic Development Director, referred the Board to the quarterly report she provided in their packet prior to the meeting. She advised that this is the same report she provided for the City Council's review, as well. She advised that in her recent report to the City Council, she discussed her efforts to create a new Economic Development Element for the City's Comprehensive Plan. She said she believes the introductory statement in this element should outline the City's basic approach to economic development, explain why the City is working on economic development, and provide a summary of past economic development efforts that have taken place in the City. She said it would also be important to identify who the stakeholders are, what other cities in the region are doing to encourage economic development, and what the current economic development trends are.

Ms. Gerend advised that she is currently working to collect data and analyze the local economy. She said she plans to compare her data with the information provided in the consultant studies that have been completed for the City in the recent past. In addition, she said she has ordered new data to identify where the new employers are located in the City and where the revenues are coming from. She would also review the town center and regional plans that have been created by surrounding jurisdictions. Ms. Gerend said another important part of the Economic Development Element of the Comprehensive Plan is a section that defines the City's current values, goals, policies and services offered.

Ms. Gerend advised that as she reviewed economic development elements from other cities in the region, she noted that they range significantly in size. She said she is currently working to analyze all of the data she has collected to date, looking at what has been done in the past and what the current trends are. In addition, she said she would work with the local stakeholders. She plans to hold a stakeholders meeting in October, at which she would review the findings of her data compilation. The feedback obtained from the stakeholders meeting would be forwarded to the City Council in October or November. Depending on the City Council's feedback, she plans to do the bulk of the writing on the element in November and December. Her goal is to have the element to the Board for review in the early spring, with adoption by the City Council following soon after.

Board Member Freeman inquired if, in addition to representatives from groups such as the Chamber of Commerce and the Downtown Merchants Association, local property owners would be invited to attend the stakeholders meeting, too. Ms. Gerend answered affirmatively and pointed out that the stakeholders meeting would be advertised openly to all stakeholders in Edmonds.

Chair Young summarized that Ms. Gerend plans to schedule a public hearing on the Economic Development Element of the Comprehensive Plan sometime in early 2006, but she would provide periodic updates to the Board between now and the public hearing.

Next, Ms. Gerend referred the Board to the interim ordinance that was recently approved by the City Council, which prohibits storage facilities as a permitted use and secondary use in the CG and CG2 zones. She said she recommended approval of the interim ordinance at the request of the Highway 99 Task Force who felt the City should limit certain uses on Highway 99 that do not generate significant revenues for the City but occupy a large amount of land. She pointed out that the Planning Board has not had the opportunity to study the Highway 99 issue, and it was felt that continuing to allow these outright uses would hinder other possible retail and commercial development that would generate greater revenues for the City.

Board Member Works thanked Ms. Gerend for sending each of the Board Members a copy of her quarterly Economic Development Report.

PARKS, RECREATION & CULTURAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT REPORT

Brian McIntosh, Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services Manager, reported that the department has completed its reorganization with staffing changes that include managers for Recreation (Renee McRae), Cultural Services (Frances Chapin) and Parks Maintenance (Rich Lindsay). In addition, two new Recreational Coordinators (Tammy Bayliss and Todd Cort) were added to the department's staff.

APPROVED

Mr. McIntosh reported on the following projects and programs:

- **Skate Park:** The Greenbusch Group of Seattle has been hired to perform an acoustical analysis of noise levels associated with both modular and in-ground skate parks. They will create a computer model of the Civic Field site and the surrounding community to predict the noise exposure from the skate park activity. The study and any proposed mitigation treatments would be completed by early September, and the results would be presented to the Board for review.

Board Member Works asked if staff has determined that the skate park would be constructed at the Civic Field. Mr. McIntosh answered that the proposal is to locate the facility at the Civic Field, and the work group is focusing the noise study on this site. However, no site decision has been finalized and the study could be applied to different locations in the City, as well.

- **264 Beach Place:** Early this year, the City acquired this property adjacent to Olympic Beach Park, further increasing the public's access to the waterfront. Waterfront acquisition remains a high priority as identified in the City's and Parks & Recreation Comprehensive Plans. To date, property and hazardous materials surveys have been completed. Abatement, demolition and restoration work should be completed by the end of September.
- **Marine Beach Park:** Following emergency restoration of the Willow Creek stormwater outfall pipe under the park's north parking lot last fall and replacement of the outfall discharge line in the winter, work began on planned renovations at this park. These renovations included a new irrigation system, turf replacement, and new parking on both the north and south parking lots. The project was completed and the park reopened on May 27th. Access to the off-leash area at south Marina Beach Park was only minimally impacted during the closure of north Marina Beach Park.

Board Member Freeman inquired regarding the current parking situation at Marina Beach Park. Mr. McIntosh answered that parking at the park is limited, particularly on sunny days. By repaving and changing the configuration in the south parking lot, the City was able to provide five additional spaces, which helped some. The City does not have any plans to provide shuttle service to the park, nor do they have space to expand the parking areas. Instead, they encourage people to park anywhere on the waterfront and then walk to Marina Beach Park via the boardwalk.

- **Edmonds Memorial Cemetery Columbarium:** Advertising for bids for this project is scheduled to take place in mid September, with award of contract in October. The Edmonds Cemetery Board completed positive feasibility and performance studies that reflect the community need and revenue benefits of the cemetery operations. Fees from the cemetery sales and services help offset annual costs of operations. The goal of the Board is to ensure a continue funding source to provide for the operation and maintenance of the Edmonds Memorial Cemetery. In addition, the Cemetery Board has initiated the potential reclamation of over 1,100 gravesites that have been abandoned and whose owners cannot be found. The end of a five-year notification process is December 31st of this year. Starting in January, the Board plans to begin the legal preparations to reclaim the gravesites.

Board Member Freeman asked what the Cemetery Board would do if an individual were to come forward to claim a gravesite after the legal notification process had expired. Mr. McIntosh said the Cemetery Board plans to work with any individual who steps forward at any time.

- **Edmonds Streetscape Plan:** Following the recent City planning efforts in the downtown/waterfront area and Highway 99, the initial 2002 Urban Design in Public Spaces and Street Tree Plan (now referred to as the Edmonds Streetscape Plan) would be updated to include elements of these studies. The Streetscape Plan would be expanded to provide an overall picture for the downtown/waterfront area, key arterials, and feeder streets throughout the City. The goal is to highlight and focus on improvements and requirements in specific target area and to establish priorities. Following a Request for Qualifications, two consultants were interviewed and Crea Affiliates was selected. The contract goes before the City Council for review and approval in late August.
- **Edmonds Interurban Trail Project:** Major delays have resurfaced in determining rights-of-way in this old interurban train corridor going back many generations. Staff hoped these property acquisition issues could be solved readily, but

APPROVED

the ability to determine clear ownership becomes more complicated. Staff and consultants are meeting within the week to study alternatives.

Chair Young asked for more information regarding the rights-of-way problems. Mr. McIntosh said some of the property rights go back three or four generations, and it has been difficult to locate the original owners. In addition, there seems to be some overlaps between the PUD, private and old train rights-of-way. Chair Young expressed his belief that bicycle trails are difficult to construct in the metropolitan area because of the situation regarding rights-of-way. Mr. McIntosh pointed out that this Interurban Trail would run for nearly a mile and includes rights-of-way that are currently owned by numerous people.

- **Old Woodway Elementary:** On June 7th Mayor Haakenson updated the City Council on the status of this eleven-acre former school site and efforts by the Mayor and staff to ensure that any sale and development of the site include a portion to be set aside for parkland. A Council discussion followed regarding many topics, but centered on the desire to pursue the possibility of purchasing the entire park, not just a portion of it. Staff was directed to submit a letter of intent to the Edmonds School District for the entire 11 acres and develop a 5-year work plan for recovery, bond financing, and grant funding to complete the purchase. The Council further requested staff to report on maintenance costs for all or part of the site, cost of demolition of the old school buildings, development costs and possible conflicts in financing development, and financing scenarios. At the June 28th Council meeting, staff presented their report and answered questions from the Council. The Council voted unanimously to direct staff to prepare a first right of refusal and continue negotiations with the District for purchase of the full school site.

Board Member Freeman asked if acquisition of this site would have an impact on the City's ability to purchase other sites, such as waterfront properties. Mr. McIntosh explained that the old Woodway High School site is owned and would continue to be owned by the School District. Because of Department of Natural Resource policies, this site can only be used for educational or recreational uses. However, the Old Woodway Elementary site is available for purchase, and the District has committed to sell the property to the highest bidder. The City has decided to pursue the purchase of this property, so they would need to be the highest bidder in order to do so. He said this property acquisition would have an impact on the City's ability to purchase properties in the future, but the City Council has indicated they are willing to take this risk because the City is close to build out and there is not a lot of land available for park space.

- **Old Woodway High School:** Since the new Edmonds/Woodway High School was completed in 1998, athletic associations interested in using the old Woodway High School site have approached the Edmonds School District. Most have recognized that it is an underutilized facility with much potential. District officials initiated a meeting in May with interested user groups including Pacific League, Northwest Nationals Soccer, Sno-King Young Club, and King's High School, as well as City, School District and County officials to gauge the interest and brainstorm ideas. The District's architect for the new Lynnwood High School has developed conceptual drawings and the group would meet in the near future to discuss the concepts again, as well as potential funding sources.

Chair Young expressed that getting the potential user groups together for a meeting was a great idea. He asked if staff has considered the possibility of tying the City's plans for this site in with the Economic Development element that is being created for the Comprehensive Plan. For example, he pointed out that a softball league as a tenant could provide a significant benefit to the City's economy. He asked that Mr. McIntosh keep the Board apprised of this situation since some of the groups have money available to develop this property. Mr. McIntosh agreed that a developer of this site could help the City's economy, depending on how the facilities are marketed and used. The City staff would also consider opportunities for other sports such as lacrosse and rugby. When the site is developed, the goal is to accommodate many different uses.

- **Public Art:** The Arts Commission implemented the Public Art Maintenance Plan developed in 2004, which prioritizes the use of some of the Percent for Art funds to maintain artwork in the City's collection. The original Percent for the Art purchase by the City is a stained glass scene, which was repaired at the end of 2004 and reinstalled in 2005 in the Anderson Center in a new case above the main gallery. The marble sculpture "Snowy Owl" was resurfaced and three major bronze sculptures (Vision, Beach Launch and Locals) were professionally cleaned and re-waxed in July. Artist

Nik Meisel was selected in June 2005, through the Public Art Process, to recycle copper from the old roundabout fountain and create a new sculpture for the south wall of City Hall. Installation is planned for the fall. In addition, the Arts Commission Public Art Committee and staff are working with the City's Economic Development Director to develop design concepts for a Transportation Enhancement Grant for the International District on Highway 99. The Arts Commission has budgeted \$5,000 in 2006 towards a public art piece as part of that enhancement project.

Board Member Works asked if the staff has considered opportunities for public art to be located along the Arts Corridor as part of the new Edmonds Streetscape Plan. Mr. McIntosh answered affirmatively.

- **Band Shell at City Park:** The Rotary Club of Edmonds Daybreakers is working on this project to commemorate the Rotary Centennial. They have completed design work and are currently filing for the appropriate City permits. Construction of the foundation, pad, and utility connections are scheduled to be completed this fall, with the band shell structure to be completed in the spring of 2006 in time for the Summer Concert Series. The project would be a wonderful addition to the park.
- **Edmonds Center for the Arts:** The Edmonds Public Facilities District is moving forward with construction financing, and construction is scheduled to begin on September 16, 2005. A groundbreaking event would be held in the fall. The Board has approved a national search for an executive director, which will be advertised late this month. The capital campaign would resume once construction is underway and the new executive director would provide staff support to the campaign volunteers.
- **Anderson Center FEMA Matching Grant:** A \$1 million seismic upgrade is the final project for the Anderson Center renovation that started four years ago. The City's Public Works Department has applied for a 75 percent matching grant from FEMA. Early indications are that the application has ranked high, and they are optimistic that it would be awarded in the near future.
- **Senior Center:** A 2005 CDBG/HUD Grant of \$200,000 for fire detection system improvements and construction of a new entry vestibule and walkway canopy was awarded on May 10, 2005. It is anticipated that this work would be undertaken in 2006.
- **Edmonds Summer Day Camp:** This is an 8-week program where campers learn new ways to recreate traditional activities such as tie-dye, lanyards and spud. Campers received a surprise visit from Governor Gregoire, participated in a hoe down, and raised over \$1,000 for the Youth Scholarship Fund. The camp ends on Friday, August 19th.
- **Yost Pool:** The pool opened for the season on Memorial Day Weekend. It was off to a slow start due to the weather, but it is a popular destination now that the temperatures have increased. This year's swim team is at a maximum number of 185 swimmers. The pool closes on August 28th.

Board Member Freeman asked if the pool operations have been able to pay for themselves this year. Mr. McIntosh answered that this would be difficult to determine before the end of the summer season, but the revenues are down this year. He said it is important to recognize that not only is good weather important, there are so many recreational opportunities available for kids in the summer that they are not getting the numbers they used to.

- **Concerts:** The Edmonds Arts Commission's Family Concerts at the Frances Anderson Center Amphitheater have finished for the year, and the Sunday Summer Concerts at City Park continue to be popular. The Sunday Concert Series ends on August 21st.
- **Fall CRAZE:** The Fall CRAZE book is available to the public and includes an array of programs for all ages. Some of the upcoming events include:
 - The Ranger-Naturalists are presenting an interpretive program called **A Moonlight Beach Adventure**. This event is scheduled for September 10th at Marina Beach Park.

APPROVED

- The **Edmonds Watershed Fun Fair** is scheduled for September 24th. This annual event is held at Yost Park.
- The Edmonds Arts Commission will present the 20th Annual **Write on the Sound Writers' Conference** on October 1st and 2nd.
- The City is encouraging families to walk together at the Edmonds segment of the **Walk Across Washington 2005**. City Park is the start of this three-mile walk that is scheduled for October 14th.

FURTHER DISCUSSION ON POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS TO THE EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE ESTABLISHING ZONES AND OVERLAY DISTRICTS INTENDED TO IMPLEMENT THE DOWNTOWN WATERFRONT COMPONENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (FILE NUMBER CDC-05-80)

Mr. Chave reported that the City Council updated its recommendation on the downtown plan implementation program during their meeting on July 26th, at which time they created a new set of maps for the Board to consider. He noted that the configuration of the retail core area is a little smaller on the new map, and the area that was at one point called the “conservation district” has now been relabeled as the “arts corridor.” Other than those two changes, he said the new maps are very similar to those approved previously by the City Council.

Mr. Chave referred the Board to the City Council minutes of July 26th. He advised that while the City Council discussed some changes from their June 14th conclusions, some of the recent changes they have in mind would need to be inferred, since they were not clearly stated. He said that although the City Council talked about the “arts corridor” and its building heights, they did not talk specifically about the strip of lots fronting on 5th Avenue North, directly across from the Public Safety Complex. The Board must consider whether these lots should have a 25-foot height limit, or be consistent with the adjacent “arts corridor” and allow up to 30 feet in height if a development resembles single family construction. Secondly, Mr. Chave said that although the Council changed portions of the retail core back to mixed commercial, they did not specifically talk about whether building heights for this “reclaimed” area should be set at 33 feet like the other mixed commercial areas. The Board must sort this issue out as part of their review and recommendation.

Mr. Chave suggested that perhaps the simplest approach would be for the Board to deal with height and zoning as two separate issues. If they try to combine the two, the issue could get very complicated because the zoning map and the height map do not necessarily match each other. He pointed out that, initially, the boundary lines on the zoning and height maps were significantly different, but the new maps created by the City Council are much closer.

Chair Young said he is still not clear about what the Board is being asked to reconsider. Mr. Chave said the Board should review the City Council’s discussion regarding the implementation of the Downtown Waterfront Plan, as well as the maps they provided. The Planning Board will have an opportunity to hold additional public hearings and make a recommendation to the City Council. He emphasized that the Board’s recommendation could end up being very different than the City Council’s discussion. He pointed out that the Board should keep in mind that the City Council’s vote on this issue was split 4 to 3. He summarized that the Board has been charged with measuring the actual Downtown Waterfront Plan that was adopted as part of the City’s Comprehensive Plan against the City Council’s discussion regarding height and zoning.

Chair Young expressed his concern that this process has gone on for such a long time that the discussions are starting to drift away from what the Comprehensive Plan specified for the downtown area. He said that from his perspective, this makes further deliberations a little problematic. He suggested that it would be helpful if staff could prepare a simple matrix identifying the Comprehensive Plan goals, policies and objectives for the downtown area, as well as some of the other issues the Board must consider. Board Member Henderson concurred that a matrix would help the Board contrast the latest version from the City Council with the Comprehensive Plan goals and policies that were just adopted. The remainder of the Board agreed.

Board Member Freeman said Board Member Crim previously suggested that it would be helpful to define the terms that are used in the language so that the Board can make sure everyone is talking about the same thing. For example, the term “story” can have different meanings, depending on whom you are talking to. She said it is important to have the terms

clearly defined before they start identifying recommended heights and zones. She said Board Member Crim also suggested that the Board form small subcommittees to discuss the various issues and terms. Board Member Henderson agreed that the definitions for many of the terms are unclear, and the Board is a long way from being able to draft a code that answers all of the concerns. Mr. Chave suggested that Board members email staff a list of the terms and issues they would like staff to clarify. Then staff could compile the comments into a list for the Board to review. At the first meeting in September, the Board could break into small groups to tackle the various issues. Board Member Cassutt suggested that once a term has been clearly defined, this same term and definition should be used consistently in the Downtown Waterfront Plan and any future discussions that take place. Board Member Freeman agreed.

Board Member Works suggested that the term “single-family appearance” should be defined. She said she would also like a clear interpretation from the City Attorney and staff regarding what constitutes a “taking.” She noted that several different people who own property in the area that is now being identified as the “arts corridor” used this term. Mr. Chave said some property owners also used this term during the public hearing regarding the retail only zones.

Board Member Freeman pointed out that the Board has not even discussed the concept of using setbacks as a method of achieving space to accommodate 15-foot wide sidewalks in the downtown.

Board Member Works referred to Page 7 of the July 27th City Council Meeting Minutes. She pointed out that Mr. Clements informed the City Council that he would develop a detailed report on where the City stands economically and that the report would be presented to both the Planning Board and the City Council. Mr. Chave said he is not sure what report Mr. Clements was referring to, but he would check to see if and when any new information would be available for the Board’s review.

FURTHER REVIEW AND DISCUSSION OF DEFINITION OF “SETBACK” AND CLARIFICATION OF WHAT STRUCTURES/BUILDINGS COULD BE PLACED IN SETBACKS (FILE NUMBER CDC-05-5)

Mr. Chave advised that staff has been considering the best way to construct language related to setbacks. The City’s current approach is to define how each type or set of structures relates to setbacks. For example, is a particularly structure allowed in setbacks or not, and what are the specific standards or regulations that apply. This method leads to confusion. Another option would be to define performance standards and allow any structures within setbacks so long as they conform to the performance standards. For example, the code could define standards for height or square footage of ground coverage for structures within setbacks, and as long as the standards are met, the structure could be located in the setback. With this option, performance standards could be drafted to establish a consistent set of standards that would apply to most structures and uses that occur in single-family zones without trying to provide standards for each use or structure defined in the code.

Mr. Chave summarized that the broad category performance standard approach would be easier to apply, but the individual restriction approach would allow the City to tailor specific rules for uses or structures within a setback to consider the specific impacts of each. However, this approach could become very elaborate and cumbersome to formulate all of the rules. He pointed out that the draft code language would be different, depending on the approach the Board wants to take.

Board Member Works asked if the performance standard approach would be more consistent with the City’s current code. Mr. Chave said this approach would be the easiest to create, but it would still be difficult to come up with categories for each type of use or structure. If the Board wants to use the performance standard approach, the language should be crafted so that a significant number of use and structure types are captured. The key is to figure out how the different uses and structures are both alike and different, and then group them into categories. He advised that when creating performance standards, the Board should consider issues such as height, bulk, lot coverage, noise, etc.

Board Member Works asked if other jurisdictions in the area use the performance standard approach for setbacks. Mr. Chave said he has not seen performance standards specifically used for setbacks, but some jurisdictions use performance standards for much of their zoning code. He said he would check to see if any of them have applied the performance standard approach to their setback regulations.

Board Member Freeman asked Mr. Chave to describe the purpose of a setback requirement. She felt this would help the Board gain a clear understanding of what they are trying to achieve. Mr. Chave explained that setback requirements provide some assurance to adjacent property owners that buildings and structures would be set back from the property line by a certain amount. Board Member Freeman asked if safety could also be considered a reason for setback requirements. Mr. Chave answered affirmatively and said that is why more setback is required on the street side. He further explained that another purpose for the setback requirements is to provide consistency in neighborhoods by requiring that all structures be set back a certain amount from the street. However, he emphasized that setback requirements are more related to air and light. He said that, zoning, in its inception, was a lot about trying to protect the character and aesthetic quality of the neighborhoods, and setback requirements became part of this effort.

Chair Young asked if impervious surface would be addressed as part of the Board's review of the setback requirements. Mr. Chave answered that impervious surfaces are currently dealt with holistically on single-family lots. When projects are reviewed, City staff considers the amount of impervious surface and also determines if there is sufficient stormwater retention on the site. He said he could ask the Engineering Department to provide the Board with more information regarding this issue. He said that, in some jurisdictions, lot coverage is calculated in part by impervious surface, but the City only counts the structure as part of the total lot coverage. Chair Young pointed to the critical areas requirements and suggested that impervious surfaces should probably be addressed as part of the setback issue. He asked that the Engineering Department provide more information regarding impervious surfaces in single-family zones and how one property owner could impact an adjacent property owner by creating more impervious surface on a lot.

Board Member Henderson said he likes the concept of using the performance standard approach, but he can think of a number of uses and structures that would not really fit in this concept. He asked how the City would deal with these. Mr. Chave explained that the Board should first try to come up with categories and then create performance standards for each category. Next, an exception could be provided to address those uses and structures that do not fit in any of the categories. He said the Board might find that there are so many exceptions that the performance standard approach is not really feasible, but it is still probably a better approach to start with.

Mr. Chave said another reason for the setback requirements is to provide some predictability of corridors for view. Board Member Freeman said another issue that must be considered when discussing the setback requirements is privacy. She suggested that perhaps there should be different setback standards in the buildable areas as opposed to the non-buildable areas. Mr. Chave said that a typical property has one street, two side and one rear setback. However, when lots do not fit this pattern, the issue becomes less clear. A corner lot has two street setbacks and two side setbacks, but no rear setback. If a property has no frontage on a street, it would be considered to have all side setbacks. These different configurations can result in situations where one person's side setback is next to another person's rear setback, so the rules would be different for each side of the property line.

Board Member Freeman expressed her opinion that there should be no distinction between temporary and permanent structures in the setback areas. Mr. Chave said the Code Enforcement Officer agrees that no distinction should be made. Board Member Henderson said the Board could also discuss the impact of allowing recreational vehicles to be parked within the setback areas.

Board Member Freeman asked if it would be legal for the City to allow only the adjacent neighbors to complain about something in the setback along their property line. Mr. Chave said he would seek input from the City Attorney about whether or not it would be legal to restrict who could complain about something in the setback areas.

The Board agreed that they would use the performance standard approach first. In addition, they asked that staff provide feedback from the Engineering Department regarding how much impervious surface is allowed on single-family lots and how the City manages impervious surfaces.

UPDATE ON DRAFT CODE AMENDMENTS FOR TITLE 20 ECDC – REVIEW PROCEDURES FOR STAFF, HEARING EXAMINER, PLANNING BOARD AND CITY COUNCIL DECISIONS (FILE NUMBER CDC-05-15)

APPROVED

Mr. Chave reported that staff is hoping to have preliminary draft language for this amendment available for the Board's review at their first meeting in September.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Mr. Chave said staff would prepare a new extended agenda for the remainder of 2005, which would include all of the items currently on the Board's work plan. Chair Young noted that there are a lot of serious activities going on right now and the Board is responsible for reviewing a number of plans and policies.

Mr. Chave reminded the Board that a public hearing regarding the definition of "family" is scheduled on the Board's September 14th agenda. He further advised that the Streetscape Plan and the Economic Development Plan are on the same schedule and draft language should be completed by January. That means the Board would be reviewing the documents and holding public hearings early in 2006.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT

Mr. Chave reported that the City received their LIDAR maps, which identify the contours of the City. He explained that the map would be used as a guide to give people an idea of what is likely to be found on their property. However, property owners would always be allowed to conduct a site-specific survey, which would take precedent over what the LIDAR data indicates. The data is intended to be a public information tool for both the property owners and staff. It is part of the GIS system so it can be overlaid on zoning and aerial maps. In addition, the City has the capability of doing three-dimensional survey modeling for the entire City.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Young referred to an article in *THE SEATTLE TIMES* regarding the development that has occurred in downtown Vancouver. Consultants for the City of Vancouver reached the same consensus as Mr. Hinshaw, the City's design consultant. He recalled Mr. Hinshaw's conclusion that the height of a building has little to do with the quality of the pedestrian experience. Chair Young said the Board has an opportunity to listen to what the experts are saying and make a recommendation that would benefit the City of Edmonds. He agreed with Mr. Hinshaw that the issue is all about how the downtown area is designed. Board Member Cassutt pointed out that Vancouver's plan also appealed to families by providing amenities for children.

Board Member Freeman pointed out that this same article indicated that parks and services should be located within a five-minute walking distance from residential buildings. She said it is important that the Board talk about how the City could place people in residential units within five to fifteen minutes of the parks, etc.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no additional comments provided during this portion of the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

APPROVED