

**CITY OF EDMONDS  
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

**September 8, 2010**

---

---

Chair Lovell called the meeting of the Edmonds Planning Board to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Public Safety Complex, 250 – 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

Philip Lovell, Chair  
John Reed, Vice Chair  
Kevin Clarke  
Todd Cloutier  
Kristiana Johnson  
Valerie Stewart

**STAFF PRESENT**

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager  
Rob English, City Engineer  
Phil Williams, Public Works Director  
Brian McIntosh, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director  
Mike Clugston, Planner  
Karin Noyes, Recorder

**READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**VICE CHAIR REED MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF AUGUST 25, 2010 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER CLOUTIER 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.

**PRESENTATION ON DRAFT CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN (2011-2016)**

Mr. English explained that tonight's presentation is on the draft Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) and the draft Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), which are two separate but related documents. He explained that the CFP dates back to the City's first Comprehensive Plan in 1995 and identifies improvements over a 6-year period and the funding sources needed to build the projects. It is mandated by the Growth Management Act, and its projections are intended to accommodate the City's projected population growth. The CIP is a budget planning tool that covers the same 6-year period. It is comprised of two sets of projects: preservation and maintenance projects and capital facilities projects. The CIP includes estimated expenditures and funding sources. Mr. English provided a graphic that Mr. Chave prepared to illustrate how the two documents are related. He also referenced a matrix that was prepared to compare the two documents. He explained both documents have a 6-year planning projection, but the CFP includes a 20-year list, as well. They both include capital improvements, but preservation and maintenance improvements are not included in the CFP.

Mr. English reviewed that the draft CFP has three project sections: A general section that covers parks, buildings, and regional projects; a transportation section that covers safety, capacity, pedestrian, and bicycle projects; and a stormwater section. The purpose and potential funding sources for each project are also identified in the plan. In addition, individual project sheets have been prepared for each CFP project, providing a schedule and explanation for each one. He noted that the CFP incorporates projects from other plans the Board has already reviewed: 2008 Parks, Recreation and Cultural

Services Plan, 2009 Transportation Plan, and 2010 Storm and Surface Water Plan. The CIP is intended to be a supporting document for the CFP, and the Board is not required to take action. The projects in the CIP are divided into the following funds:

- Fund 112 – Transportation related projects that are managed by the Public Works Department.
- Fund 113 – Edmonds Crossing Project that is managed by the Community Services Department.
- Fund 116 – Building maintenance that is managed by the Public Works Department.
- Fund 125 – REET-2 Funds for transportation that are managed by the Public Works Department.
- Fund 125 – REED 2 Funds for park improvements that are managed by the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Department.
- Fund 126 – Park acquisition projects that are managed by the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Department.
- Fund 129 – Special projects.
- Fund 132 – Park construction projects that are managed by the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Department.
- Funds 412 through 414 – Public utility projects that are managed by the Public Works Department.

Mr. English noted that information related to the Fund 129 projects was not included in the draft plan. Staff had a technical problem on Friday and was unable to incorporate this section. However, the information would be included in the draft that is posted on the City's website before the public hearing, which is scheduled for September 22<sup>nd</sup>. The documents would be presented to the City Council's Development Services/Community Services Committee on September 14 and to the City Council on September 21<sup>st</sup>. A public hearing before the City Council has tentatively been scheduled for October 5<sup>th</sup>, and staff anticipates the CFP would be adopted as part of the 2010 Comprehensive Plan amendments before the end of the year.

Chair Lovell asked staff to provide each Board Member with a copy of staff's PowerPoint presentation, and Mr. English agreed. Chair Lovell said he understands the basic differences between the CIP and CFP. However, he was confused because the CFP appears to identify project costs and anticipated revenues to implement some of the projects. Mr. English clarified that the CFP is supposed to identify potential funding sources for the projects identified in the CFP. However, that does not mean that funding has been budgeted for the projects. Staff is applying for grant funding, and the numbers are staff's best estimate of when that funding would be secured.

Chair Lovell inquired if the transportation and stormwater projects are listed by priority. Mr. English answered that projects listed in the plan are prioritized in the 2008 Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Plan, 2009 Transportation Plan, and 2010 Storm and Surface Water Plan, as well as specific input from the City Council and staff and available funding.

Chair Lovell reminded the Board that the City Council is in the process of discussing the Board's recommendation to increase the Transportation Benefit District (TBD) funding to by \$40 per vehicle, which requires voter approval. If the proposal is approved, he asked if the projects that would be funded with this additional tax are identified in the proposed CFP. Mr. English noted that the "funding source" column on the transportation project spreadsheet identifies those items that would be funded with TBD monies. However, because this funding is not secure, it is difficult to identify which projects would move forward in 2011, 2012 and 2013 if the voters approve the additional tax.

Board Member Cloutier recalled that when the Board reviewed the Storm and Surface Water Plan, they agreed that the 100-year flood plain study should be moved up on the list of priorities, ahead of the Edmonds Marsh Restoration Project. Mr. English agreed that the project was mislabeled and would be corrected before the document is posted on the City's website.

Vice Chair Reed noted that none of the projects identified in the CIP would be funded by the existing \$20 TBD fee. Mr. English answered that the \$20 TBD fee was implemented in 2009 for street maintenance and operations, but the funds cannot be used for capital projects. If the additional TBD fee is approved by voters in November, Vice Chair Reed noted that funding would be available in 2011. Mr. English agreed but said the City is required to adopt a CIP that contains a financially constrained project list for the first three years. Right now, the City cannot confirm the additional TBD funding as a revenue source. If the TBD funding initiative passes, the CIP and Transportation Improvement Plan would be updated to identify the projects that would be funded.

Board Member Stewart referred to statements in the draft document that some existing structures are “reaching the end of their useful life and need to be replaced.” She explained that in light of the City’s current economic situation, perhaps there are some creative ways to retrofit or renovate an existing structure rather than tearing it down and replacing it with a new structure. She suggested a better term would be “are in need of major renovation or replacement,” since this would allow the City to consider all options. The Board directed staff to word search the document and replace all of the phrases as recommended by Board Member Stewart.

Board Member Stewart noted that the CFP identifies \$20,000 to restripe and remove the parking areas at Main and 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Walnut Street and 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue. She questioned why restriping a street would cost so much. Mr. English reminded the Board that the numbers are estimates at this time, but grinding off the existing striping is a significant cost. In addition, staff estimates it would cost between \$3,000 and \$4,000 to bring in the equipment and crew to do the restriping work. He explained that these two projects are intended to address concurrency issues. The level of service on these two streets is such that additional capacity is needed. Rather than building a costly traffic signal or acquiring additional right-of-way at the intersection, the streets would be restriped to provide a turn lane or a combination turn/through lane.

Board Member Stewart noted some fairly large cost estimates for sidewalk improvements. She asked if the City seeks out contractors that are moving towards sustainable practices when they solicit bids. Mr. English answered that if the additional TBD fee is approved and the sidewalk projects are moved forward, there will be a big push from the Public Works Department to construct Low-Impact Development (LID) infrastructure whenever possible. For projects that are estimated to cost less than \$200,000, staff can request bids from at least five contractors from the small works roster. Projects that cost more than \$200,000 require a more formal process. In these cases, the City would issue a Request for Proposals, and any contractor would be able to bid on the project. The contract would be awarded to the lowest responsive bidder. He emphasized that the City does not have the ability to pick individual contractors without going through a bid process. When reviewing bids, Board Member Stewart recommended staff consider the high costs associated with maintaining projects once they are built rather than just the lowest bid. She noted that LID projects are often less costly to maintain. Mr. English clarified that all contractors would be bidding on the same project. If sustainable practices were identified in the bid documents, that is what all contractors would bid on. They would not be asked to bid on maintenance of the projects once they have been completed. Maintenance requirements are determined by a project’s design.

Board Member Stewart asked if it is possible to designate one project as a pilot for pervious concrete or pavement. She noted that other jurisdictions in the region have done this, and it is time for the City of Edmonds to take action on its statement of being a green and sustainable city. Mr. English agreed this would be appropriate. He announced that the City recently received grant funding for the Shell Valley Emergency Access Road Project, and pervious pavement would be used. The proposed walkway project on 226<sup>th</sup> Street would also use pervious pavement. Both of these projects are scheduled for construction in 2011. Board Member Stewart observed that when well-designed pervious pavement projects are done, more water can filtrate into the ground, and this results in cost savings down the road. Mr. English said the new Public Works Director participated in several projects in Bremerton where pervious pavement was used, and he anticipates that the City will use this concept more.

Board Member Clarke noted that a public hearing on the draft CIP has been scheduled on the Board’s September 22<sup>nd</sup> agenda. He questioned how the Board and staff could help the public become more knowledgeable about the proposed plan so they can provide meaningful input at the public hearing. Mr. English replied that the plan would be posted on the City’s website for the public to view, and notices would be published in the local newspapers and on Channel 21. A sign up sheet was placed on the table near the entrance to the Board’s meeting room for people to sign up to receive notification of upcoming hearings regarding the plan. The City’s website also encourages citizens to contact staff for more information. Board Member Clarke asked how often the Board holds hearings regarding the CFP. Mr. English answered that the CFP is updated every year, and the Board holds a public hearing each time before forwarding their recommendation to the City Council. Board Member Clarke asked how much public participation generally occurs during this process. Mr. McIntosh answered that there are typically about six people in attendance at the public hearings.

Board Member Clarke asked if staff would provide information at the September 22<sup>nd</sup> meeting to help the public understand how the projects identified in the proposed CFP would be impacted if the new TBD fee is not approved by voters. Mr. English answered that the City’s website would include information, independent of the CFP, that lays out the projects that

would be funded by the proposed TBD fee. Maps would also be provided to identify the location of each of the proposed projects. Board Member Clarke said it is important to clearly communicate to the public the impacts of rejecting or approving the new TBD fee. Mr. Williams pointed out that Board Member Johnson is a member of the committee that was formed to prepare a Pro statement about Proposition 1 (TBD fee) for the November voter's pamphlet. A committee was also formed to prepare a statement for the voter's pamphlet opposed to Proposition 1. The City cannot get involved in campaign efforts either way. However, staff can provide effective factual information upon request. They can also attend meetings when invited to deliver factual information about proposals on the ballot or about transportation in general, but they cannot recommend that voters should accept or reject a proposal. The public has the ability to do whatever they want to convince voters to take a certain action.

Board Member Clarke suggested that rather than campaigning for or against the proposal, it is important to help the public understand how critical the issue is. They must have a clear understanding of the consequences of their vote. He suggested that the public be invited to provide comments at the public hearing regarding Proposition 1, since it is major part of the CIP and CFP funding proposal. Mr. Williams agreed it would be appropriate for staff to present factual information regarding the proposed TBD fee prior to the public hearing, and this would set the stage for the Board to discuss the issue in more detail. However, he emphasized that staff and elected officials are limited to just providing factual information related to ballot issues. He said he held a transportation forum in the City of Bremerton, inviting people to comment on transportation issues, but only 14 people attended the meeting.

Board Member Clarke suggested the City invite *THE BEACON* to write an article to help the public understand the issues. Rather than merely going through the required public hearing process, the Board should look for opportunities to make their public hearings more effective. Mr. Williams commented that the future looks rather bleak based on existing transportation funding sources. He pointed out that, other than one stimulus project last year, the City has not done a single paving project since 2006. It doesn't take a lot to figure out that the street system will only get worse, but it is difficult to get this message to the people who need to hear it.

Chair Lovell reminded the Board that when they reviewed the Transportation Improvement Plan earlier in the year, staff provided quite a bit of information about what projects could be funded if the TBD fee were raised to a certain level. He noted that the voters pamphlet that is published for the November election would include a brief statement about Proposition 1. Board Member Johnson also pointed out that a table was provided on Page 3 of the draft CIP showing what projects would be done if the new TBD fee is approved. She suggested it would be appropriate for the Board to highlight this information at the public hearing. She said that while they may not get a lot of citizens to attend their hearing, the same presentation would be made before the City Council, and the Board has an opportunity to highlight and explain certain things. She observed that City Council hearings typically draw more people and they are also broadcast on Channel 21. Board Member Cloutier suggested that when staff presents the CFP to the City Council on September 21<sup>st</sup>, they could invite the public to attend the Board's public hearing on September 22<sup>nd</sup>.

Chair Lovell noted that the CIP identifies \$11 million over the next six years for the Edmonds Cross Project. However, there is speculation that this project may never happen. Mr. English said he would invite Mr. Clifton, Community Services Director, to the public hearing to provide more information about the Edmonds Crossing Project. Vice Chair Reed asked if Mr. McIntosh would be present at the September 22<sup>nd</sup> public hearing, and Mr. McIntosh answered affirmatively.

Board Member Johnson noted that some of the projects in the CFP are beyond the 6-year period of time but could be done earlier if funding becomes available. For example, the Boys and Girls Club Project is budgeted for \$5 million in 2017 and beyond. She questioned what it would take to complete the ADA improvements prior to 2017. She also noted that \$1 million is budgeted in 2017 and beyond for creating an arts center. She questioned if there are opportunities to pursue this project prior to the scheduled date using leased space in a vacant building rather than building a separate new arts center. Mr. English agreed to forward Board Member Johnson's questions to Jim Stevens, Facilities Manager, and Francis Chapin, Cultural Services Manager.

**FURTHER DISCUSSION ON PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ECDC 18.05 AND 20.50 CLARIFYING DEFINITIONS AND PROCESSES FOR REGULATION OF WIRELESS TELECOMMUNICATION FACILITIES**

**APPROVED**

Mr. Clugston reviewed that the Board received a lot of information at the July 28<sup>th</sup> public hearing, and they agreed to continue their discussion on September 8<sup>th</sup>. At the hearing, Richard Busch, the attorney representing AT&T Wireless and president of the Northwest Wireless Association, provided a general presentation regarding how cell sites are selected. He also suggested possible changes. He announced that Mr. Busch was present to provide additional information as requested by the Board.

Chair Lovell cautioned that, although the Board heard from citizens regarding a Clearwire installation on 96<sup>th</sup> Avenue, they should keep in mind that the proposed amendments would not be applicable to current projects. The Board should also keep in mind that the City cannot regulate wireless facilities on the basis of public health and safety. They must also adhere to the Federal Communication Commission's (FCC) regulations, which require the City to allow wireless companies to provide adequate coverage to their customers.

**Richard Busch, Attorney and President of the Northwest Wireless Association, Issaquah**, said he represents AT&T on a proposed wireless project in Edmonds. He expressed his belief that wireless technology will continue to become more popular, and people will desire to have quality wireless service. The City must balance this need with the need to protect residential communities. He recalled that he provided photographs at the July 28<sup>th</sup> hearing of well-integrated wireless facilities that most people would not be concerned about. When determining what types of facilities should be allowed in the City and where, he suggested the Board start by identifying those types that would be appropriate in all locations, those that may be okay but with additional scrutiny, and those that should only be allowed as a last resort. They should discuss the various types of technology and identify the impacts each type would have on the community. This information will allow the Board to develop a hierarchy approach for locating wireless facilities in the future. He suggested they divide the technology into the following three categories:

- **Technologies appropriate for all locations.** These types should be allowed as permitted uses with design review. The industry should be encouraged to install these types of facilities so a lengthy review process should not be required. This category could include co-locating on an existing monopole and rooftop installation in multi-family and commercial zones. Rather than requiring a provider to go down a priority list, outright permitting certain types of facilities would encourage carriers to design facilities that are consistent. This reduces carrier costs and makes it easier for staff to implement the code.
- **Technologies that are acceptable but require closer scrutiny.** These types are more likely to be located in or near residential zones and could be permitted with an administrative conditional use permit and design review. People are demanding more and more data in the residential areas, and over time, carriers will likely need to put more capacity into neighborhoods. It will be critical to come up with a process that balances the carriers' needs with what the community is willing to accept. Carriers should be encouraged to look at existing infrastructure first.
- **Technologies that should only be allowed as a last resort.** While the Telecommunication Act may require the City to allow monopoles in residential zones, the City could restrict this type unless there are no other options. These types could require a formal public hearing and City Council approval.

Mr. Busch recommended that, regardless of the City's approach for regulating the location of wireless facilities, they should incorporate an administrative waiver provision that allows staff to make decisions that make sense. He shared a recent situation in which a hearing examiner had no option but to require a carrier to put landscaping around a communication site that was located in the middle of a forested area because it was a code requirement. Staff should have the ability to waive a requirement when it makes common sense to do so and all of the community goals would be protected.

Mr. Busch summarized that he was not present to tell the Board what the code requirements should be, but to help them discuss what is important to their community. He advised that he could provide a copy of the Personal Communication Industry Association's (PCIA) draft code, which the Board could use as a model. However, changes would be needed to address the specific needs of the City.

Board Member Johnson observed that communication devices are getting smaller and better. She asked if the wireless facilities are also getting smaller in design. Mr. Busch agreed that newer technology is getting smaller, but carriers must

continue to provide service for the older technology. In order to serve all customers, multiple transmitters are often required. These can be placed all inside of one large shroud, which means the facilities would not be smaller, or more small antennas could be used.

Board Member Johnson noted that some antennas are visible from the street and cannot be equated with attractiveness. She asked if there is scientific information to support why an antenna has to be located in a particular place on a roof. Mr. Busch answered that there is science behind antenna location, but some judgment is also involved. Radio frequency engineers look at where additional capacity is needed and the existing topography. Other factors (i.e. willing landlords, visual impact, and code requirements) are also considered. Board Member Johnson asked if the City's current code requires that rooftop mounted wireless facilities be screened so they are not visible from the street. Mr. Busch answered that the industry prefers to place antennas on flat roofs rather than pitched roofs, and they are typically painted to match the roof. While they are usually still visible from the street, they are not obvious. He added that rooftop antennas can be screened with materials that are radio frequency transparent, but screening panels are often more visible than the antennas themselves.

Board Member Johnson recalled that at the last meeting a number of citizens from the community called attention to the Clearwire installation that is taking place on 96<sup>th</sup> Avenue. She asked why the technology could not have been located on the taller Public Utility District (PUD) poles that already exist in the neighborhood. Mr. Busch answered that the taller PUD poles are likely high-voltage transmission lines that are taller and have conductors installed near the top. Because of separation requirements, carriers must co-locate at 10 to 15 feet either above or below the conductors. While the industry does not prohibit wireless facilities above the conductors, the technology can only be installed when the power is off. Therefore, it is not likely that carriers will propose equipment above the conductors, and the area below the conductors may not be high enough to provide the desired coverage.

Board Member Clarke asked Mr. Busch how communities in Europe have regulated wireless equipment so it blends in with the historic areas. Mr. Busch said he recently viewed a video that shows the facilities being located on the top or side of multi-family and commercial structures, but he doubts they would allow the facilities to be placed on historic churches, etc. Board Member Clarke asked how wireless facilities are regulated amongst the historic buildings in downtown Boston. Mr. Busch said it is common to have rooftop installations that are painted to match the buildings. It is not likely that a monopole would be located in downtown Boston, but they can be found along the freeways. Even in downtown Seattle, there are numerous antennas located on rooftops. He cautioned that it would be a mistake for Edmonds to mimic either Seattle or Portland because their existing development is very different. They do not have tall buildings.

Board Member Clarke expressed concern about how the rooftop antennas would be viewed from properties located uphill. Mr. Busch agreed that the antennas would be visible, and that is why it is important to work with the industry to make sure they are integrated as much as possible. Antennas cannot be totally hidden from view, but they can be made less obvious. The reality is that transmission and distribution poles tend to blend in over time.

Board Member Johnson suggested it would be appropriate for the Board to participate in an educational tour of the various wireless facilities that exist in Edmonds. Mr. Busch agreed that would be appropriate, and he suggested the Board focus on rooftop and wall-mounted installations given the City's topography.

Board Member Clarke said his office is located at the corner of Third Avenue and Main Street, and he has noticed there are multiple rooftop antennas located on his building. He questioned how these installations could be done so they are less visually intrusive. Mr. Busch said there are ways to screen the equipment using materials that are radio frequency transparent, but the Board needs to ask which is less intrusive; the antennas or the screening. He commented that once a provider finds a willing landlord and the City has approved the site, other providers will likely want to co-locate on the same structure. He expressed his belief that it is better to have multiple antennas on one building than antennas on every building in the downtown.

Board Member Cloutier said he supports a hierarchy approach similar to the one described by Mr. Busch. He expressed his belief that if the City identifies the types of facilities that have the least impact and allows them outright, the industry would fall in line because it would be less costly and time consuming for them to obtain the necessary permits. This approach would also meet the City's desire to encourage co-location and reduce the staff time required to review applications. Mr.

**APPROVED**

Chave pointed out that this has largely been the City's approach for some time. Board Member Cloutier agreed with Board Member Johnson that a tour of existing facilities would be helpful. However, the Board does not have the expertise to divide the various types of facilities into categories. This work must be done by staff.

Board Member Clarke said he supports the hierarchy approach, and he also agreed with Mr. Busch that the code should include a provision that allows the staff to make decisions based on common sense.

Board Member Johnson referred to her recent visit to the neighborhood on 96<sup>th</sup> Avenue West where the Clearwire facility is being installed and said she can understand why the neighbors are concerned. They already have more overhead wires than most neighborhoods, and there are two facilities (school and church) nearby that could have been considered had the applicant been required to use a hierarchy approach. She suggested this is a perfect case study. Board Member Cloutier said that while the City cannot regulate wireless facilities based on health and safety issues, the neighbors' concerns were related to the scale of the project.

As requested by the Board, Mr. Clugston provided a map of the existing wireless facilities in the City, which total 20 (4 utility poles, 7 monopoles and 10 building mounted). He also referred to the updated language for ECDC 20.50 and noted that a number of changes (see Staff Report) have been made since the last time the Board reviewed the document. He observed that what was originally anticipated to be a few minor tweaks to enhance 18.05 has evolved to include a broader review of 20.50. However, staff believes this review is appropriate given the changes that have taken place with technology and the City's understanding of wireless siting needs.

After further discussion, the Board requested that staff provide them with a list and map of the existing wireless facilities. Each of the facilities should be clearly labeled with their correct technical names, and a brief description should be provided, as well. The Board Members would conduct self-guided tours prior to the next meeting. As they tour the sites, the Board Members could make a rough list of which category each would fall under. It was also suggested that staff provide the Board with pictures to illustrate the various types of equipment that should be encouraged and discouraged in the City. Board Member Stewart suggested that the list of existing facilities should also be published on the City's website for the public's information. Staff would provide additional notification to the individuals who signed up during the July 28<sup>th</sup> public hearing.

Board Member Clarke observed that there is only one wireless facility in his area, which explains why he cannot get cell phone service inside his home. He asked if the providers have decided not to add additional facilities in this location because there is not enough population density or if the City's code prevents additional facilities. Mr. Chave answered that the existing wireless communication regulations have been in place since 1996, so there is nothing to prevent a provider from placing additional facilities in Mr. Clarke's neighborhood.

Board Member Clarke asked staff to provide the Board with information about how many wireless facilities are located in the Town of Woodway. Board Member Stewart said it would also be helpful to know how many companies are represented in the various wireless facilities that currently exist in Edmonds. This information may be helpful to encourage co-location. Board Member Johnson advised that the FCC licenses for each of the existing facilities is available on line, and there is also information available about the permits, themselves.

Board Member Clarke observed that quick-serve restaurants like to locate within close proximity to each other. He asked if the same would be true for the wireless industry, or do they try to block each other out once a location has been established. Mr. Busch said the two concepts are unrelated. The FCC quickly realized that communities would not tolerate numerous carriers with their own structures, so they began encouraging co-location. All providers now have co-location staff to facilitate this process. While it is helpful to see where the facilities are located on the map prepared by Mr. Clugston, the carriers already know this information.

Board Member Clarke asked if the City could require a provider to co-locate on an existing facility rather than create a new one. Mr. Busch answered that the City cannot prohibit a new facility as long as the provider can show there are no other alternatives. He expressed his belief that encouraging co-location is appropriate, but it may not work in all situations. Board Member Clarke asked if the code could give a carrier the right to expand an existing facility to accommodate a new carrier.

Mr. Busch suggested that rather than creating new language to address this issue, the City could reference the FCC's programmatic agreement, which allows a carrier to extend the height of a tower by 20% or up to 20 feet, but only once.

Chair Lovell noted that a public hearing has been tentatively scheduled for October 13<sup>th</sup>, which would not allow enough time for the Board to complete their self-guided tour and for staff to prepare draft language to incorporate Mr. Busch's recommendation. He expressed his belief that the changes made by staff are appropriate and address the Board's desire to place more emphasis on the need to prioritize location options. The current draft language makes it clear that the City does not encourage large facilities in residential neighborhoods. Beyond that, he suggested it is not reasonable to expect the Board and/or City Council to come up with specific technical guidelines for each type of wireless facility that might be proposed in Edmonds. He recommended the Board provide their final comments to staff so that the draft language can be updated and presented for public hearing on October 13<sup>th</sup>.

Board Member Johnson agreed that the latest draft document reflects the Board's thinking as of July 28<sup>th</sup>. However, it is intended to be a working document, and it may be appropriate to invite staff to fold Mr. Busch's recommendation into the draft language before it is presented for public hearing. She invited Mr. Clugston to share his thoughts on how the Board should move forward. Mr. Clugston answered that perhaps the current draft language in ECDC 20.50.002 addresses the site selection criteria satisfactorily, but he would like to review it one more time to make sure. He suggested that he may be able to make the site selection criteria clearer using the template provided by Mr. Busch. He reminded the Board that the intent of the proposed amendments is to make the regulations as clear and useful as possible. He suggested the Board continue their discussion to the next meeting.

Board Member Cloutier agreed with Chair Lovell that the existing proposed language works, but they should take every opportunity to make it even better. He noted that the proposed language does not address the idea of offering incentives to providers to encourage certain types of installations.

Vice Chair Reed noted that one of staff's recommended changes is to remove the illustrations. He said he likes illustrations because they help the public understand the various types of facilities. However, he agreed that they should be updated to ensure they are consistent with current technology. Mr. Chave explained that if illustrations are included in the code, then they must be updated whenever technology changes, which is frequently.

Vice Chair Reed asked what the review process would be for large facilities. Mr. Clugston said that, as proposed, design review would be required for any type of installation, but monopoles and lattice towers would require a conditional use permit and a public hearing before the Hearing Examiner (See ECDC 20.50.040).

Board Member Clarke pointed out that ECDC 20.50.040.B references Woodway High School and Edmonds High School. These references should be changed to Old Woodway High School and Edmonds/Woodway High School since that is what they are called today.

Board Member Clarke observed that there is no time constraint regarding this issue. Mr. Clugston agreed and said the City Council asked the Board to review the existing regulations to make sure they adequately protect the community. Board Member Clarke suggested it would be appropriate to postpone the public hearing so the Board has ample time to accomplish their goals. The more the Board can understand the issues, the better they can represent the proposed amendments to the citizens. He said he would like the City to publish a notice in *THE EDMONDS BEACON* inviting citizens to provide input. The notice should describe the Board's process and indicate how the public can obtain more information. Mr. Clugston agreed that the Board could direct staff to go beyond the City's traditional methods for notifying the public, but he did not anticipate this would result in significantly more public participation. It is difficult to get citizens to participate in the public process until a proposal directly impacts them.

Vice Chair Reed said that most people do not even see the Planning Board meeting notices that are published in *THE EDMONDS BEACON*. He suggested it may be appropriate to have a regular Planning Board section that identifies issues that are coming before the Board. In addition, notice of Planning Board hearings could also be published on MyEdmondsNews.com. Board Member Cloutier added that the editor of MyEdmondsNews.com would be likely willing to publish an article that is written by a Planning Board member.

The Board agreed to continue their discussion to the October 13<sup>th</sup> meeting, at which time staff would provide updated draft language related to site selection criteria, etc. They agreed to tentatively schedule a public hearing for November 10<sup>th</sup>. Mr. Clugston agreed to provide information related to the self-guided tour on September 22<sup>nd</sup>.

Board Member Clarke inquired if the existing draft language addresses the concept of allowing staff the ability to make common sense decisions. Mr. Clugston answered that, at this time, the draft language is fairly prescriptive and does not allow a lot of flexibility. There is some question as to how much flexibility the City Council would be willing to give staff. He expressed his belief that an administrative waiver would not necessarily solve issues related to changing technology that does not meet code requirements. Mr. Busch pointed out that the terms “mini,” and “macro” are no longer applicable because technology has changed. In addition, the code references an aggregate antenna size of 584 inches, but he is unclear about what that means. He summarized that the language should be tweaked to reflect current technology and staff should be allowed some flexibility when they are talking about something that is just a small degree over what the code allows. Mr. Clugston agreed to review the definition section and make the appropriate adjustments.

### **DISCUSSION ON INTERIOR LOT LINES OVERLAPPING PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (PRD) PERIMETER BUFFERS**

Vice Chair Reed announced that the City Council adopted an interim ordinance in April of 2010 that included a provision related to interior lot lines in PRD’s. The interim ordinance was due to expire in October. At the last City Council Meeting, Mr. Chave recommended the City Council extend the interim ordinance. He explained that the Board was in the process of reviewing the subdivision regulations and would take PRD’s into account as part of that process. The City Council voted to extend the interim ordinance, but they decided that the Board should consider the PRD issue as a separate item. He referred to the interim ordinance, which provides new language for ECDC 20.35.050.C.2. He explained that the Board’s responsibility is to review the language found in the interim ordinance and make a recommendation about whether or not it should be made permanent.

Mr. Chave advised that staff would bring this item before the Board for additional discussion prior to the public hearing that is tentatively scheduled for October 27<sup>th</sup>. Staff would also provide a sketch to describe the language better. Mr. Clugston reported that staff would present the first draft of the subdivision regulations to the Board on October 13<sup>th</sup>, and a discussion regarding the PRD issue could be added to the agenda as a separate agenda item.

### **UPDATE ON SUSTAINABILITY INDICATORS**

Board Member Cloutier reported that the Board’s work on sustainability indicators is moving forward parallel to the efforts of the Mayors Climate Protection Committee, starting with building energy and focusing on natural gas because the Snohomish County Public Utility District is unable to provide accurate consumption data at this time. The Climate Protection Committee has developed a sample webpage, and they are hoping to have it completed by October 10<sup>th</sup>. He was tasked with providing data, and he created a spreadsheet that enables staff to type in the numbers and everything else would be automated. He agreed to forward a copy of the graphs and tables to each of the Board Members.

### **REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA**

No comments were made regarding the revised Extended Agenda.

### **PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS**

Chair Lovell did not provide comments during this portion of the meeting.

### **PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

Board Member Johnson announced that the Cascade Land Conservancy would meet on September 9<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 p.m. at the Point Edwards Club House. There will be featured speakers on the subject of “Complete Streets,” which is a new nationwide

**APPROVED**

concept that has gained momentum. The basic concept is that streets are for everyone, not just for cars and delivery trucks. In addition, different transportation groups would be talking about various elements of transportation.

Board Member Johnson announced that the Citizens Economic Development Commission (CEDC) was supposed to sunset after 18 months, which is the end of this year. However, they will ask the City Council to extend the CEDC for another 18 months to complete some of their large planning tasks such as neighborhood plans for Five Corners and Westgate and putting together a strategic plan. They believe they have the momentum to pursue these projects.

Vice Chair Reed reported that at their last meeting, the City Council adopted the SEPA changes that were recommended by the Planning Board, with the exception of the new thresholds. The vote was unanimous. He said he was bothered by the comments of a few City Council members, which inferred that “the Planning Board really missed it on this one.” These types of comments show that they really didn’t read through the Planning Board minutes to learn more about what the Board discussed. He commented that there will be many instances where what the Board comes up with as a group will be different than what the City Council wants.

Vice Chair Reed reported that at their last meeting, the City Council reviewed maps of the Highway 99/Medical Activity Center and the Highway 99 Corridor. They discussed that perhaps the lines need to be redrawn, and they agreed to docket the issue for consideration as part of the 2011 Comprehensive Plan amendments.

Vice Chair Reed said Mayor Cooper indicated that he received six applications for the vacant Planning Board positions. He plans to interview at least three of the candidates. The Mayor also indicated that he would continue to accept applications for the two vacant positions.

Board Member Stewart reported on her attendance at a “Green Building” event in Bellingham last week. She learned that the City of Bellingham has a green building incentive program that was developed in conjunction with a non-profit group called Sustainable Connections. The program includes a list of incentives for green building projects such as expediting permits. In addition, they have a “green team” to help with green building programs and certification. Applicants need to seek at least Four or Five Star Built Green, LEED Gold or equivalent. She provided handouts to each of the Board Members and encouraged them to review the information. It is a great program that she would like the City to consider, and she offered her services to get the process started.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

The Board meeting was adjourned at 10:17 p.m.

**APPROVED**