

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
February 8, 2006**

Chair Freeman 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

Janice Freeman, Chair
John Dewhirst, Vice Chair
Jim Young
Virginia Cassutt
Judith Works
Cary Guenther

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Dave Gebert, City Engineer
Don Fiene, Assistant City Engineer
Noel Miller, Public Works Director
Karin Noyes, Recorder

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Jim Crim
Don Henderson

Board Members Crim and Henderson were excused from the meeting.

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

VICE CHAIR DEWHIRST MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 25, 2006 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER CASSUTT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

No changes were made to the agenda.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

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

REPORT ON SIX-YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (CIP)

Don Fiene, Assistant City Engineer, advised that the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is intended to be a planning tool and is a requirement of the Growth Management Act (GMA). He said the CIP provides a spreadsheet for the nine different funds. He provided an illustration of what a typical spreadsheet looks like and noted that each one contains information about projects and the years they are to be implemented. It also identifies the intended revenues that would be used to pay for them.

Mr. Fiene reported that a Project Description Book was prepared to provide a detailed description of each of the major projects identified in the nine funds. It identifies the projected cost of each, as well as the benefit and rationale and schedule. He provided an example of what a typical project description looks like and noted that the Project Description Book would be accessible via the City's website later in the year.

Mr. Fiene reviewed each of the funds as follows:

- **Fund 112 – Transportation Projects:** Mr. Fiene explained that this fund is for projects such as street overlays and other road improvements like widening, traffic signals, road stabilization, traffic calming, and bicycle ways and walkways. The two major projects associated with this fund include the 220th Street Project where most of the funding has come from grants and low-interest loans and the 100th Avenue Roadway Stabilization Project, which is being funded by a low-interest public trust fund loan.

Mr. Fiene displayed a pie chart to illustrate the impact of Initiative 776 on Fund 112. He pointed out that the City lost 46 percent of their recurring revenues for transportation projects, which equates to about \$380,000 in 2006. Now there is a significant funding gap that must be taken care of, and the City is currently falling behind on implementing the goals and objectives identified in the Transportation Plan.

Mr. Fiene referred to the "Needs Chart," which was created by engineering staff to illustrate the minimum funding necessary for the City to implement their Comprehensive Plan goals and objectives as identified in the Transportation Plan. He reviewed that by the year 2009, the City's revenue needs for Fund 112 would be as follows:

- \$800,000 for a 30-year overlay cycle
- \$145,000 for walkway and sidewalk improvements, not including those identified in the Parks Plan
- \$295,000 for signals and intersection improvements
- \$770,000 for roadway capacity projects
- \$185,000 for roadway slope stabilization projects
- \$60,000 for miscellaneous projects.

Mr. Fiene explained that at the 2005 City Council Retreat, the engineering staff was tasked with coming up with a financing plan to meet the City's future needs. As a result of this effort, the City Council did adopt a traffic impact fee program and they increased their utility transfers as of 2005. He noted that while the City does receive transfer funds from the Edmonds Water and Sewer District, they do not receive any from the Olympic View Water and Sewer District.

Board Member Young asked if the Olympic View Water and Sewer District pays to fix the streets that they tear up when new utility lines are laid. Mr. Fiene explained that many areas served by the Olympic View Water and Sewer District are within the unincorporated part of Snohomish County, and they typically are only responsible to patch the roads after they lay a line. In the past, the City of Edmonds has let the patchwork settle a year before doing an overlay on the road. He noted that Olympic View Water District does pay a franchise fee into the City's General Fund, but this money is not transferred into the City's Transportation Fund. He pointed out that in 2005, the engineering staff recommended to the City Council that money from the franchise fees be transferred into the Transportation Fund, but this recommendation was not included as an option in the Mayor's submission package to the City Council. He noted that the City collects about \$120,000 in franchise fees per year from the Olympic View Water and Sewer District, and approximately \$180,000 of the fees collected from the Edmonds Water and Sewer District are transferred to Fund 112.

Chair Freeman suggested that it would be helpful for staff to identify the total amount of funding necessary in 2009 for the City meet the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan as required by GMA. She also asked that staff identify the amount of funding they anticipate receiving from grants, etc. Dave Gebert, City Engineer, agreed that staff should provide a total figure. He advised that at the 2004 City Council Retreat, engineering staff identified a need for additional revenue of \$750,000 in Fund 112 in order to implement a minimally adequate program. By 2009, this need would be significantly greater.

Mr. Fiene reported that in 2005, the City Council decided to defer the remainder of the engineering staff's proposal for Fund 112. Instead, they decided to wait for a solution from the State Legislature. Board Member Young asked how the City Council expected the State Legislature to address the problem. Mr. Fiene answered that one idea is to increase the real estate excise tax (REET), which is popular with builders but not with real estate agents. He noted that REET is already increasing at a greater rate than inflation, so he does not expect the concept to be popular with the citizens. Board Member Young agreed and pointed out that increasing the real estate excise tax does not appear to be a significant item on the Legislature's agenda in 2006.

Vice Chair Dewhirst asked if staff has considered a recommendation that would delete projects from Fund 112 to bring the total cost down. Mr. Fiene answered that staff plans to continue to identify all projects on the CIP, but many have had to be pushed out to a later date. He noted that signal projects, roadway capacity projects, overlay projects and other major transportation projects have had to be pushed out. He specifically expressed concern that the City's overlay program is currently on a 70-year cycle rather than the appropriate 30-year cycle.

Mr. Fiene pointed out that revenue from the gas tax does not increase with inflation. He also pointed out that the new gas tax increase provides an additional \$165,000 for transportation projects each year. The City Council has established a policy that directs 1/3 of this revenue to transportation capital projects and 2/3 to the operations and maintenance budget. The additional \$56,000 that comes into Fund 112 is only enough to fund about 1/3 of a mile of overlay per year.

Mr. Fiene advised that at the 2005 City Council Retreat, the Public Works Director pointed out that the City is falling behind their Comprehensive Plan goals and objectives as they relate to operations and maintenance. He suggested an increase in utility transfers, and this was approved by the City Council in 2005. He said staff believes the utility funds are paying their fair share of street overlay projects. He also advised that a traffic mitigation fee was also implemented in 2005; now the mitigation fee and utility transfers make up about 45 percent of the revenues in Fund 112. Board Member Young pointed out that traffic mitigation fees are limited and cannot be used as general revenue for Fund 112. Projects funded by mitigation fees must have some nexus to those who pay the fee. Mr. Gebert agreed and pointed out that all of the traffic mitigation fees collected in 2006 would be used to fund the 220th Street Project.

Board Member Works noted that a number of grants and loans are identified on the Fund 112 spreadsheet. She asked how sure staff is that the City would be able to obtain this funding. Mr. Fiene responded that the engineering staff has had good success in securing grants for Fund 112, and the previous traffic engineer was very successful in this effort. He explained that if projects are dependent upon grant funding that is not received, they would be pushed out to future years. He noted that many of the City's major projects are dependent upon grant funding, such as walkway projects that link neighborhoods to schools. For these projects, staff is optimistic about their ability to obtain grant funding. However, grant funding is more difficult to obtain for major projects such as road stabilization and street overlays.

Board Member Works requested that staff identify the legal consequences of the City deferring street overlay projects. Mr. Fiene answered that if overlay work is postponed for too long and streets fall apart, it could cost the City a substantial amount of money to rebuild them. Also, the number of lawsuits against the City could increase as a result of potholes forming on City roadways. Noel Miller, Public Works Director, added that the City does not currently receive a lot of claims filed against them as a result of road conditions. However, if they do not keep up on road maintenance, the number of claims could increase.

Board Member Works suggested that at the public hearing on the CIP, it would be helpful for the engineering staff to portray the potential costs associated with not doing street overlays on a reasonable cycle. Mr. Fiene answered that staff could provide an estimated cost for rebuilding a roadway versus a simple overlay. Board Member Works emphasized the importance of portraying these costs so that everyone (citizens and City Council) has a clear understanding of the consequences. Mr. Miller pointed out that while the additional funding from the gas tax increase would allow them to do more crack sealing and road repair, this would only forestall the inevitable results of not having a permanent solution to the problem.

Board Member Young asked how much of the Public Works Operation and Maintenance Budget is devoted to repairing potholes. Mr. Miller answered that about 15 percent of the budget is allocated to patching the roadways. In comparison,

he noted that about 25 percent of the budget is allocated for street lighting. He pointed out that, until a few years ago, Edmonds did a good job of resurfacing their streets, with the exception of cul-de-sacs and local neighborhood streets, so it would take a while for the streets to deteriorate into a huge problem. However, the City would still have to do a significant amount of catch up work.

Board Member Young said it would be helpful for staff to provide information regarding the current condition of City streets. Mr. Miller said the City is required to provide information to the State regarding the condition of all primary arterials. He suggested that the condition of approximately 25 percent of the streets in Edmonds would likely be classified as poor. Prior to the public hearing, the Board requested that staff provide a chart showing the percentage of streets of each type that would fall into the poor category.

Vice Chair Dewhirst pointed out that the situation is getting progressively worse each year, so perhaps the City should consider the option of using LID's to improve transportation in various parts of the community. Mr. Fiene said the City did offer an LID as a strategy for funding a sidewalk improvement project in the Meadowdale area, but the concept was never utilized. He pointed out that LID's require the City to show the cost/benefit of a project. Vice Chair Dewhirst suggested that, rather than utilizing the LID concept as a citywide solution, it could be used for projects in small sections of the City where there is a direct relationship to the citizens who would be paying the fees. Mr. Fiene said staff would be open to the concept, but it would require citizen involvement and public support. Vice Chair Dewhirst agreed but pointed out that the City must start the ball rolling by identifying the needs, holding neighborhood meetings, etc. He said he recognizes that this concept would take a lot of work to implement, but the City doesn't really have other options.

Mr. Gebert advised that the LID concept was included in the bundle of funding options that was prepared by the engineering staff and presented to the City Council a few years ago. In addition, staff attended workshops on the concept and learned that the City of Tacoma uses LID's to implement their street improvements. Mr. Fiene added that he has had experience in working with people to implement an LID. He briefly described the process of establishing an LID and advised that staff would not be averse to working on two or three per year. However, he emphasized that it would likely take a great deal of effort to sell the concept to the public.

Chair Freeman expressed her belief that while a sewer project LID would likely result in increased property values, citizens expect the roads in front of their homes to be maintained by the City using the revenues collected from taxes. Mr. Fiene agreed that overlay projects should be considered ongoing maintenance projects that the City takes care of. However, if LID's were used for walkway projects, additional money could be allocated to the overlay program.

Mr. Fiene recalled that in 2005 the Board recommended denial of the CIP because it did not meet the goals and objectives of the Comprehensive Plan. The City Council subsequently adopted the CIP, but added language at the bottom of each spreadsheet to indicate that they recognized there were not sufficient funds to accomplish the Comprehensive Plan goals and that the City Council was committed to seeking additional funding sources. Chair Freeman pointed out that it has been nearly a year since the City Council made the commitment to explore other funding options, yet nothing has been done to address the problem. Board Member Young agreed and inquired if the City could run into compliance issues because they do not have funding to implement the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Chave answered if the City gets to the point where a number of different funds are having the same difficulty, they could be in trouble. But there is balance in most of the other funds, which indicates that; overall, the City has the ability to move money around. He summarized that they have not reached the point of non-compliance, but in the near future the City Council must discuss the City's priorities and how the City revenues would be distributed amongst the various funds.

Board Member Young emphasized that there are many annual maintenance projects the City should be doing or is legally required to do that are not getting done because there is no available funding. Mr. Chave explained that, typically, maintenance projects are not part of a CIP. While they are supposed to be funded, the GMA does not mandate that maintenance items be identified in the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Fiene pointed out that most jurisdictions in the State include street overlay work as part of their CIP. Mr. Chave pointed out that while maintenance, itself, might not be a compliance issue; it is often the most efficient way to keep the infrastructure from becoming capital projects down the

road. The danger of differing maintenance for an extended period of time is that the City could eventually be faced with major capital expenditures.

➤ **Fund 113 – Multi-Modal Edmonds Crossing Project**

- **Fund 116 – Building Maintenance:** Mr. Fiene explained that this fund has been significantly impacted by Initiative 695 and Initiative 747. Vice Chair Dewhirst recalled that for the past two years, staff has been emphasizing the revenue problems associated with Fund 116. He asked if there are adequate funds to complete all of the necessary maintenance work or if projects had to be deferred because of lack of funding. Mr. Miller answered that the City is reaching a point where maintenance projects would have to be deferred. Based on the current schedule, the City Council is going to have to increase funding by 2007, and staff plans to address this need at the 2006 City Council Retreat.

Vice Chair Dewhirst asked if the City would be responsible for the costs of operating and maintaining the new Performing Arts Center. Mr. Miller answered that this facility would be self-sustaining as part of the Public Facilities District.

Mr. Miller advised that he plans to make a request that the City Council significantly increase funding for Fund 116 in 2007. He explained that there are a number of necessary projects that must be completed to keep the buildings functional, and they cannot wait any longer. The City Council has been funding building maintenance at a very low level for the past few years and projects have had to be postponed. He reported that the City recently received a FEMA Grant for seismic reinforcement of the Francis Anderson Center, and they plan to participate in the Washington State Energy Savings Program in order to upgrade the HVAC in the library, City Hall and the public safety buildings. Board Member Young said it would be critical for staff to point out at the public hearing that the City is already pursuing all possible outside funding sources for building maintenance. It should also be clearly noted that grant funding of this type of very competitive.

Board Member Young asked if there are buildings that are falling behind the generally accepted architectural or engineering standards for replacement. Mr. Miller answered that, fortunately, the City has upgraded their facilities in the recent past. At this point, they are not in real dire straights, but the CIP paints the picture that there are projects that need to be done in the near future. In order to accomplish this work, additional funding must be identified. He pointed out that because City buildings are occupied by people, the City must be sure they meet the health and safety standards.

- **Fund 125 – Parks, Open Space, Recreation and Beautification:** Vice Chair Dewhirst asked if funding identified in Fund 125 could be used for sidewalk improvements within the rights-of-way in and around City parks. Mr. Fiene answered that the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan mentions building sidewalks linking neighborhoods to schools and parks. Vice Chair Dewhirst said that while the City builds and maintains a good parks system, they often fail to provide good access to them. He pointed out that since Fund 125 is in much better shape than Fund 112, some of the transportation funding problems could be addressed by having a policy that would allow the City to use park funding for sidewalk construction associated with parks.

Mr. Fiene explained that engineering staff has worked with the Parks and Recreation Director to determine if sidewalk projects in the transportation plan would meet the goals of the parks plan. They agreed that there are some possibilities. He noted that while the Parks, Open Space and Recreation Plan calls out \$150,000 per year to be spent on walkways and trails, these are not being shown as CIP projects. Mr. Gebert added that it is legal for the City to use REET funding for projects other than parks, but the Edmonds City Council has established a policy of dedicating REET funding to park improvements and acquisition. Vice Chair Dewhirst suggested that there is a direct nexus between park development and walkway projects to provide access to the parks. Mr. Fiene agreed that some walkway projects could meet the goals and objectives of both the Transportation Plan and the Parks, Open Space and Recreation Plan. However, when the concept was presented to the City Council as an option, it was not accepted.

Chair Freeman asked how much REET funding the City received in 2005 and how much the amount has increased over the past several years. Mr. Fiene said that five years ago, the City received about \$700,000 in REET funding, and now they receive over \$1 million. Chair Freeman suggested that this excess money could be used for walkways without

damaging parks. She said public safety is a significant concern in the City and without adequate roads and sidewalks, they cannot address this need.

Chair Freeman said that she spent some time comparing the 2005 CIP with what is being proposed for 2006 and found some inconsistencies. She said it is difficult to determine whether funding was spent in 2005 and then more is being designated for a project in 2006 or if funding from 2005 was carried over to 2006 because the project was never implemented. Vice Chair Dewhirst agreed that more information would be helpful. He also suggested clarification regarding the City's ability to carry money over from one year to the next. Mr. Fiene answered that carrying funds over from one year to the next is legally allowed, and the City doesn't have a policy that unused CIP funds would be lost.

Mr. Gebert suggested, and the Board agreed, to invite the Parks and Recreation Director to respond to the following questions:

- What is the five-year history for the end of year cash balance in Fund 125?
- What has been the history of REET Funding amounts?
- Are project numbers being carried forward from one year to another or are their new funds being identified for these projects?

- **Fund 126 – Parks Acquisition:** Mr. Fiene emphasized that REET Funding in this account can only be used for park acquisition. Mr. Chave noted that about 2/3 of the funding in this account is dedicated to debt service for projects like the library roof. Mr. Fiene said this fund also receives a significant amount of grant funding.
- **Fund 412 – Combined Utility:** Mr. Fiene reported that a rate study was recently conducted by the City and they are projecting some minor increases, primarily in the water and storm utility funds. The sewer utility is in good shape. The average increase in utilities for each City user would be less than inflation for the next few years.
- **Fund 412-100 – Water Utility:** Mr. Fiene advised that the projects funded by this account are identified in the Comprehensive Water Plan and include improving fire flow, replacing deteriorated pipes, and making storage and control improvements.
- **Fund 412-200 – Storm Utility:** Mr. Fiene reviewed that the projects funded by this account are identified in the Comprehensive Storm Water Plan. They include addressing capacity problems, completing maintenance projects, and addressing environmental concerns.

Board Member Young asked if the transfer of funds from this account would go into Fund 112 or the General Fund and whether or not there are restrictions on how the money could be spent. Mr. Fiene advised that logic is that the utility fund should pay for about half of the cost of resurfacing the roadway, so the transferred funds would be used for overlay work.

- **Fund 412-300 – Sewer Utility:** Mr. Fiene advised that projects funded by this account are identified in the 2000 Storm Water Comprehensive Plan, which will be updated in 2006 to become a more proactive program. The Comprehensive Plan priorities include addressing maintenance issues, environmental issues and capacity problems.
- **Fund 414 – Wastewater Treatment Plant** – The funds in this account are used to replace worn machinery and controls for the wastewater treatment plan, improve and replace flow meters, repair outfall lines, and repair influent trunk lines.

Board Member Young noted that the City currently receives about \$149,000 per year in intergovernmental revenue from the cities of Lynnwood and Mountlake Terrace. He asked if staff feels this is an equitable amount. Mr. Fiene answered that these fees are based on precise computations of what flow comes from each jurisdiction. Each jurisdiction is then charged their proportional amount. Board Member Young asked if the City is able to collect money from these jurisdictions to repair streets when lines are replaced. Mr. Fiene said the City does not really tear up streets too much for wastewater treatment projects since they typically use a trenchless technique. When streets have to be torn up, the City would work to make sure they each pay their fair and equitable share.

Board Member Dewhirst asked if the City could charge an amount to each jurisdiction that would result in a profit for the City of Edmonds. Mr. Miller explained that in the original negotiations for the treatment plant, it was decided that these two jurisdictions would pay for the City's oversight of the treatment plant. The final cost sharing agreement was eventually decided by the courts. There is a joint responsibility for all of the lines coming to the plant and everyone pays a portion of these costs.

Board Member Young asked Mr. Fiene to explain what a road stabilization project was. Mr. Fiene explained that various techniques could be used to stabilize a roadway, including retaining walls and rockeries. The intent is to support falling slopes and stabilize hillsides within the right-of-way. He noted that the City completed four road stability projects over the past year, which were unforeseen. He said staff believes the City must allocate some money each year for road stabilization in case another situation arises in the future. He noted that the proposed CIP identifies \$75,000 per year as a contingency fund for this purpose. Mr. Miller added that the Public Works Department is currently watching a number of rockeries in the public right-of-way that would eventually have to be fixed.

Board Member Young pointed out that while the Federal Government requires the City to upgrade their curbs to meet ADA requirements, the proposed CIP only identifies \$5,000 per year for this work. Mr. Gebert pointed out that \$5,000 would only fund a few upgrades. Chair Freeman asked how staff decides which curbs are upgraded each year. Mr. Gebert said that one curb cut was done in 2005 even though it was not identified in the budget because a citizen wrote a letter to the City Council requesting the improvement and the City Council approved the request. Mr. Miller advised that the City's street crew does about five upgrades per year, and these are generally on routes used by people in wheelchairs who have made a request to the City. They have been able to keep up with the demand to date, but now there is a Federal mandate that requires the City to upgrade the curbs when streets are resurfaced. Mr. Miller further advised that this issue would be raised when the CIP is presented at the City Council retreat in March.

THE BOARD TOOK A BREAK AT 8:55 P.M. THE RECONVENED THE MEETING AT 9:03 P.M.

REPORT ON NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS DISTRICT PLAN MEETINGS FOR FIVE CORNERS AND FIRDALE VILLAGE

Mr. Chave advised that Ms. Gerend, the Economic Development Director, was not able to attend the Board's meeting to provide a report on the neighborhood business district planning meetings. However, she did provide a thorough written report for the Board Members to review. He advised that another set of meetings would be conducted in the near future to discuss conclusions and potential Comprehensive Plan and zoning changes that could be made. Staff would also attempt to solicit public reaction to some different types of designs for buildings to get a better feel for what people really want to see in those two areas.

WORK SESSION ON HIGHWAY 99 ZONING ISSUES

Mr. Chave referred to the packet of information that was provided to each Board Member. He noted that the packet included the following items:

- The last draft of the "BR" zone considered by the Planning Board, with a map of proposed locations.
- A letter and petition from Jim Underhill et.al. concerning zoning along 215th Street Southwest.
- Recommendations from the Highway 99 Task Force concerning the BR zone and Highway 99.
- A draft of a proposed "BR2" zone submitted by Stan Piha for elsewhere in the Highway 99 corridor.
- The Council agenda memorandum and ordinance enacting a moratorium for certain uses in CG and CG2 zoned properties.
- Miscellaneous articles on Highway 99.

Mr. Chave reviewed that the letter and petition from Mr. Underhill was a request that the Board consider changing the zoning of their neighborhood from multi-family residential to single-family residential. He pointed out that this group has

APPROVED

not submitted a formal request for the change, so it is up to the Board whether or not they pursue the idea or not. He suggested that one option would be include the request as part of their discussion about the BR zone.

Chair Freeman pointed out that the neighborhood along 215th Street Southwest has been identified as multi-family residential zoning since 1980, prior to the time that many of the residents purchased their homes. She asked if changing the zoning to single-family residential could have a potential impact on adjoining zones. Mr. Chave answered that as drafted, the BR zone would limit the height of buildings within 25 feet of any residentially zoned property to 25 feet, and this would apply to both single-family and multi-family residential. Therefore, a single-family residential zoning designation would not make any difference to adjacent BR zoned properties because the setback requirements would be the same. However, the Board must consider that nothing would really be gained by changing the zoning designation.

Board Member Cassutt recalled that the Board previously discussed these properties and decided against making a recommendation to change the zoning. Vice Chair Dewhirst agreed that the Board decided not to recommend changes. The Board agreed that it would be appropriate to consider the proposal as part of their discussion on the creation of a new BR zone. Vice Chair Dewhirst questioned what would happen if the Board were to recommend denial of Mr. Underhill's request, given the environment of the new City Council. Chair Freeman pointed out that the City has also been charged with providing more housing opportunity in this particular area, which is located close to the hospital. This would be an excellent location for employees of the hospital to live and be able to walk to work.

Mr. Chave advised that staff would attempt to assemble the Board's comments and make some markups to the draft language for the new CG and BR zones. Vice Chair Dewhirst asked staff to pay particular attention to comments from the Highway 99 Task Force regarding the need to allow restaurants, etc. in the BR zone. Mr. Chave advised that staff would also review the comments provided by the Highway 99 Task Force and incorporate them into the draft language, as well.

Vice Chair Dewhirst recalled that the Highway 99 Task Force particularly mentioned the parking requirements. When the Board reviews this issue, they should keep in mind that the parking requirements would dictate the density. Mr. Chave said one thought could also be to allow more flexibility in terms of shared parking, which could give some benefit for overall projects that make the most efficient use of their parking areas rather than having separate requirements for each use.

Vice Chair Dewhirst reminded the Board that until the Design Guidelines are approved, the draft language for the BR and CG zones must include design guidelines to address issues such as height and massing. Mr. Chave agreed that some design guidelines would need to be included in the draft language to address the concept of creating a pedestrian oriented environment and a transition to adjacent uses, etc.

Board Member Cassutt noted that the Architectural Design Board held a special meeting on February 8th from 4 to 7 p.m. to discuss the draft design guidelines. Vice Chair Dewhirst pointed out that even if the Architectural Design Board provides their recommendation to the City Council soon, it would take some time before they are adopted. Mr. Chave pointed out that while there is a general template for design of buildings in the City, specific districts or areas could have their own guidelines to address the building design and the relationship of the building to the streetscape. Therefore, it would make sense to incorporate design guidelines into the CG and BR language even if the design guidelines get adopted.

The Board discussed that there are properties in the areas being considered for BR or CG zoning that are potential sites for redevelopment to occur. They agreed that now is an appropriate time for the Board to complete their work on the new zone language and forward a recommendation to the City Council as soon as possible. Mr. Chave noted that a work session has been scheduled for February 22nd, and staff hopes to have some draft language for the Board to consider at that time.

Board Member Young reported that the Highway 99 Task Force would meet again before the Board's next meeting. He advised that he has invited City Council Member Marin and the Economic Development Director to lay out plainly what they want the Board to do and why. The Board has talked about general ideas for the zones, but they don't have enough background or policy direction to know exactly what direction they should go. If the BR and CG zones are going to be a key element of the Economic Development Plan, the Economic Development Director must act as an advocate to provide context and direction. The Board agreed that it would be helpful to invite both Council Member Marin and the Economic

Development Director to the Board's next meeting to talk about specific plans for Highway 99. Mr. Chave said staff would provide at least one option for the Board to consider implementing the Highway 99 Plan.

Vice Chair Dewhirst suggested it would also be appropriate to address the issue of Adult Entertainment, since their current policy of allowing the use on Highway 99 appears to be in conflict with the Highway 99 Plan. Mr. Chave pointed out that the sites available for adult entertainment along Highway are limited. If the economic development policies for Highway 99 result in these properties becoming very valuable, adult entertainment would not be the likely use for these costly sites. Chair Freeman asked that staff provide a report on adult entertainment in the near future.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Mr. Chave reported that the City Council remanded the MPOR Zoning issue back to the Board for further review. Board Member Young noted that they did not, however, provide any policy direction.

Chair Freeman reminded the Board that they previously agreed to hold off on doing any more work on the downtown plan until after the City Council had conducted their retreat and provided policy direction. She suggested that the Board discuss how they want to proceed at their March 8th meeting, after the City Council Retreat. Mr. Chave noted that the City Council has scheduled a discussion on the issue of height in the BC zone on their March 21st agenda. This meeting is scheduled as a public hearing, with participation from the Chamber of Commerce and Allied Citizens for Edmonds. However, he emphasized that the City Council would not likely make a decision at that meeting.

Vice Chair Dewhirst said he would be opposed to the Board continuing their work on the Downtown Plan before receiving policy direction from the City Council. The majority of the Board agreed. They further agreed to schedule the issue as an agenda item on March 8th to discuss the City Council's progress.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Freeman referred the Board to an article in the February 8, 2006 *POST INTELLIGENCER* titled, "*Driving Towards Fewer Cars.*" The article describes a program that is currently taking place in the City of Seattle where they offer incentives for people not to drive their cars. She encouraged the Board members to read the article.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Vice Chair Dewhirst announced that Mr. Chave is member of the Savoy Swing Club, who is scheduled to perform in Edmonds on March 1st.

Board Member Young said he was impressed with the interest and questions raised regarding the Capital Improvement Program. The Board held a very good discussion with the City Engineers. The time is now for the Board and staff to convince the City Council of the situation. He said he finds it interesting that at the last City Council meeting, a City Council Member made the comment that Edmonds is the most economically healthy community on Puget Sound.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 9:45 p.m.

APPROVED