

## PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

February 14, 2001

---

---

Chair John Dewhirst called the regular meeting of the Planning Board to order at 6:45 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Public Safety Complex, 250 – 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North.

### PRESENT

John Dewhirst, Chair  
Beverly Lindh, Vice Chair  
Virginia Cassutt  
Bruce Witenberg  
Jim Crim  
Joanne Langendorfer  
Stan Monlux

### ABSENT

### STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager  
Duane Bowman,  
Karin Noyes, Recorder

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION BY MS. CASSUTT, SECONDED BY MR. CRIM, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JANUARY 24, 2001 AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED.

### ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

No changes were made to the proposed agenda. Mr. Dewhirst noted that the public hearings that were originally scheduled on the agenda were postponed to the February 28, 2001 meeting because THE HERALD did not publish the meeting notice in time for tonight's meeting.

### REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

There was no one in the audience to provide public comment.

### DISCUSSION ON FILLING PLANNING BOARD VACANCIES

Mr. Dewhirst reported that the Board met at 6:30 to discuss the candidates for the Planning Board vacancy. He said it was the Board's consensus to recommend the City Council appoint Cary Guenther to the vacant position. Mr. Dewhirst noted that this recommendation would go before the Mayor and the Council for consideration.

### REVIEW OF DRAFT DESIGN GUIDELINES AND POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS REQUIRED TO IMPLEMENT THE DESIGN GUIDELINES

Mr. Chave referred the Board to the new draft design guidelines document dated February 9, 2001. He said staff attempted to make all of the adjustments requested by the Board at their last meeting. Mr. Dewhirst commented that after reviewing the draft document it appears that everything that was discussed at the last meeting has been included in the new draft. The Board and staff reviewed the following items found in the document:

**Page 19**

Mr. Chave particularly noted Item 6. He said staff suggests that this standard be modified to address corner and intersection lots, without making it mandatory to set back the first floor 15 feet. This change would allow flexibility.

**Page 33**

Mr. Chave noted that Item 1.a.i still needs to include an illustration for terraced roofs, but staff incorporated the language limiting the total roof area above 25 feet to 65 percent of the roof. He noted that this was discussed at the last meeting.

**Page 1**

Mr. Dewhirst suggested, and the Board and staff concurred, that the word “zone” should be changed to “dwelling unit” in the second to the last bulleted item on the page.

Mr. Chave noted that the last bulleted item on this page identifies what projects are classified as small, medium or large as per the Board’s discussion at the last meeting.

**Page 2**

Ms. Lindh referred to the first bulleted item on the page, and inquired if it would be better to include a percentage figure or something else to define what would be considered significant alterations. Mr. Chave replied that this issue would be addressed when the Board discusses the review process and identifies which projects need to have ADB review, etc. He suggested that the guidelines be as broad as possible, but that the Board recognize that not all projects will require an ADB review.

Mr. Witenberg said it seems that the Board has struggled when making the distinction between the design guidelines and the review process, and he suggested that a cover letter should be provided to the public to clearly describe these differences to the public at and prior to the public hearing. Ms. Cassutt agreed that most members of the public would not understand that the proposed document is intended to provide guidelines. The Board agreed that the purpose and intent of the design guidelines should be clearly explained to the public.

Mr. Dewhirst suggested that the cover letter stress that the intent of the public hearing on the design guidelines would be to collect feedback regarding the content of the document and not necessarily how the guidelines would be administered at this point. Mr. Chave said that it is likely that some of the objectives found in the design guidelines document would end up in the Comprehensive Plan whereas the standards would fairly naturally fall into the Community Development Code. However, the Board could recommend that the objectives be placed in the Code, as well.

Mr. Witenberg inquired if the name “guidelines” might contribute to the confusion. Mr. Bowman answered that if the document is called standards, most people will equate the document with code. But guidelines, on the other hand, are typically designed to provide policy direction to identify what projects would be weighed against in determining whether or not they are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Chave added that one of the questions that must be addressed at the public hearing is how much of the document should be “fixed in stone,” and how much should allow latitude for staff and ADB review.

Mr. Dewhirst noted that the Board previously agreed that they would deal with the content issues first before starting their consideration of the review process and whether the guidelines should be in the Comprehensive Plan or in the Development

**APPROVED**

Code. While a certain amount of overlap will occur between these three issues, Mr. Dewhirst suggested that it would be better to consider one issue at a time.

Mr. Witenberg said he would feel more comfortable if staff were to introduce the design guidelines to the public with a cover page providing an overview of what the first step in the process would be. Once the Board makes a recommendation to the Council regarding the content of the document, they could proceed to the next phase. Mr. Chave agreed and noted that there would likely be at least two public hearings for the guidelines document.

Mr. Bowman agreed that it would be appropriate to provide a cover page to the document explaining the process to the public at the hearing. He suggested that the opening comments from staff at the hearing could also review this concept to make sure it is clear that the hearing is related to the content of the design guidelines only.

Mr. Crim noted that the term "guidelines" tends to imply that there is flexibility, which is what the Board and staff have been striving to provide. The Board concurred.

### **Page 36**

Mr. Chave referred to the first paragraph on this page, which describes where a slope is measured from. He suggested that staff might be able to craft language that would apply only to those sites where view blockage is not an issue. Mr. Dewhirst inquired if there is any sample language available that the Board could consider in advance of the public hearing. Mr. Chave said that staff anticipates a significant amount of public comment regarding this issue, and perhaps the Board will find that the concept should not be considered as an option. He said without public feedback, it is difficult for staff to provide code language for the Board's consideration at this point. However, the cover letter could suggest that the public speak to this option.

Mr. Chave inquired if there are any other particular issues related to the document that should be highlighted for the public hearing. He said staff would attempt to explain the new concept of identifying three different sizes of buildings: small, medium and large. They should point out that the landscaping standards are a little different, and the sign standards should also be clarified.

Mr. Witenberg inquired if the City Attorney has had the opportunity to review the latest version of the design guidelines. Mr. Chave said that he has not reviewed the last document, but before the hearing, staff would seek his input.

The Board accepted the draft design guidelines dated February 9, 2001 as the draft that would be used for the public hearing. They complimented the staff for their efforts.

### **DISCUSSION REGARDING ANNUAL RETREAT TO ESTABLISH WORK PROGRAM FOR 2001**

Mr. Dewhirst referred the Board to the draft retreat agenda which provides suggestions for issues that the Board could discuss at a retreat. He said the retreat would provide the Board with the opportunity to discuss upcoming issues with staff and set priorities for the future agendas. The Board could also discuss any changes they would like to occur in order for the Board to function more efficiently.

Mr. Bowman said that in his previous tenure with the City, the Planning Board traditionally held annual retreats. Usually, the met on a Saturday in one of the Board members homes with a potluck lunch. The intent of the retreat was to establish a work program for the upcoming year, debrief regarding the previous year, and identify any issues regarding the Board/staff relationship. The retreats were open to the public, but they have only had a few citizens show interest.

Mr. Witenberg said that when he joined the Planning Board five years ago, they had one or two retreats, and they proved to be useful and beneficial. He said he would rather have the retreat on an evening instead of a weekend.

**APPROVED**

The Board concluded that the retreat would be held on February 21, 2001 starting at 6:00 p.m. in either the Great Room of City Hall or the Plaza Room of the Public Library. Mr. Bowman said the meeting would be advertised as a special meeting that requires three days notice. However, he cautioned the Board against accepting public testimony at the retreat. The public should only be invited to listen to the discussion.

Mr. Dewhirst stated that after the Board's retreat, he anticipates a joint meeting between the Council and the Board to discuss the work scheduled for 2001.

The Board reviewed the proposed retreat agenda. One particular issue they felt should be placed on the 2001 work program is the review process. Mr. Crim suggested that staff provide clarification on the three options that were presented in a memorandum to the Board. Mr. Witenberg suggested that the Cedar River Study on the role of the ADB should be provided to all of the new Board members to help them understand the history related to the review process issue.

Mr. Witenberg said it would be helpful for staff to identify the time frame anticipated or required for each of the items on the Board's work program.

The Board supported the layout of the proposed agenda and asked staff to incorporate the comments provided by the Board. Mr. Bowman said he would work with staff to make sure that the draft agenda is available for the chair's review prior to the retreat, but the Board may not receive their copy until the actual retreat. The Board agreed that Cary Guenther, the Board's recommendation for the vacant Board position, should be invited to attend the retreat, also.

#### **REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA**

This issue was postponed until the retreat.

#### **PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS**

Mr. Dewhirst had no comments to provide during this portion of the meeting.

#### **PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

Mr. Crim announced that he would be attending an Edmonds TAC Committee meeting next Tuesday, February 20, 2001.

Ms. Cassutt advised that she attended the first historical committee meeting for Edmonds. The committee will be meeting on the fourth Thursday of each month at 3:30 p.m. At the next meeting a representative from Olympia, who is highly involved in the historical process with the State of Washington, would be present to speak to the committee regarding how they can get started on the process. At the last meeting, the group divided into sub-committees, but they will wait until after the next meeting to start individual sub-committee activities.

Mr. Bowman announced that he has arranged to have Gary Hasner, who is from the City of Bothell and participated in the land management board, provide a history of how Bothell went through its inventory of historical sites.

**MOTION BY MR. DEWHIRST, SECONDED BY MR. MONLUX, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 7:35 P.M.  
MOTION CARRIED.**

**APPROVED**