

CITY OF EDMONDS
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
May 12, 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
Bruce Faires
Don Hall
Beatrice O'Rourke
Evan Pierce
Rich Senderoff
Bruce Witenberg
Rebecca Wolfe
Frank Yamamoto
Marianne Zagorski

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Stacy Gardea
Darrol Haug
Betty Larman
Mary Monfort
David Schaefer
Kerry St. Clair Ayers
Rob VanTassell

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER PRESENT

Phil Lovell, Chair
John Reed, Vice Chair
Kristiana Johnson
Valerie Stewart
William Ellis
Neil Tibbotts

STAFF PRESENT

Stephen Clifton, Community Services/Economic
Development Director
Cindi Cruz, Executive Assistant
Rob Chave, Planning Manager
Kernen Lien, Planner
Frances Chapin, Cultural Services Manager
Jeannie Dines, Recorder

PUBLIC PRESENT

Natalie Shippen
Ron Wambolt
Roger Hertich

1. INTRODUCTION AND COMMENTS BY CHAIR

New Planning Board Members Neil Tibbotts and William Ellis introduced themselves.

Port Commissioners Marianne Zagorski, Bruce Faires, and Mary Lou Block, and Port Executive Director Bob McChesney introduced themselves.

2. AMENDMENTS TO AGENDA

Chair Yamamoto advised an update on the Harbor Square Master Planning process will be provided prior to the update on the Five Corners/Westgate Study.

3. APPROVAL OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION MINUTES OF APRIL 20, 2011.

**COMMISSIONER ZAGORSKI MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINTUES OF APRIL 20, 2011.
COMMISSIONER FAIRES SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

4. HARBOR SQUARE MASTER PLANNING PROCESS

Port of Edmonds Executive Director Bob McChesney explained last year the Port reported to the EDC their plans for the Phase 2 public outreach, the follow-up to the Phase 1 feasibility study. He assured no decisions have been made and a preferred alternative has not been identified. This is simply an organized collection of ideas and concepts. He invited the EDC and Planning Board to revalidate the process and endorse their continuation. Economic development is vitally important to Edmonds and the core of the Port's mission. The previous feasibility study indicated the one time revenues generated to City by redevelopment would be over \$700,000 as well as ongoing revenues.

Bill Trimm, Steering Committee Facilitator, explained the overarching project goal is to prepare a redevelopment plan that will "Amend the Ports Master Plan and the City of Edmonds Comprehensive Plan with an economically feasible, environment responsible and highly quality designed redevelopment plan for Harbor Square." He reviewed the four stage planning process that is currently in the second stage, the public outreach process. After tonight's meeting, they will schedule a community open house to solicit input about the plans. Comments will then forwarded to the Steering Committee who will meet for a fourth time and eventually make a recommendation to the Port Commission to amend the Master Plan, the conclusion of the second stage. The third stage is the City's Comprehensive Plan amendment process. Once that is accomplished in late 2011/early 2012, the Port will begin marketing the plan to the development community.

Mr. Trimm described the Steering Committee's role: to determine what goals/principles should be used to guide the preparation of the redevelopment plan that will meet the Port's stated project goal. Stephen Clifton, although not a member of the 14-member Steering Committee, has been an active observer and a great resource. The Steering Committee first met December 6 for a conversation about Harbor Square and to accept comments. At the end of that meeting, the comments were organized in three categories, 1) uses and economic feasibility, 2) connectivity, and 3) design. He provided a summary of comments from December 6 meeting:

- Introduce a mix of uses that complement downtown with residential (mixed use) as the predominant use
- Connect redevelopment to downtown and waterfront
- A village character with a focus on the pedestrian
- Public assets for all of Edmonds and bike and pedestrian routes through site that connect to Citywide systems
- Focus density away from downtown, step back building heights along Dayton
- The pedestrian and visual gateway should be from SR104/Dayton intersection
- Marsh is a key attribute of site redevelopment

John Owen, Makers, introduced **Stefani Wildhaber, Makers**, who is managing the team. He explained the visualizations are an attempt to understand the issues, respond to input from the Steering Committee and illustrate basic ideas. He reviewed Scheme 01 Site Diagram, the result of the first exercise with the Committee. He reviewed several Scheme 01 3D diagrams, assuring they were an exercise to consider views, uses on the site, building setbacks, connection to marsh, circulation, etc.

He reviewed Scheme 02 Site Diagram, explaining this scheme moved the tennis courts toward the railroad tracks to a sports facility atop parking. He identified the location of residential in this scheme facing the Marsh in a village-like setting. He reviewed Scheme 02 3D diagrams, identifying the location of the existing hotel, residential, office, and retail with buildings up to 5 stories in some places. He provided a comparison of Schemes 01 and 02:

	Scheme 01	Scheme 02
Retail	88,589 SF	50,400 SF
Office	34,900 SF	9,784 SF
Residential	457,575 SR (358 units)	362,571 SF (340 units)
Recreational	55,000 SF (existing)	123,410 SF
Totals	679,263 SF	546,165 SF
Parking (off street)	839 stalls	1,091 stalls
Open Space (public)	173,800 SF (4 acres)	164,410 SF (3.8 acres)
Open Space (private)	51,660 SF (1.2 acres)	131,236 SF (3.0 acres)
Revenue Base Projections		
Residents	716	680
Residential	358 units	340 units
Square Feet	457,575 SF	362,571 SF
Sales Tax	\$103,820	\$ 98,600
Utility Tax	\$ 80,908	\$ 76,840
Property Tax	\$222,676	\$211,480
Projected Annual Additional Revenue	\$407,404	\$386,920

He reviewed a view shed analysis conducted by UW students to look at existing view sheds and models of impacts to those views. He provided photographs that illustrate the existing view and simulated impacts on views from the following locations:

- 2nd Ave S and Dayton looking west toward intersection of SR104 and Dayton
- Alder between 5th & 6th looking west toward Puget Sound
- NE corner of SR104 and Dayton looking SW
- 3rd Ave S, north of Alder

Mr. Owen provided the results of a visual preference exercise with the Committee:

- NW traditional style
- Modulation of buildings
- Active sidewalk/pedestrian area
- Informal curvilinear green space
- Curb-less street
- Good separation between street and residential

Steering Committee comments/suggestions from the second meeting (February 1, 2011) included:

- Preference for Scheme 02
- Look at different locations for view sheds
- Ensure a mix of housing
- Parking structures will be expensive
- Ensure floor plans flexible (i.e. residential to office)
- Roof over tennis courts
- Entrance/exit at SR104/Dayton as gateway feature
- Coordinate SR104 entrance with WSDOT

He reviewed Scheme 02 with 1st adjustments incorporating the Steering Committee's comments/suggestion. The Steering Committee comments/suggestions from their third (April 4, 2011) meeting included:

- Reduce building height along Dayton from 55' to 45' and create more modulation

- Sidewalks to be 15' wide
- Include a civic/cultural/viewpoint/interpretive element in redevelop as public benefit
- Provide gateway at SR104
- 25' building north of Dayton with street trees and 15' wide sidewalks to frame the redevelopment
- Remove the office/retail appendage at the corner and add a little 3-story building on the opposite side along SR104
- Show an additional view farther to the south and east (#36)
- Comparison existing conditions to proposed schemes

He reviewed Scheme 02 with the 2nd adjustments and drawings of the revised character. He provided a comparison of existing conditions to Scheme 02 with regard to impervious surface and Marsh setback.

Mr. McChesney invited input from the EDC and Planning Board, emphasizing this is a process and their intent is to developing a project that will be beneficial to Edmonds.

Discussion followed regarding ongoing discussion with the health club owner regarding the feasibility of relocating the facility to accommodate Scheme 02, feasibility of moving the tennis courts, the health club owner's attendance at Steering Committee meetings, potential vibration from the railroad tracks on the relocated tennis courts, public views from the site, potential for using rooftops as public places to increase views, a suggestion for a bird lookout structure in the Marsh, the Marsh as a wildlife sanctuary, varying public opinion regarding interface between the Marsh and Harbor Square, whether consideration has been given to including regional attractions in Harbor Square, how the development fits within the downtown/waterfront/Port area, rejection of this area for a big box store and preference for a planned residential community that complements Edmonds,

COMMISSIONER WITENBERG MOVED TO REVALIDATE THE PROCESS AND ENDORSE ITS CONTINUATION. COMMISSIONER FAIRES SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANMOUSLY.

Mr. Clifton provided an update on the Strategic Plan process. Today was the deadline for submittals in response to the RFP; 13 were submitted. The Review/Interview Committee will review the submittals over the next week and make a determination by May 19 regarding which consultants to interview.

5. FIVE CORNERS/WESTGATE SPECIAL DISTRICT STUDY – UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON PRESENTATION OF ALTERNATE CONCEPTS AND DISCUSSION OF CODE RELATED ITEMS

Jill Sterritt, Affiliate Faculty, University of Washington, identified this presentation within the overall process, explaining the goal of tonight's presentation and discussion was for the EDC to select a preferred alternative that will be provided to the City Council for their input prior to the students developing the code.

UW Student Betsy Jacobson described the pedestrian connections they considered, explaining their focus was on a 5-10 minute walk. She displayed a diagram of current and potential pedestrian connections in the Five Corners area, advising of the need to complete sidewalks in the 10-minute walk area. They also considered bicycle connections to bring bicyclists near the site without using the roundabout, recognizing that roundabouts can be difficult for bicycles. They also looked at green connections to connect nearby schools and parks to the site.

Ms. Jacobson reviewed pedestrian connections in the Westgate area, highlighting the importance of widening sidewalks on SR104 as well as pedestrian improvement on 100th. There are currently no bicycle connections through Westgate; their focus for bicycle amenities was on 100th. She reviewed green

connections, pointed out natural topography that can be utilized for open space as well as to connect schools and parks. Another important issue in this area is stormwater management; runoff currently flows directly into Puget Sound primarily without filtration. Their process considered sustainable stormwater infrastructure to slow runoff including green screens, living walls, bioswales/rain gardens, green roofs, and permeable paving

UW Student Julie Creek reviewed design alternatives with photos of life space. She reviewed the Five Corners Garden Gateway:

- Life space happens around the roundabout
- Design incorporates bioswales and water filtration systems, open plaza areas
- A secondary life space includes street trees, greening along roadways leading to the site
- Opportunity for green/open space behind buildings such as farmer market, summer movie screening
- Icon at entrance to site
- Opportunity for roof top gardens
- Smaller more affordable-type housing
- Building scale increasing as one moves onto the site.

Ms. Sterritt relayed the public's comments regarding this alternative at the May 3 meeting:

- Liked building oriented toward the roundabout including the icon building
- Liked that the focus of this alternative was redevelopment to support neighborhood center services such as grocery store, small shops and entertainment
- Liked water quality, open space and green landscape features
- Liked that there was no large retail, shopping, services communicate a local feel

Ms. Creek reviewed the Five Corners Village Center:

- Building masses are smaller
- Retains Jeremiah Center
- Clustering of buildings
- Greening streets
- Courtyards
- Lower scale buildings, 1-2 story with allowance for 3 story buildings in center
- Retail and restaurants on ground level with housing and offices above

Public comments regarding the Five Corners Village Center included:

- Preferred 2-3 story height limit versus 3-4 in previous alternative
- Preferred the retail/restaurant with office/housing above over other alternative
- Liked local retail and services
- Liked activity focused throughout the site

Ms. Creek reviewed the Westgate Urban Village alternative:

- More dense development
- Internal streets for vehicle or pedestrians
- Mixed use, retains some large retail
- Community open space in center
- Parking structure fronted with retail
- Streets pedestrian scale in north-south direction and building pulled to corner
- Buildings' focus is internal
- Taller building at corner, potential for overpass

Public comment regarding the Westgate Urban Village alternative included:

- 50/50 response to the internal circulation
- 50/50 response regarding new building versus protect existing vegetation

Ms. Creek reviewed the Westgate Arts and Food Hub alternative:

- Opportunity for green buffering on SR104
- Green gateway and building pulled back to allow that to happen
- Less parking in back
- Larger footprint buildings, as redevelop occurs, could have housing on top
- Housing on edges with retail office on street

Public comment regarding the Westgate Arts and Food Hub alternative included:

- Public preferred this alternative
- Preferred 3-story height limit versus the 4-story high limit in other alternative
- Liked buildings' orientation to the street
- Liked retention of PCC, Starbucks, and QFC redeveloped
- Support for Pedestrian improvements along 100th
- Support for surface parking versus structured parking in other alternative behind PCC

Ms. Sterritt referred to a summary of results from Preference Cards completed by members of the public at the May 3 meeting regarding the Five Corners and Westgate alternatives. She also referred to a list of key issues for EDC decisions and a comparison of the alternatives.

Commissioner Faires inquired about a quantification of impact to revenue projections such as if the Westgate business climate was different or there were more residential units. Ms. Sterritt responded that was not part of their assignment or skill set. If that information was important to the EDC, she suggested that it be an additional task requested from the economist. Commissioner Faires suggested the Commission select a preferred alternative and then request an estimate of the potential change.

Commissioner Pierce asked whether the open space square footage in Garden Gateway and Village Center include all trees on the parking lot edges, etc. Ms. Creek responded the open space represents an assumption of a green swath around the parking lots and the green treed areas within the parking lots and plazas which are all private property. Ms. Sterritt advised there is also a green corridor around the roundabout and street trees which are on public property.

Commissioner Pierce recalled the original site designs from the workshops had large areas of open space/green space that are not shown in either alternative. Ms. Creek referred to Five Corners Village Center that has open space/public park in the northeast corner with an adjacent pervious paver plaza. There are also pocket parks amongst and in between buildings. Village Center is designed with swing space rather than dedicated open space. Ms. Sterritt agreed many of the tables at the Saturday workshop had larger park/open spaces. If that was desired, it would likely require acquisition by the City or a least a public/private partnership as it was unlikely that much green space would be dedicated on one piece of property by a private owner.

Commissioner Pierce asked whether there would be pedestrian space within the roundabout. Mr. Clifton answered there will be crosswalks but usable open space may not be desirable due to circling traffic. He relayed that the Public Director is in the process of selecting an engineer and will hold community meetings to design the roundabout. Ms. Creek commented in one of the alternatives green space is located in the northeast corner of because it is undeveloped space owned by the church. The roundabout is

envisioned as quite small, one lane, so that it does not encroach onto private property. The roundabout would need to be enlarged to allow any use in the center.

Commissioner Senderoff pointed out Pine Ridge Park provides green space but the access is hidden. He suggested making the access more visible and making a bike connection from the neighborhood to Five Corners through park.

Ms. Sterritt reviewed Key Issues for EDC Decisions for each alternative, explaining their recommendation is based on public comment as well as their feeling regarding the site. She pointed out one of the key concept for both Five Corners options is that without additional height there is little incentive for redevelopment.

Commissioner Anderson referred to the five lanes of traffic going through roundabout and asked whether consideration had been given to redirecting one of the streets through development. Mr. Clifton offered to inquire with the Public Works Director whether the engineer planned to study that.

Commissioner Faires commented the concentration of building around the roundabout provides a community focus and critical mass of people that would be dynamic enough to make it look like people were on the street versus defuse may not look like enough. Ms. Sterritt agreed, noting the team favored pulling buildings out to the street to encourage people to walk to the site.

Commissioner Hall pointed out Five Corners is basically a big parking lot and most people drive there. He suggested that pulling development out to the street would make it look busier. Ms. Sterritt agreed, noting building at the street and the presence of pedestrians also slows traffic. Commissioner Hall commented visible retail stores also slow traffic.

Commissioner Zagorski emphasized the opportunity in both areas to attract young people. Ms. Sterritt pointed out younger people are often more willing to walk. Commissioner Zagorski noted younger people likely will not care whether a building is 4 versus 3 stories.

Planning Board Chair Lovell agreed with the comments about increasing residential density and moving buildings close to the street to create a neighborhood feel. It is was his impression from the workshops that the neighbors want to retain the existing neighborhood feel and want to be able to access the area by car, bicycle or walking. He expressed support for allowing 3 stories outright and up to an additional 1 story via a development agreement in which the developer provides additional amenities.

Commissioner Pierce asked whether residential was defined as condominiums or apartments. Mr. Sterritt advised they did not differentiate and likely would not unless the EDC had a preference. The economic analysis suggested apartments are more viable in the foreseeable future. Commissioner Faires advised those economics change approximately every 3-4 years. Mr. Clifton advised the City did not define multifamily as apartments or condominiums, the market decides.

If buildings are pulled to the street edge, Commissioner Pierce asked whether the primary entrance would be on the back side or the street side. Ms. Sterritt answered it could be either. The form-based code could require entries be visible to the street even if there was entry from the parking lot. Ms. Creek advised they considered live/work units in one quadrant, small 900-square footage apartments in another, affordable housing in another and loft spaces in another in order to provide a variety of housing to attract a variety of residents. Ms. Sterritt reminded what was actually constructed on as site would be determined by the developer.

Commissioner Faires suggested a reality check regarding the viability of development.

Commissioner Yamamoto commented on the need to balance what the neighborhood wants with what the EDC wants. Ms. Sterritt explained the recommendation is a hybrid of what the community said and what they professionally think is best for site. The public comment is from the people who live there now; this is planning for who may live there in the future.

Commissioner Wolfe inquired about Snohomish County population growth projections, noting with Sounder, Boeing demand for less expensive housing, etc. it seems logical more young people will be moving to this area. Mr. Clifton responded Edmonds is currently meeting its population targets.

Commissioner Hall agreed additional height at Five Corners would be necessary to encourage redevelopment and did not think 2 stories + bonus would be enough.

Five Corners

COMMISSIONER WITENBERG MOVED THAT THE EDC SUPPORT THE RECOMMENDED FOR FIVE CORNERS WITH A CHANGE IN THE BUILDING HEIGHT FROM 2 STORIES + BONUS TO THREE STORIES + ONE STORY VIA A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT PROCESS. COMMISSIONER FAIRES SECONDED THE MOTION.

Mr. Clifton recommended the Planning Board provide their input but not vote as the Board will be providing a recommendation to the City Council.

COMMISSIONER SENDEROFF MOVED TO AMEND THE MOTION TO ADD TO PLAZAS/OPEN SPACE “FOCUSED AROUND THE ROUNDABOUT” AND ADD VERBIAGE REGARDING COMMUNITY SERVICE ACTIVITIES TO ACTIVITY. COMMISSIONER ZAGORSKI SECONDED. AMENDMENT CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

VOTE ON MAIN MOTION AS AMENDED UNANIMOUSLY.

Westgate

Ms. Sterritt reviewed differences between two alternatives with regard to the key concept, building placement and building height. She advised the parking would also include one space per dwelling unit.

Commissioner Faires recalled one of ideas expressed at the first meeting was to move residential units away from the streets and toward the hill where increased building heights would not impact the adjacent residential uses. Ms. Sterritt identified the location of the residential in both alternatives, noting the Urban Village alternative has more residential at the base of hill.

Commissioner Wolfe recalled a member of the public spoke to the EDC who was interested in increasing density of her property southeast of Westgate. Ms. Sterritt responded that was beyond the study area and could be a future consideration. She agreed increasing residential density in the area increases walkability.

Planning Board Chair Lovell commented this is a very challenging area due to the State highway and ferry traffic. Both alternatives pull the buildings closer to SR104 but the Arts and Food provides a green space between the highway and the buildings. Development at Westgate is an opportunity for residents to live, shop, and work and possibly not own a car due to the availability of public transportation. If done properly, Westgate would be an appropriate location to increase density without impacting the surrounding single family residential neighborhoods. It could also be a gateway to Edmonds. Although a Master Plan is unlikely due to numerous property owners, there is opportunity to create an environment that appeals to young people. He recalled a preference for surface versus structured parking. Ms. Sterritt

advised the Village Center alternative shows structured parking. Structured parking is expensive and may require some public investment. She agreed internal streets may be difficult to accomplish with multiple property owners.

Commissioner Wolfe expressed support for greenery on SR104 and 100th, commenting it would attract people and give them a good feeling about the City.

Commissioner Senderoff suggested the sidewalks along SR104 be separated from the road to allow planting/buffer zone to provide separation from cars and to encourage people to walk. A brief discussion followed regarding the right-of-way width on SR104.

COMMISSIONER WITENBERG MOVED THAT THE EDC SUPPORT RECOMMENDED FOR WESTGATE AND ADD A BUFFER BETWEEN THE STREET AND THE SIDEWALK, UNDER BUILDING HEIGHT, THREE STORIES PLUS ONE STORY CONSISTENT WITH THE TOPOGRAPHY BASED ON A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, AND ADD VILLAGE PARK UNDER CIVIC INVESTMENT. COMMISSIONER FAIRES SECONDED THE MOTION.

Ms. Sterritt clarified their intent was to have pedestrian walkways on 100th as well as on SR104. Discussion followed regarding encouraging increased building height where the topography would allow buildings to be located at the base of the hill. Ms. Sterritt advised this is the EDC's primary opportunity for input on the preferred alternative before it is presented to the

VOTE MOTION CARRIED (9-1); COMMISSIONER SENDEROFF VOTING NO.

It was the consensus of the Commission that they preferred green features along SR104 in Westgate.

Commissioner Pierce inquired about the building placement in the recommended alternative and whether it incorporated the desire for green features along SR104. Ms. Sterritt explained the intent would be to blend the two alternatives, retaining green along SR104 with some internal streets. The recommended would be more similar to Arts and Food Hub alternative than the Urban Village. Ms. Jacobson explained the plan could be reconfigured slightly to provide the green space on SR104 and provide parking. Ms. Sterritt explained the internal circulation in the urban village area on the northwest quadrant will be reduced in order to retain QFC and other larger footprint stores.

Commissioner Faires commented structured/underground parking makes sense with 3-4 story buildings. Ms. Sterritt relayed the economist's indication that underground parking is not feasible due to the cost: \$35,000 per space for underground and \$20,000 per space for structured. She summarized the economist's direction that it was not reasonable to expect underground parking.

Mr. Clifton referred to the discussion at the joint Planning Board/EDC meeting regarding the bank building and buildings fronting the street. The language in the recommended alternative does not reflect that intent and suggested it be rewritten something like all building should front public streets and internal streets where feasible, minimizing sides and backs of buildings to public streets. The Comprehensive Plan states buildings must front on public streets.

(Commissioner Faires left the meeting at 8:45 p.m.)

Discussion followed regarding a blended concept with more green along SR104, support for the Arts & Food Hub alternative with more housing near the hills, additional green that was envisioned on private property, ability to mass buildings at the corner along with green features, add greening at the corners (between the sidewalk and the building and between the street and the sidewalk) under key concept,

whether to allow height above 3 stories (100% corner) at the corners, and adding consistent with Comprehensive Plan under building placement and discourage/prohibit side/back to public streets.

Ms. Sterritt suggested striking the 100% corner, adding discourage sides and backs to public streets and maintaining the existing Comprehensive Plan language. Ms. Creek commented most people will access the site via a vehicle. The building could have display windows on the street with access from the parking lot. Building modulation allowed for greening in addition to green in the right-of-way. Ms. Sterritt explained form based code can be more specific with regard to the building façade. Internal streets and parking encourages entry from those internal streets. This discussion indicates the Commission does not want sides and backs facing public streets. Ms. Chapin pointed out form based code allows for the creation of a visual sense of vibrancy along the street without requiring every business to have an entry on the street.

COMMISSIONER ZAGORSKI MOVED TO DISCOURAGE SIDES AND BACK TO PUBLIC STREETS AND REMOVE 100% CORNER. COMMISSIONER WITENBERG SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

To minimize the impact of building sides and backs, Mr. Clifton suggested replacing an occasional building along the corridor with a courtyard. Ms. Sterritt suggested requiring a break in the buildings in a certain distance to allow for pedestrian access.

6. REPORTS FROM SUBGROUPS – None

7. UPDATE OF PLANNING BOARD DISCUSSIONS ON POTENTIAL BOARD & BN ZONING AMENDMENTS

Planning Board Chair Phil Lovell reported the Planning Board had a lengthy discussion at last night's meeting regarding the bank project on the corner of SR104 & 100th. The Board voted to recommend to the City Council that a temporary ordinance be approved that establishes a minimum setback on SR104 of 8 feet in lieu of the current 20 feet, and 5 feet along 100th in lieu of the current 20 feet. The ordinance is applicable only to Westgate and expires one year from the date it is approved. The one-year time period will allow this study to be reviewed and the necessary changes made to the Comprehensive Plan and zoning to implement form based zoning.

8. PRIORITIZATION OF FUTURE AGENDA TOPICS

9. MISCELLANEOUS

Mr. Clifton reported the Dick's Drive In permit has been issued. Bill the Butcher is scheduled to open in June. He anticipated news will soon be provided about a proposed project for Swedish-Edmonds.

Planning Board Member Stewart offered to send the EDC statistics compiled based on a walking tour of the BD1 zone. She relayed there are a total of 87 spaces 38% retail and art related, 20% food related, 10% beauty/health, 13% finance/insurance/real estate, 2% office, 7% other, and 9% vacant.

Commissioner Anderson inquired whether Swedish-Edmonds planned to renew Value Village's lease. Mr. Clifton offered to research.

10. AUDIENCE COMMENTS – None

11. ADJOURN

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 9:15 p.m.