

CITY OF EDMONDS
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
April 20, 2011

The Citizens Economic Development Committee meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chair Frank Yamamoto in the Brackett Room, 121 5th Avenue North, Edmonds.

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT

Paul Anderson
Stacy Gardea
Don Hall
Darrol Haug
Mary Monfort
Beatrice O'Rourke
Evan Pierce
David Schaefer
Rich Senderoff
Kerry St. Clair Ayers
Bruce Witenberg
Rebecca Wolfe
Frank Yamamoto
Marianne Zagorski

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Bruce Faires
Betty Larman
Rob VanTassell

ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT

Councilmember Diane Buckshnis

STAFF PRESENT

Stephen Clifton, Community Services/Economic
Development Director
Cindi Cruz, Executive Assistant
Rob Chave, Planning Manager
Phil Williams, Public Works
Frances Chapin, Cultural Services Manager
Jeannie Dines, Recorder

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Phil Lovell, Chair
John Reed, Vice Chair
Kristiana Johnson
Todd Cloutier
Valerie Stewart

PUBLIC PRESENT

Jim Clark
Jennifer Mantooth
John Quast

1. **INTRODUCTION AND COMMENTS BY CHAIR – NONE**
2. **AMENDMENTS TO AGENDA – NONE**
3. **APPROVAL OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION MINUTES OF MARCH 16, 2011**
COMMISSIONER WITENBERG MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 16, 2011.
COMMISSIONER HALL SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.
4. **FIVE-CORNERS/WESTGATE SPECIAL DISTRICT STUDY – UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON PRESENTATION OF ALTERNATE CONCEPTS AND DISCUSSION OF CODE RELATED ITEMS**

Planning Manager Rob Chave explained this is a follow up to the design workshop held in March for Five Corners and Westgate where attendees were divided into groups to develop their vision for the two areas.

Summaries of what each group at the workshop developed have been distributed to the Economic Development Commissioners and Planning Board Members. The UW Team will present concept alternatives that will be also presented to the public prior to development of final plans and implementation.

Jill Sterritt, Affiliate Faculty, University of Washington, provided an overview of the process to date and the process timeline.

- Phase 1: Site Analysis and Online Survey
 - Citizen survey – 400 responses
 - Site surveys of land uses and amenities
 - Parking counts
 - Walking distance and conditions
 - Mapping study results
 - Analysis of user friendliness
- Phase 2: Listening Sessions and Audience Response Surveys
 - Listening sessions for each site
 - Audience response survey
 - Synthesis of survey results
 - Form based code case studies
- Phase 3: Design Workshop and Draft Plans
 - Public design workshop attended by 50-60 people
 - Review of what we have heard from the public
 - Draft site design

Brad Shipley, UW Student, provided a summary of the design workshop results, explaining at the workshop participants were asked to build the site up from bottom using a life space and buildings concept where the participants talked about the life they would like to have or activities they envision at the site, spaces needed for that and then adding buildings to the space. He reviewed the results from the three tables for Westgate and five tables for Five Corners at the design workshop:

Westgate Table 1 (Edmonds Gateway)

- Outdoor café
- Outdoor gathering spaces – courtyard park and park on the corner
- 3-story buildings
- Make an entryway into Edmonds
- Create a neighborhood feel
- Increase pedestrian safety

Westgate Table 2 (The Food + Shopping Experience)

- Entertainment for all ages
- Create a designation for all ages
- Benches, pedestrian corridors
- Green the site, add parks
- 2-4 story buildings
- Create entry to Edmonds

Westgate Table 3 (Westgate Create)

- Outdoor café
- Gathering/meeting places
- Create place for people to come together
- Plazas

- Greening the streets
- 3-4 story buildings

Five Corners 1 (A neighborhood of connection + opportunity)

- Maximum 3 stories
- Green space in back with buildings along the street
- Community gardens
- View roundabout as gateway into Edmonds

Five Corners 2 (Multi-generational neighborhood play yard)

- Places to meet
- Rain gardens
- Kid friendly restaurants'
- 2-3 stories
- Buildings at street edge, green space in back

Five Corners 3 (Garden Gateway)

- Small, local and intimate
- Internal areas to walk
- 2-3 stories
- Buildings along street edge with wide space for pedestrians
- Space for pedestrians to walk
- Create a connection to Pine Ridge Park

Five Corners 4 (Five Corners Circle)

- Improve pedestrian experience and safety
- Provide residents with key services
- Each corner has its own plaza the facing roundabout
- Buildings more spaced out and smaller in scale

Five Corners 5 (High Five Staying Alive)

- 2-3 stories
- Green corridor Main Street through 212th with landscaping
- Buildings on the street
- Parks and courtyards behind buildings

Mr. Shipley reviewed a summary of what they heard via the online survey, audience response survey, listening sessions and design workshop for Westgate and Five Corners with regard to building scale, public space, walking/biking, traffic, services and amenities.

Nancy Rottle, Landscape Architecture Department Faculty, UW, displayed photographs of green features such as street trees, green street edges, green roofs, stormwater treatment, bioswales, rainwater harvesting, rain gardens, permeable paving, pocket parks, and courtyards. She explained while their charge has been to focus on the two centers, there was a great deal of interest in walkability and they wanted to consider the 5-10 minute walkshed and opportunities to reach the centers without driving. They developed diagrams that identify where sidewalks are missing, where bicycle lanes could be located, how green spaces and amenities could be connected, how connections could be greened, etc.

Julie Creek, UW Student, explained the design alternatives were developed using comments from the workshop and by compiling the most frequently mentioned items. The alternatives are categorized into two versions, one with higher density/intensity and the other with lower density/intensity.

Garden Gateway (Five Corners)

- 2 story retail with roof deck opportunities
- More intensity around roundabout
- Activities happen in front of buildings, screened by rain garden plantings around roundabout
- Office uses such as medical
- 41 new residential units
- Emphasis on greening the streets and creating a walkable area
- Some parking along the streets with most parking behind buildings
- Potential area for a farmers market
- Gateway icon building at roundabout such as a garden center
- Increases retail/office square footage from current 60,000 square feet to up to 150,000 square feet

Village Gateway (Five Corners)

- Lower stories
- Less build out
- Keeps the Jeremiah Center function
- Smaller buildings and retail in clusters in a village concept
- Icon building
- Retail, office and residential uses
- Increases retail/office square footage from current 60,000 square feet to up to 100,000 square feet
- More walkable green streetscape
- 34 new residential units

Westgate 1

- Interior walkways like University Village interspersed with plazas
- Lower level retail and residential/office above
- To meet parking requirements, proposing structured parking fronted on lower level with retail, surface parking and under building parking
- Green spaces and plazas
- Residential on edges, more office and public use toward the center core
- 3-4 stories building at center core, lower building heights as move out from center
- 432,000 square feet office/retail
- Assumes QFC or other large floor plate retail with residential/office above
- 266 residential units

Westgate 2

- Green SR104 with rain gardens, street trees and walking paths along SR104 corridors
- Buildings set back to accommodate greening
- More suburban model with parking behind and activity along greenway in front of buildings
- Keeps PCC and bigger commercial areas and allow for larger plate retail
- Some under building parking
- 425,000 square feet office/retail
- 132 residential units

Commissioner Pierce asked for clarification regarding parking ratios. Ms. Sterritt explained the parking provided for the Village Gateway and Garden Gateway is less than required by the current code for retail (1:300) and more than required for office (1:800); it uses a ratio of 1:500 which often is used in more walkable communities. That ratio has been discussed with staff as an option. Mr. Chave explained the City's current parking requirements are by use. This can be problematic when a new business that does not have the same parking ratio as the old business inquires about a space. Consideration was given a few years ago to a flat parking ratio for downtown which would remove barriers to businesses moving in/out

of spaces. Consideration is being given to whether a flat parking scheme is appropriate for a neighborhood center. Another factor is on-street parking in the area. Ms. Creek commented one of the key concepts identified by residents is walkability, park once and walk around the area. Mr. Clifton clarified the alternatives assume the uses currently allowed in the Neighborhood Business Zone will remain the same.

Commissioner Pierce commented Seattle is incorporating less parking intentionally to create more a pedestrian friendly environment, almost intentionally forcing out vehicles. Ms. Creek answered the proposed parking ratio (1:500) is an average between the existing 1:300 and 1:800 parking ratio. The intent is to create an area that is so pleasant to walk through that people park once rather than moving their car. The roundabout also creates a safer pedestrian walkway. Mr. Chave commented parking cannot be constricted so much that it spills into the adjacent residential neighborhoods. Ms. Rottle advised there has been some reduction in parking in Seattle but parking is desirable to buffer pedestrians from the street. Seattle is raising their parking rates to increase turnover of parking spaces.

Commissioner Senderoff commented although he understands this is a visioning process and the value of initiating creativity via a blank slate, some development is relatively new such as PCC. He asked whether there was a way to prioritize areas that are more easily redeveloped and/or to encourage redevelopment. Ms. Sterritt explained the proposed concept is a 20 year plan; PCC may be last one to redevelop due to their recent investment. The City cannot control development but needs to plan for the future. Regarding incentives to make things happen, that can be considered when writing regulations.

Ms. Sterritt invited Commissioners' comments/feedback on the alternatives. They will take these same alternatives to the public on May 3. They will return to the EDC on May 12 for the EDC to make a decision regarding the alternatives that will form the basis for the Special District Plans and implementing regulations.

Planning Board Chair Phil Lovell commented one of major challenges in the Westgate area is the major arterial routes and heavy traffic. He anticipated difficulty achieving a degree of comfort on public walkways in Westgate 2, particularly as that route becomes busier. Ms. Creek explained the alternatives are a consolidation of viewpoints from the tables at the design workshop and input at the listening sessions. Westgate 1 has the same amount of retail and could have the same amount of housing, but has internal streets that would allow SR104 to function as an arterial. Chair Lovell preferred Westgate 1 over Westgate 2.

Councilmember Buckshnis asked how many citizens from the neighborhoods participated versus members of the EDC, Planning Board, etc. Ms. Sterritt answered about there were about 50 citizens at the Five Corners listening session, 20 at the Westgate listening session, 50 at the design workshop and nearly 400 respondents to the online survey. Councilmember Buckshnis suggested adding specific street schemes, for example the park blocks at Portland State. Ms. Sterritt agreed they could provide visual examples of internal streets at the public meeting.

Commissioner Gardea asked how many business/property owners participated. Mr. Clifton identified business/property owners in each area that participated, assuring that the businesses/property owners have been contacted and encouraged to participate. Mr. Chave advised there have also been individual interviews.

Planning Board Member Johnson inquired about the market survey. Ms. Sterritt answered an overview level market study was done by Greg Easton, Property Counselors. His recommendations were used as a basis for the types of businesses, general size and square footage. The study was not detailed enough to provide specific market demand. Specific market demand is also difficult to provide in the current

economy. Mr. Clifton offered to post the economic study information on the Five Corners and Westgate web page.

Mr. Clifton explained Mr. Easton considered median income, household income, potential for redevelopment, etc. in a 1, 3 and 5 mile radius. Mr. Easton recognized redevelopment would take 20+ years; there is not the development funding or market available currently. He provided some specific thoughts for the future such as envisioning Five Corners as an area that serves the neighborhood and Westgate drawing on a larger population.

Commissioner Zagorski commented even though Five Corners was designed to meet the needs of neighborhood, she was concerned the design does not include enough housing to support the retail. Although the average household in Edmonds is 2.25 people, she doubted there would be that many people in each of these units, using her condominium building as an example. Ms. Sterritt commented the existing housing around Five Corners provides a fairly good population base to support more retail and the walkability in the Five Corners areas is reasonably good. There were mixed feelings from the community regarding increased density.

Councilmember Buckshnis expressed interest in more density, particularly smaller units that are more affordable to the 20-something age group. She was surprised there were not taller buildings in the Westgate area because taller buildings in that area would not affect views. She suggested creating a 30 minute neighborhood in the Westgate area. Ms. Sterritt explained to calculate residential units they had used the total residential square footage divided by 1200 square feet. If the units were smaller, there would be greater density.

Commissioner Pierce inquired about the existing square footage versus the proposed plans. Ms. Sterritt answered there are currently 60,000 square feet of non-residential uses at Five Corners; 100,000-150,000 is envisioned in the plans. There is also currently 9,500 square feet of multifamily residential at Five Corners. There is currently 235,000 square feet at Westgate; the plans envision an average of 430,000 square feet in the two alternatives, approximately doubling the current amount. She clarified the building footprints do not double, the additional square footage is accomplished via multiple stories.

Commissioner Zagorski agreed Westgate was an ideal place to focus on attracting young people, something that is very much needed in the community. She pointed out Westgate is on the bus route, an advantage over Five Corners which is a neighborhood of single family homes. She asked whether something could be done on at least a portion of the Westgate site to make it particularly attractive to young people. Ms. Rottle explained their process looked at retail, commercial and housing. People at the meetings also had great ideas for recreation and entertainment. Traditional zoning designates allowable uses; form based code would allow a number of different uses. Smaller housing units may attract younger people. The intent is to make a desirable environment to live in such as with the housing in back, internal streets that have a neighborhood feel but close to retail and entertainment. Ms. Sterritt relayed that Mr. Easton's economy study suggested there was a market for entertainment and upscale restaurants, etc. in this area.

Board Member Stewart agreed attracting young people was important. She inquired about the age of the people at the workshop. Ms. Sterritt agreed there has been little input from the younger population. The online survey requested demographic information. Mr. Clifton advised 90+% at the listening sessions were over 35 years of age. Mr. Chave recalled there was greater mixture of ages at the design workshop.

Commissioner Wolfe suggested looking at places where young professionals live such as Fremont and Ballard and what those areas have done to attract younger people – build it and they will come. There is good transit access at Westgate and affordable, smaller units, farmers market, pea patches, etc. will attract younger people.

Mr. Clifton recommended reading, “The Rise of the Creative Class” that describes how young people are moving to places with creative environments. Ms. Creek commented young people want a live, work, play concept that is very casual with walkable destinations. Commissioner Wolfe commented young people are also interested in safety such as the bike paths in Fremont.

Commissioner Hall referred to a *Seattle Times* article regarding the twin towers project in downtown that will have 600 apartments that rent for \$1900/month for 800 square feet. In this economy, people are scared of home ownership. Young people are attracted to an area that has businesses within walking distance or a 10 minute bus ride. In Edmonds, there may need to be more emphasis on zoning to accomplish taller building and smaller apartments on bus routes. Ms. Sterritt commented the economic study also favored apartments over condominiums.

Commissioner Pierce commented the charm of neighborhoods like Fremont, Capital Hill, Ballard, Bell Town is the old and funky housing stock. The buildings in those areas were not redeveloped, most of the buildings are the original, small, old structures. He questioned how the City could attract the type of people that want to live in Ballard versus U-Village. Ms. Sterritt suggested further research into the areas that have history, charm and funkiness and whether new buildings could create something that attracts those people. Ms. Rottle commented part of the charm is scale, buildings with smaller units and facades, smaller retail square footages that are incubators for new businesses, etc. Older buildings allow adaptive reuse, there may be opportunities for adaptive reuse in Five Corners and Westgate but more density will require taller building. Ms. Creek referred to Stapleton in Denver, Colorado, as an example of an area that was redeveloped and has a primarily young population.

Board Member Stewart commented the aerial views do not provide a massing perspective. She asked whether technology such as SketchUp would be utilized at future meetings to provide a walking view. Ms. Sterritt advised the 3-D view can be tilted so that it is visible from ground level. Ms. Stewart commented the viewpoint provided by something like SketchUp is needed in order to sell an idea. Ms. Sterritt advised that would require additional budget.

Planning Board Chair Lovell asked whether development of a building at the street front in Westgate could be done now. Ms. Sterritt encouraged the City to take advantage of opportunities as they occur. Form based code can establish a “build-to line” versus a setback line to require buildings to be pulled up to the street. Mr. Clifton offered to send out a link to an article from Bristol, Connecticut, “Cool Communities,” that describes what they have done to create sustainability and bring people into clustered areas. They found the green index increases as more people live in an area. Ms. Rottle explained the intent is to create a plan that will be shaped by private developers and guided by the code. The other consideration is investments the City can make as a catalyst such as building structured parking that developers pay into or establishing parks/plazas that are catalysts for future development.

Mr. Clifton suggested melding Westgate 1 and 2, incorporating the QFC site proposal in Westgate 2 into Westgate 1. He anticipated citizens will be dismayed if the plans do not show QFC.

Board Member Johnson recalled at the design workshop everyone had different ideas about existing conditions. She suggested the team be prepared to answer questions from the public about existing development and the age of buildings. Ms. Sterritt suggested the team provide a better explanation that this is a 20 year plan that will evolve as property owners decide to make changes.

Mr. Clifton summarized the EDC and Planning Board are interested in more housing in each plan. Mr. Chave suggested a different of mix of housing, such as apartments that are smaller than 1200 square feet.

Commissioner Zagorski suggested 3-5 stories at Westgate rather than 3-4. Ms. Sterritt recalled the economic study not find a market for 5 story buildings; she offered to confirm that with Mr. Easton. Commissioner Zagorski suggested underground parking in the northwest corner of the Westgate site. Ms. Sterritt responded underground parking is very expensive, approximately \$35,000/stall; structured parking costs approximately \$20,000/stall. Mr. Chave recalled the economic study cited the interaction between cost and demand; Mr. Easton found there was not enough demand for density to support underground parking.

Commissioner Schaefer asked whether additional density such as from a 5-story building would affect the level of service of the intersection. Mr. Clifton answered the number of units proposed for each area will have negligible impacts on transportation.

Commissioner Wolfe supported the eventual possibility of more density at Five Corners because it is less busy and may be attractive to young people. Mr. Clifton envisioned smaller units at Five Corners for empty nesters, single people, etc. Ms. Sterritt suggested the density assumption be changed using the same total square footage but smaller unit size.

Board Member Cloutier commented on rental, condo and small homes vacancies in Five Corners, suggesting a draw needs to be created to fill the existing housing stock. Commissioner Wolfe commented Paris invested in museums, sculptures, etc. to create neighborhood character. She suggested consideration be given to what the City could do to create a personality for a neighborhood. Ms. Rottle suggested incorporating art into the code.

Audience Comments

Jim Clark, resident of the Westgate area, commented he often walks to Westgate with his grandchildren so the traffic on SR104 is an issue. He participated in the online survey and the listening session. He felt it was a very credible process and appreciated the opportunity to provide citizen input. With regard to higher density in Westgate or 5 story buildings, he recalled the residents of the area who attended the listening session preferred lower story buildings, less change and more residential. He preferred 2-3 story buildings and was concerned with 5 story buildings.

John Quast, Edmonds, explained his background is in real estate land use development. He expressed concern that focusing on the ability to walk to the centers would not provide enough financial support for businesses. Businesses will pay a great deal to be visible from SR104; he was concerned with the impact of walling off their visibility. He suggested comparing demographic data from the surrounding area with businesses envisioned for these sites. For example, the type of customers a business needed to be profitable. He recalled similar efforts to change downtown have been unsuccessful and asked how this effort will be different and accomplish a vision that was not accomplished downtown. Ms. Sterritt agreed his concerns should be discussed with the economic consultant.

Jennifer Mantooth, property owner near Westgate, suggested expanding the boundaries where higher density could be located. The current code refers to buffer zone between single family and more intense uses. She identified property she owns east of Westgate, a duplex with a separate 3-car garage and guesthouse. She identified other duplexes and businesses in that area, advising there is enough property to double the amount of housing and it is within walking distance of Westgate. She recalled the Comprehensive Plan envisioned retail on first floor with housing above along Edmonds Way. She also suggested 100th to 232nd be rezoned to encourage redevelopment as that area is also within walking distance to Westgate and transit.

Councilmember Buckshnis recommended referring to Five Corners and Westgate by name rather than as BN zones. She did not anticipate the Council would agree to change the zoning in all BN zones. Ms. Sterritt explained the intent was not to apply their proposal to all BN zones. The intent is an overlay zone

or replacement zone for two distinct areas, Five Corners and Westgate. Mr. Clifton explained form based code considers each area distinctly and separately.

5. REPORTS FROM SUBGROUPS

a. Land Use (Westgate & Five Corners)

b. Strategic Planning and Visioning – Fundraising

Mr. Clifton reported he extended an invitation to the Planning Board, City Council and EDC for up to two members from each group to serve on the review and selection committee for the Strategic Plan consultant. He requested members advise the chair of their group if they are interested in participating.

c. Technology

Councilmember Buckshnis thanked CIO Carl Nelson for the summary he provided to the Finance Committee.

d. Tourism

Mr. Clifton advised with input from the Police Department, community groups, Parks Department, Senior Center, Port, he obtained estimated attendance at major festivals/events in 2010. Businesses are often interested in the attendance at events/festivals.

6. PRIORITIZATION OF FUTURE AGENDA TOPICS

Chair Yamamoto advised the next EDC meeting will be Thursday, May 12. The public meeting to present the alternatives is May 3 in the Library Plaza Room from 6:00 – 8:00 p.m.

7. MISCELLANEOUS

8. AUDIENCE COMMENTS

9. ADJOURN

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:53 p.m.