

CITY OF EDMONDS
ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION
June 15, 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
Stacy Gardea
Darrol Haug
Mary Monfort
Evan Pierce
David Schaefer
Rich Senderoff
Frank Yamamoto
Marianne Zagorski

COMMISSIONERS ABSENT

Don Hall
Beatrice O'Rourke
Kerry St. Clair Ayers
Rob VanTassell
Bruce Witenberg
Rebecca Wolfe

ELECTED OFFICIALS PRESENT

Councilmember Diane Buckshnis

PLANNING BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Phil Lovell, Chair
Kristiana Johnson
Todd Cloutier
Valerie Stewart
William Ellis

STAFF PRESENT

Stephen Clifton, Community Services/Economic
Development Director
Cindi Cruz, Executive Assistant
Rob Chave, Planning Manager
Jeannie Dines, Recorder

PUBLIC PRESENT

Roger Hertrich
Joan Bloom
Brad Sturgill, MarketFitz, Inc.

1. **INTRODUCTIONS AND COMMENTS BY CHAIR - NONE**
2. **AMENDMENTS TO AGENDA – NONE**
3. **APPROVAL OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION MINUTES OF MAY 12, 2011**

**COMMISSIONER FAIRES MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MAY 12, 2011.
COMMISSIONER ZAGORSKI SECONDED THE MOTION.**

Commissioner Senderoff expressed concern the minutes did not accurately reflect what the Commission approved for Five Corners, 3 stories plus bonus to 4 stories per a development agreement, and for Westgate, 3 stories plus bonus to 4 stories and consistent with topography.

Commissioner Senderoff explained he planned to offer an amendment later in the meeting for Westgate, 3 stories plus 1 or 2 additional stories per a development agreement and consistent with the topography.

COMMISSIONER FAIRES WITHDREW HIS MOTION WITH THE AGREEMENT OF THE SECOND.

COMMISSIONER FAIRES MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MAY 12, 2011 AS AMENDED (CHANGE MOTION ON PAGE 9, TO READ, "...THAT THE EDC SUPPORT THE RECOMMENDED FOR FIVE CORNERS WITH A CHANGE IN THE BUILDING HEIGHT FROM 2 STORIES + BONUS TO 3 STORIES + ~~BONUSES~~ 1 ADDITIONAL STORY VIA A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT PROCESS." AND CHANGE MOTION ON PAGE 10, TO READ, "...THAT THE EDC SUPPORT RECOMMENDED FOR WESTGATE AND ADD A BUFFER BETWEEN THE STREET AND THE SIDEWALK, UNDER BUILDING HEIGHT, 3 STORIES PLUS ~~HEIGHT BONUS~~ 1 ADDITIONAL STORY FOR SOME AMENITIES CONSISTENT WITH THE TOPOGRAPHY BASED ON A DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT, AND ADD VILLAGE PARK UNDER CIVIC INVESTMENT.") COMMISSIONER ZAGORSKI SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

4. FIVE CORNERS/WESTGATE SPECIAL DISTRICT STUDY – UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON PRESENTATION OF UPDATED CONCEPTS

Chair Yamamoto explained tonight's goal was general approval by the EDC so that it can be referred on to the City Council.

Jill Sterritt, Affiliate Faculty, University of Washington, explained the EDC provided approval at the last meeting time but further work was done on the plans based on the EDC's direction. She reiterated the plans were illustrative only to provide an example of what development could look like. Form-based code will not dictate a specific development for each site but rather establish a framework.

Westgate

UW Student Betsy Jacobsen provided an overview of the Westgate plan. She explained the goals for Westgate include retaining the two grocery stores and businesses that were identified during the public workshop, incorporating large footprint buildings and retail uses, retaining large trees, avoid building into the steep slope surrounding the site, and creating internal circulation on the north quadrants. She reviewed the proposed changes:

- Along SR 104 incorporate a 5-7 foot green buffer and 8-10 foot sidewalks
- On the two north quadrants large footprint buildings that could potentially have entrances on both the front and rear. Specifics will be addressed in street frontage recommendation
- On the southeast quadrant, parking along SR 104 reconfigured to allow for corner entrances
- Massing diagrams show the QFC building envelope and the numbers reflect the QFC redeveloped to include the adjacent blocks. Would include some structured parking in new development
- Two examples provided of different types of housing that could be built into the steep slopes that would buffer the adjacent neighborhoods. One example is a 3-story bed and breakfast with structured parking near Bartells, and on the north quadrant 2-story row houses with tuck-under parking

Five Corners

UW Student Brad Shipley provided an overview of the Five Corners plan. Changes included:

- Density by changing 2-3 stories to up to 4 stories. Residential over ground floor office/retail
- Massing focused primarily around roundabout and scaling down to blend with adjacent single family neighborhood
- Buildings at the street, parking in back
- Primary focus for retail along Main and 212th
- Max build out 95 housing units above retail, previously 49

Ms. Sterritt explained Plan/Form-Based Code includes an introduction, regulating framework, land use and building standards, streetscape and public space standards, frontage types, green features standards and administration and implementation. Building types in the plan include:

- *Row house* – townhome apartments or condominiums
- *Live/work* – townhome apartments or condominiums
- *Courtyard residential* – apartment or condominium flats
- *Side court* – office only, retail mixed use with office or residential above or community service mixed use with office or residential above
- *Commercial block* – retail only, office only, retail mixed use with office or residential above, or community service mixed use with office or residential above

Ms. Sterritt provided photographic examples of building types that will be included in the document, noting the photographs will include both traditional and contemporary building forms.

Ms. Sterritt displayed examples of streetscape standards for Westgate and Five Corners, explaining they are still working with Public Works staff to ensure the standards proposed in the Plan will work with the City's current standards. For Westgate along 100th, one option is a bicycle lane on both sides of the street and parking with trees at intervals. A second option for 100th is a 2-way cycle path that is buffered on one side with a bioswale and planted buffer on the other side. She displayed examples of streetscape standards for Five Corners along Main Street there are two travel lanes with bike lanes on either side with a combination of parking/landscaping. The goal is wherever possible to have sidewalk on the property owner setback as well as in the public right-of-way to provide a 10-12 foot sidewalk to allow retail use on the sidewalk. She displayed a streetscape standard along Bowdoin that includes a bioswale and sidewalk.

Ms. Sterritt reviewed green features they are trying to include in the plan. She recalled the EDC's direction was to require various green features as well as allow additional green features as amenities for additional building height.

Ms. Sterritt requested the EDC reaffirm their support for the concepts. They will present the plan to the City Council on June 21. With approval of the City Council, the plan will be forwarded to the Planning Board for review and refinement. She anticipated public meetings this fall and a City Council decision approximately yearend. Ms. Sterritt reviewed the list of key issues for Westgate and Five Corners, the UW recommendation, the EDC decision and revised Plan details reflecting the EDC decision.

Councilmember Buckshnis asked whether the street edge is the property line. Ms. Sterritt responded they are recommending a required 5-foot setback from the property line. The building code typically has a required minimum setback; there is a maximum setback in form-based code.

Commissioner Faires asked whether a development agreement would allow a staggered line of buildings along the street front. Ms. Sterritt answered one of the ideas in form-based code is creating a strong line of buildings. Mr. Chave responded there could be options by district. If the intent is focused retail activity, a consistent linear front of building is preferred. Where that is less important, there could be some flexibility. Ms. Sterritt anticipated the differences between areas would be addressed during the Planning Board's review. Mr. Chave anticipated more flexibility at Westgate because it is a much larger area and the quadrants have different characters.

Commissioner Anderson asked how the proposed bank building will fit with the plan. Mr. Clifton answered it will fit in well other than it is only one story. He pointed out in the revised plan the buildings are close to the street but it does not define a specific setback; that would be defined by the Planning Board. The interim zoning for Westgate proposes a 5 foot setback from the property line on 100th and an 8

foot setback from the property line on SR 104. Mr. Clifton explained the developer of the bank building originally proposed a drive lane between the building and street but are willing to put the building up to the setback and have the drive-through on the side or rear of the building. Mr. Chave summarized the building the developer has said they are willing to build if the proposed setbacks are approved is very close to the concept in the UW Plan other than building height.

Commissioner Zagorski observed the site plan shows one story for the QFC building; an earlier drawing showed a grocery on the ground floor with residential above. She anticipated this would be a great place for residential units for younger people. Ms. Sterritt explained when redevelopment was shown for the site the public assumed QFC would be eliminated. It is shown on the plans as a shadow building, a space that could remain as is or could accommodate change. Commissioner Zagorski agreed with retaining QFC but enhancing the building with residential above. Ms. Sterritt explained retaining the base footprint was intended to indicate that building did not need to change for surrounding development to occur but it could change.

Commissioner Senderoff inquired about the large building behind QFC. Ms. Jacobson advised the goal is to bring buildings to the street. That building would need to be torn down to allow for surface parking.

Commissioner Senderoff asked whether there was a way in form-based code to encourage some of the resident units to be smaller apartments/condominiums to attract couple/singles to this area that has many of the elements of an urban village. Ms. Sterritt agreed smaller residential units are the vision for the overall development. Residential is more feasible on the upper stories rather than commercial due to parking restrictions. Providing smaller housing units could be on the menu of amenities for additional height.

Commissioner Senderoff inquired how building heights would be controlled at the edges in Five Corners. Ms. Sterritt answered this is an illustrative plan. If the EDC felt two stories were more compatible at the edge, that could be controlled via the plan. Mr. Chave explained the code will apply the building types to a map which provides guidance and control.

Commissioner Senderoff asked whether uses on the upper floors in Five Corners could be something other than residential if the parking requirements were relaxed. Mr. Chave answered flat rate parking is assumed rather than parking ratios for specific uses. Enough parking needs to be provided to avoid spill over in the neighborhood. The goal is to make the parking requirements more flexible than they are currently but also ensuring they are not so flexible that it impacts neighborhood. With regard to uses other than residential on upper floors such as office, Mr. Clifton explained there is more opportunity for that in the Westgate area due to the possibility of structured parking. Ms. Sterritt envisioned in Five Corners there would primarily be surface parking and some tuck-under parking. In Westgate where there are larger parcels, there may be opportunity for incorporating parking in a building.

Commissioner Pierce asked whether form-based code could state redevelopment of the QFC site include a grocery store. Ms. Sterritt answered there could be a general statement in the vision. Mr. Chave advised that could be an incentive in a development agreement. For example providing one of the desired uses could meet one of the criteria on list.

Councilmember Buckshnis asked about the potential for a parking structure. Ms. Sterritt answered they are not opposed to a parking structure; they typically are not economically viable. The plan will include language regarding shared parking agreements and structured parking if economically viable. If a parking structure were provided on SR 104 or 100th, it should be encircled with retail to hide it. Mr. Chave clarified the plan did not assume structured parking because the economic study found it was not economically viable. Ms. Sterritt commented the City could construct a parking structure to incentive

development. Mr. Chave pointed out University Village and Bellevue Square added their structured parking later as the need occurred.

Because it would be a walkable/bikeable/transit community, Planning Board Stewart asked whether consideration had been given to not providing a parking space with a unit but allowing a resident to rent a parking space. Ms. Sterritt explained the alternatives were designed with one parking space per unit. She agreed in urban areas a parking space is not always included with a unit.

Planning Board Member Johnson inquired about the streetscape standard for SR 104. Ms. Sterritt responded the streetscape standards are very preliminary. Mr. Chave advised they are still being discussed with staff. Ms. Sterritt reviewed two options for the 100th streetscape standard:

1. Bike lanes on both sides, 2 travel lanes and a center turn lane, parking and bulb out areas for landscaping, a 6-foot sidewalk on both sides in the public right-of-way connected to a 5-foot sidewalk on the private property setback.
2. A 2-way cycle path, 2 travel lanes and center turn lane, bioswale and same sidewalk and landscaping.

The intent of both options is to provide good pedestrian access near the building frontage, bicycle path/trail, and bioswales. Ms. Clifton advised the UW team has been asked to provide Public Works all the concepts prepared to date so that they can be reviewed against the City's adopted plan to determine where there are conflicts or where concepts can be incorporated into the Transportation Plan.

Commissioner Pierce asked whether the State has any requirement for future improvements on SR 104. Mr. Clifton advised the State does not have any improvements planned for SR 104.

A brief discussion occurred regarding changing the recommendation for Westgate to allow 3 stories + 1 or 2 additional stories via a development agreement and consistent with topography and how the amenities for allowing additional height would be determined.

Planning Board Chair Lovell referred to the Summary of Planning Board Recommended Changes to BD Zones, specifically #4 regarding criteria for a development agreement. The UW Plan is a concept for Westgate and Five Corners; the specifics can be worked out in the future via form-based zoning and criteria for development agreement.

Planning Board Johnson advised she has attended all meetings, workshops and listening sessions. She observed one of the key elements of the Westgate plan is bringing building to the street and that form-based code would help implement that vision. She recalled Westgate 1 showed 100% massing at SR 104/100th and Westgate 2 showed significant setbacks at the corner to provide a green gateway. Today's revised plan seems to be a compromise. Ms. Sterritt recalled strong direction from the EDC that the buildings face the street or have sufficient transparency to the street.

Commissioner Faires commented his vision was for Westgate to be a place to walk and shop; the proposed plan fulfills that vision. Commissioner Senderoff agreed the UW plan was a compromise.

Chair Yamamoto relayed the EDC's desire to see the information that will be presented to the City Council. Ms. Sterritt explained the information that will be provided to the Council will be the PowerPoint presented to the EDC tonight. The focus of the presentation to the Council will be the public process and less detail about the plans. Commissioner Pierce asked whether the presentation will incorporate the EDC's discussion tonight. Ms. Sterritt assured if motions are made that changed how the plan is illustrated, the plans will be revised before they are presented to the Council.

COMMISSIONER SENDEROFF MOVED FOR WESTGATE, TO ACCEPT THE REVISED PLAN WITH THE EXCEPTION FOR THE BUILDING HEIGHT TO GO TO THREE STORIES PLUS ONE OR TWO ADDITIONAL STORIES VIA DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT AND CONSISTENT WITH TOPOGRAPHY. COMMISSIONER FAIRES SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Zagorski expressed her support for the motion, pointing out additional stories reduces the price and makes units more affordable for younger people. That is an important opportunity in Westgate.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Commissioner Senderoff relayed his idea for Five Corners, 3 stories plus 1 additional story with development agreement for buildings facing the circle and 2 stories plus 1 story with development agreement for building not facing the circle. He envisioned the circle being the center of activity and as development moved away from the circle, there would be less activity toward the neighborhoods. Commissioner Senderoff explained his intent was mostly 3 stories with some 4 story buildings at the core and 2 stories at the edges. He was wary of unintended consequences if there was one height throughout Five Corners. He pointed out a development agreement is a public process that allows the neighborhood to be involved in process.

Commissioner Pierce asked where in the development a line would be drawn between 3 story +1 and 2 story + 1 buildings. Commissioner Faires suggested including language in the plan regarding the intent to have building heights taper toward the neighborhoods.

Commissioner Anderson recalled at the meetings residents expressed concern with having 3 story buildings looking down into their backyards. He agreed with tapering building heights toward the neighborhoods.

COMMISSIONER SENDEROFF MOVED TO ACCEPT THE REVISED PLAN FOR FIVE CORNERS WITH THE MODIFICATION THAT THE HEIGHT BE CHANGED TO THREE STORIES PLUS ONE ADDITIONAL STORY PER DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR PLOTS FACING THE CIRCLE AND TWO STORIES PLUS ONE ADDITIONAL STORY PER DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENT FOR PLOTS NOT FACING THE CIRCLE. COMMISSIONER ANDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION.

Commissioner Pierce pointed out if buildings are attached, technically it would still front the circle. Ms. Sterritt suggested working on the language with the Planning Board such as establishing a distance from the circle.

Mr. Shipley relayed in Miami, if two parcels were combined, the parcels were required to adhere to the original standards for that parcel and they did not assume the development rights of the adjacent property.

Mr. Clifton relayed all the information regarding the UW study is available via the UW logo on the front page of the City's website.

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

5. REPORTS FROM SUBGROUPS

- a. Land Use (Westgate & Five Corners)**
- b. Strategic Planning and Visioning – Fundraising**

Mr. Clifton provided an update on the Strategic Plan. The City received 13 proposals. An 11-member review/interview committee comprised of 2 City Councilmembers, 2 Economic Development Commissioners, 2 Planning Board Members and 5 staff reviewed the proposals and chose the 5 top firms. The five firms were provided questions in advance to include in their presentation to the committee and were also asked several additional questions following their presentation. The firms were narrowed to two preferred consulting firms and another interview was conducted to seek clarification regarding their proposals, who would serve as the face during the strategic planning process, their understanding of a strategic plan, etc. One of the firms was then invited back for a conversation with the lead. On June 21 a report describing the process will be submitted to the City Council along with the two top candidates and their RFPs and a recommendation to hire Beckwith Consulting. He was hopeful the Council will make a decision on June 28 to direct staff to prepare a scope of work and a professional service agreement for final action by the Council.

Mr. Clifton anticipated the strategic planning process could begin late July/early August. The recommended consultant plans a huge public outreach process including community gatherings, surveys, stakeholder interviews, etc. He expressed his thanks to the members of the EDC, Planning Board and City Council who participated on the committee, Kristiana Johnson, Maryanne Zagorski, Darrol Haug, Diane Buckshnis, Valerie Stewart and Adrienne Fraley-Monillas. Mr. Haug relayed there were over 400 hours invested in the process.

c. Technology

Commissioner Haug explained the CTAC made a proposal to the Mayor to change the reporting structure of the IT Department which currently reports to the Finance Department. Because Finance is very busy and because the IT Department serves all departments not just Finance, the CTAC recommends the IT Department report to the Mayor's office. The Mayor's response was he did not think it good idea due to the span of control issue (too many people reporting to the Mayor). Other ways to reorganize are being considered.

Mr. Clifton reported the update of the City's website. Commissioner Zagorski asked whether the City's website would include link to individual businesses. Mr. Clifton answered no because that would be a gift of public funds. There are and will continue to be links to the Downtown Edmonds Merchants Association, Chamber of Commerce, etc.

d. Tourism

Commissioner Zagorski reported at the last meeting the members decided on a framework for dividing and reporting their efforts. The committee will report on their efforts at future meetings.

6. PRIORITIZATION OF FUTURE AGENDA TOPICS

7. MISCELLANEOUS

Chair Frank reported Bruce Witenberg's condition is improving.

Mr. Clifton reviewed the Summary of Planning Board Recommended Changes to the BD zone:

- Designated street front and commercial depth requirements – consistent 45 foot depth to replace 30-foot requirement in the BD1 zone and 60-foot requirement elsewhere
- Uses in the BD1 retail core zone – continue to allow retail, restaurants, service businesses, etc. within the first 45 feet of the BD1 but restrict office uses

- Step-back requirements – step-backs are no longer required in downtown buildings (currently a 15-foot step-back above 25 feet is required in the BD1 zone)
- Development agreements – would allow modification to BD standards if certain criteria are met, 1) attaining at least LEED Gold or equivalent level of green building certification, 2) development incorporates one or more uses designed to further the City’s economic development goals (such as hotel, post office, farmers market, or space for artists, etc.), and 3) development includes enhanced public space and amenities. A development agreement cannot increase the height of a building to be more than 35 feet.

Commissioner Senderoff commented although he is very supportive of green building practices, when a person stands on the street looking at a building, they do not know whether it is LEED Gold or equivalent. He was concerned the criteria mixed two concepts.

Mr. Clifton offered to inform the EDC when the above changes to the BD zone will be presented the City Council.

8. AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Roger Hertrich, Edmonds, expressed concern the UW plan will lead to a corridor of 60-foot tall building. He preferred a corridor of 60-foot tall trees. He was also concerned that not enough parking was proposed. For example one of the plans for Five Corners refers to 50-70 on-street parking spaces but in reality there is no on-street parking in Five Corners.

9. ADJOURN

With no further business, the meeting was adjourned at 7:52 p.m.