

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

March 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 – 5th Avenue North.

PRESENT

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

ABSENT

Bruce Witenberg

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Steve Bullock,
Dave Gerbert, City Engineer
Don Fiene, Assistant City Engineer
Arvilla Ohlde, Parks and Recreation Mgr.

Mr. Witenberg was excused from the meeting.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION BY MS. LINDH, SECONDED BY MR. CRIM, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 14, 2001 WITH THE FOLLOWING CORRECTION TO PAGE 4, FOURTH PARAGRAH FROM BOTTOM: CHANGE "TACK" TO "TAC." MOTION CARRIED.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

There were no changes made to the proposed agenda.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Roger Hertrich, 1020 Puget Drive, recalled that at a recent City Council meeting there was significant discussion regarding a public district for a possible conference center. As part of that discussion, staff provided information as to the types of uses that are allowed in "P" zones. He noted that with a conditional use permit, development in a "P" zone could go up to 60 feet in height. Unfortunately, a number of the schools and other public facilities are located within "P" zones and could convert to other local or regional facilities using the greater height limit if a conditional use permit is obtained. He said that there was a general consensus amongst the City Councilmembers that that "P" zone should be eliminated and that the zoning should revert back to the original zoning of the property. Mr. Hertrich suggested that rather than waiting for the staff to fit this item on the agenda, the Board should place it on their extended agenda as a priority.

ANNUAL PARKS AND RECREATION QUARTERLY REPORT

Ms. Ohlde provided the following report:

- The **Mid-Waterfront Walkway Project** continues to progress. She recalled that the City Council sent this item back to staff for a complete analysis in preparation for the permit process. Staff will answer all of the questions and put together an environmental report, including an analysis of the habitat and wave action. Staff will also continue to work with the consultant, CH2M Hill, and two citizens, Rob Morrison and John McGibbon, to review the design and address the impacts associated with the project. She referred to the separate report that was provided in the Board's packets, which is the same report that would be provided to the City Council at their retreat. She concluded that once the design is finalized, staff could approach the City Council for authorization to start the permitting process.
- The **Comprehensive Park, Recreation and Openspace Plan** process has been progressing over the first part of the year. An analysis of the planning areas and the park maintenance operations and recreational services was completed for the current park system, and a recreational needs assessment community survey was also completed. The consultant's recommendations and policies are near completion. It is anticipated that the first presentation of this plan to the Parks Board will be in late spring.
- Staff has been working with the consultant to complete the **Street Trees, Beautification and Gateway Plan**. They are mapping the current inventory, drafting recommendations and collecting relevant background data, base maps and photographs. This information will be integrated with the concepts of the Hyatt Palma Study. The work plan will emphasize a need for an updated Street Tree Plan with recommendations for code revisions.
- Conceptual designs are in progress for the relandscaping of the **SR-104 Mini Park**. Preliminary options are now being considered for how to make the park function better. One concept would be to create an organized concessionaire area on the site. She noted that community and neighborhood workshops would be held to seek input into the design.
- The **Yost Park Pool Replastering** will begin in the next two weeks. She noted that this pool receives a tank replastering every 8-10 years. In addition, staff has recommended that the change to liquid chlorine also be made before the pool is opened the end of May. This change would provide a much safer method of handling chlorine.
- The City has submitted a grant to Snohomish County for **Neighborhood Park Acquisition** in the unincorporated Urban Growth Areas. She explained that the Esperance area is in need of a neighborhood park, and the City has submitted a grant nomination to acquire 7.48 acres from the Edmonds School District (Chase Lake property). This site is about 1/3 wetlands and 2/3 uplands.
- The City of Edmonds applied to the Snohomish County Community Development Block Grant Program for grant funding to match local dollars to improve and provide accessibility to existing playgrounds in the Edmonds Park system. While the City is eligible to apply for these funds, the committee determined to select and score the project application with unprecedented criteria and remarked during project presentation that because Edmonds is a perceived affluent community, they did not need to be funded for these projects. This is an unfortunate and inappropriate evaluation, which resulted in the County recommendation to not fund the playground accessibility project. Since the award of grants, Mayor Haakenson has been appointed as a representative of the policy board.
- A **new playground** has been installed at the Civic Center Complex and two other playgrounds will be installed early this spring to replace the old existing equipment at the Frances Anderson Center and Seaview Park.
- There is good news regarding the **Land and Water Conservation Funds**. President Bush has decided to support full funding of this program which means that the State of Washington could receive grant money for land acquisition and development through the IAC. This is a real compliment to the president and his foresight in knowing that land acquisition for parks and recreation is essential.

APPROVED

- The National Parks and Recreation Association is partnering with Active.com to form **ActiveParks.org**. This is a web site designed to make America's parks more accessible to their communities. The goal is to become a nationwide source of parks and recreation facilities information. The City of Edmonds has entered their park sites onto the web service.

Mr. Dewhirst inquired how the street tree and gateway beautification plan would coordinate with the new design guidelines that are currently being created. Ms. Ohlde answered that the street tree plan would supplement the guidelines, but the guidelines would remain the base point for future consideration. Mr. Dewhirst inquired if this plan would only apply to the City streets or to the state highways, as well. Ms. Ohlde answered that the plan would address the gateways to the City, but not the state highways, in general.

Mr. Dewhirst requested an update of future plans for South County Park. Ms. Ohlde answered that the City is interested in ownership of this park. However, there is a problem with the drainage of Perrinville Creek coming from the City of Lynnwood. The City received a Centennial Water Grant to repair the creek, but when they asked for a partnership match from the City of Lynnwood, they were turned down. Therefore, the City ended up giving the grant money back. The City feels the County should work with the City to encourage Lynnwood to become a partner in this project.

PRESENTATION AND UPDATE OF SNOHOMISH COUNTY PARK PLAN

Debbie Terwilliger, Senior Parks Planner for Snohomish County Parks, advised that she is present to present the proposed Snohomish County Park Plan as she has done at other jurisdictions throughout the County. She stated that the primary purpose of the plan is to guide the planning and acquisition programs to make sure they meet the needs of the citizens. Also, in order to be eligible for many of the grant funding opportunities, a park plan is necessary. She provided a brief overview of the plan and encouraged the Board members to participate in the future public meetings held on March 15, 20, and 22, 2001. The document would be presented to the Snohomish County Council on March 27, 2001.

Ms. Terwilliger explained that the County sent out 1,500 surveys to residents of the County and received a very large return. The number one priority indicated on the survey was regional trails. The second priority was for natural areas and the third was for water access (both lake and salt water). Sports fields were identified as the fourth most important priority. In addition to the survey, the County held a number of user group meetings, inviting the school district representatives and others to participate. The end result was a three-part vision for the County Park Plan as follows:

1. Continue the creation of regional systems (trails, water access, and other special uses).
2. Serve the growing community by using the land that has been acquired in a combination of both active and passive uses. Focus on new development of the existing properties at a community park scale.
3. Find innovate ways to manage the existing employees and park lands to provide more active uses.

Ms. Terwilliger summarized the following ten goals of the plan:

1. **Park Financing.** Develop financing strategies to address the need for regional and community park acquisition, development and stewardship. The Growth Management Act requires the County to identify their future plans and how they will be financed. The Plan will show that parks are necessary for development, which would allow the County to collect Growth Management mitigation fees for new development.
2. **Trails.** Provide a multi-use regional trail system which connects to other county and municipal parks and community trail systems. Because the citizens of the County have indicated their desire for more trails, the County supports this vision by focusing on the completion of the centennial trail.
3. **Natural Resource.** Promote preservation of natural areas to protect fish and wildlife habitat corridors, conserve open space, provide appropriate public access and offer environmental education opportunities. The County Parks Department is the major acquiring agent for critical habitat lands for Chinook Salmon. It is also to be an advocate for appropriate public access to the waterway.
4. **Water Access.** Provide opportunities for water access and activities throughout the County.

APPROVED

5. **Special Uses.** Provide facilities or dedicated use areas for single-use, indoor, emergent and/or specialized recreational uses, where feasible. A process has been identified to help determine what special uses are appropriate and in what location.
6. **Cultural/Historical Resources.** Promote the cultural and historic resources of Snohomish County through parks and programs.
7. **Community Parks.** Acquire and develop Community Parks to accommodate multiple recreational uses.
8. **Athletic Facilities.** Provide youth and adult athletic facilities throughout the County. While the County will continue to consider opportunities for both the general athletic field users and the special groups, they will focus more on the general uses.
9. **Playgrounds.** Provide safe and attractive children's play areas. They plan to replace most of the existing playground facilities over the next few years.
10. **Innovation:** Promote department-wide innovation and effectiveness through the integration of park planning, capital acquisition and development, programs, maintenance and stewardship efforts. There are different ways that County agencies can work together to promote each other and provide better park facilities.

In conclusion, Ms. Terwilliger stated that the County has designated \$7 million for the acquisition of neighborhood parks. They are now accepting nominations for neighborhood level sites that could be evaluated.

Mr. Dewhirst inquired how the plan addresses the direction the County is being pushed to look at smaller neighborhood parks. Ms. Terwilliger explained that neighborhood parks are generally about ½ to 1 acre in size and are designed to serve a specific neighborhood. Community parks are generally larger, and are designed to serve a number of communities. Community parks are meant to provide both active and passive opportunities. She concluded that neighborhood parks are primarily the responsibility of the individual cities, but the County Council is offering a one time opportunity to assist the cities in identifying and acquiring neighborhood parks.

PUBLIC HEARING ON ANNUAL UPDATE TO CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN (FILE NO. CDC-2000-147)

Don Fiene, Assistant City Engineer, referred the Board to the annual update to the Capital Facilities Plan. This plan was created through a joint effort on behalf of the Parks, Public Works, Engineering and Finance Departments. The revenue streams have been identified for each of the projects along with options on how the projects could be funded. Staff has also prepared a new document titled, "2001 Capital Improvement Project Description," which was done for the benefit of the public, staff, Planning Board and the City Council to provide more details about each of the projects identified in the Capital Facilities Plan.

Mr. Fiene briefly reviewed each of the different funds as follows:

- **Fund 112-100/200—Arterial Projects.**
- **Fund 112-300—Vehicle Registration Fee Projects.** This fund consists of mostly overlay projects.
- **Fund 112-400/500—General Projects.** This fund also consists of mainly overlay projects to repair the roads that were dug up for utility line placement. Some sidewalks and walkway projects are also identified, including one at Woodway Elementary, which has outside funding.
- **Fund 113—Multimodal Transportation.**
- **Fund 116—Building Maintenance.**
- **Fund 125/126—Parks Acquisition and Improvement.**
- **Fund 325—Capital Improvements.** This fund was only used for the sewer LID in Perrinville, which is nearing completion.
- **Fund 326—Public Safety Building Construction.** The figures for this fund comes straight out of the budget, and some adjustments will be made in the future. This fund will also be the funding source for the fire station on 196th Street.
- **Fund 412-100—Water Projects.** This fund is used for water projects and comes straight out of the Water Utility Comprehensive Plan, which will be updated this year or early next year.

APPROVED

- **Fund 412-200—Drainage Projects.** The City has just selected a consultant for the Southwest Edmonds Basin Study.
- **Fund 412-300—Sewer Projects.** This is a new proactive program of identifying projects as a result of the comprehensive sewer plan that was adopted last year. They are currently working on the Admiral Way sewer project and the Lift Station 1 replacement.
- **Fund 414—Wastewater Treatment Plant.** These improvements are associated with the Wastewater Treatment Facility at Fifth and Dayton.

Mr. Fiene provided two sample project descriptions from the 2001 Capital Improvement Projects Description Document to illustrate how the document can provide much more complete information about the project. He said that staff would begin to work on the years beyond 2001 for inclusion in the document.

Mr. Dewhirst inquired why the street lights for the new fire station were not included as part of the construction costs. Mr. Fiene answered that the existing bond did not cover this cost. There is also grant money that could be available for this project.

Mr. Dewhirst inquired if the numbers identified in the Capital Improvement Program include the matching funds the City has to provide for certain grants. Mr. Fiene answered affirmatively.

Lucien Schmidt, 545 Third Avenue South, complimented Mr. Fiene and the City staff for preparing the project description manual. It adds a great deal to the Capital Improvement Program document and will be very valuable. He said he hopes that the document is made available to the public, as well.

Mr. Schmidt inquired what the \$350,000 that is identified as “City Park costs” in Fund 125 would be used for.

Roger Hertrich, 1020 Puget Drive, inquired how much of the public safety building funds are available for the fire station on 196th Street. He said it has been difficult for the public to obtain accurate numbers. Also, the Capital Improvement Plan identifies \$500,000 for the Dayton Street Crossing and \$20,000 for the Main Street Crossing Design. He inquired who would pay for the Dayton Street Crossing Design. Mr. Hertrich inquired if there are any plans for the old Public Works Plant, and if so, why were they not included in the Capital Improvement Plan. Parking should also be identified in the plan. The location of the multi-modal station has not been determined to date, yet the City has no plans to take advantage of the funding opportunities that are available for this type of study.

Mr. Hertrich suggested that the plan also consider the installation of sidewalk improvements on Ninth Avenue between Kasper Street and Puget Drive on the west side of the street. This street is used frequently by pedestrians—especially children. He suggested that it is important to provide for safety on both sides of major arterials and streets, but this always seems to be left out of the plans.

Mr. Hertrich inquired about the estimated cost of the library roof. It was previously discussed that a library district would be formed to pay for the \$300,000 roof repair project, but Fund 116 indicates that the cost of this project would be \$600,000. Also, the City should remember that there has been significant controversy about tree removal in Hummingbird Park. Money should be set aside to study this issue further. Mr. Hertrich inquired what design would be used for the bulkhead replacement project, and what the difference in cost between the two concepts would be. He also asked that staff identify how the \$1.8 million that has been designated for park acquisition would be spent. Lastly, Mr. Hertrich recommended that whenever a utility line such as water or sewer is replaced on a street, a sidewalk or walkway should be developed if possible.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Mr. Fiene answered that the staff does not know how much funding will remain from the Public Safety Building that can be used on the fire station construction. Staff is making every effort to provide long range planning information to balance revenues, grant funding, etc. Also, Mr. Fiene pointed out that the Capital Improvement Plan does not identify \$20,000 for a study of the Main Street project. There is \$500,000 indicated for both the Main Street and the Dayton Street Crossing projects. Mr. Fiene reported that the plan does not include the old public works site. They are currently doing some

APPROVED

renovation inside of the building in anticipation of possibly moving the maintenance department to this site. He concluded that he has no specific information regarding the cost of the library roof replacement at this time.

Mr. Chave reminded the Board of their discussion with the Development Services Director, Duane Bowman, about the need for a parking study program. Parking will not be identified on the Capital Improvement Plan until after a parking study has been completed.

Mr. Dewhirst requested input from staff regarding Mr. Hertrich's suggestion that walkways or sidewalks be provided on streets when water or sewer lines are replaced. He suggested that perhaps the costs would be minimal if done at the same time that the street is repaired. Mr. Fiene noted that, typically, sidewalks would require a different type of contractor than a street overlay would require. Therefore, there would probably not be any cost savings. He suggested that a better approach would be to prioritize walkways in the City rather than just putting in new walkways when sewer and water lines are replaced. Mr. Dewhirst suggested that the incremental costs would not be significant if the City were to extend the pavement out and add striping to create a walkway along the side of a road.

Ms. Ohlde corrected the matrix that indicates that the central irrigation costs would be \$350,000. This figure should actually be \$50,000. She referred to the City Park project and reminded the Board that they previously approved the master plan for that park. The first two phases of the plan have been completed. However, the City Council directed staff to further research the third phase, which involved the development of a two-way road to replace the existing one-way configuration. If the additional research indicates that the proposed two-way configuration is appropriate, the staff can proceed with the construction and the Master Plan will remain intact. If it decided that it is not appropriate, then changes to the Master Plan would be required.

Ms. Ohlde reported that the City Council approved and directed staff to proceed with the step-down, ADA accessible walkway along the waterfront and that the bulkhead be of a curvilinear design. Regarding waterfront acquisition, Ms. Ohlde explained that there are only two parcels along the downtown waterfront not owned by the City. She concluded that staff would continue to pursue opportunities for waterfront property acquisition.

MOTION BY MR. CRIM, SECONDED BY MS. CASSUTT, TO FORWARD THE ANNUAL UPDATE TO THE CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN (FILE NO. CDC-2000-147) TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED.

THE BOARD TOOK A FIVE-MINUTE BREAK AT 8:30 P.M.

PUBLIC HEARING ON UPDATE TO EDMONDS SCHOOL DISTRICT CAPITAL FACILITEIS PLAN (FILE NO. CDC-2000-148)

Mr. Chave explained that in addition to the Capital Facilities Plan update that was just presented to the Board, the Edmonds School District Capital Facilities Plan would also be part of the Comprehensive Plan update. He said one of the benefits of adopting the plan is to enable the City to coordinate their street and walkway improvement plans and other plans with the district's plans. Mr. Chave said that while the district's plan has been ready for the Board's review for more than a year, the Board and staff decided to postpone until after the Community Facilities Plan had been finalized. The City Council will be considering the final Community Facilities Plan at their next meeting, and staff feels that there is enough information to ensure that the District's Capital Facilities Plan would not be in conflict with the Community Facilities Plan and other code requirements.

Bret Carlstad, Edmonds School District, 20420 – 68th Avenue West, said that the district has been anticipating the opportunity to bring this plan before the Board for quite some time now. They have worked with the City staff and other jurisdictions in the development and adoption of the plan, which acknowledges the importance of schools as capital facilities.

Mr. Carlstad briefly reviewed the plan, and said that the district created the plan to meet the requirements of the Growth Management Act and to use as a planning document to guide their projects and programs in the future. The plan was also

APPROVED

written to meet the requirements of Snohomish County's mitigation ordinance, although the district has not typically qualified for these fees. The plan looks at both the fixed assets (where the schools are located and what the student capacity is) and student enrollment (both current and projected). He pointed out that the district tracks their enrollment closely because it is the basis for funding dollars. It also helps them to anticipate the future facility needs. Using the enrollment and fixed assets data the District determines whether or not there are adequate facilities to meet the needs of their current and future students.

Mr. Carlstad advised that the report concludes that the district has adequate housing at all levels for the activities planned. That is why the district does not qualify for mitigation fees at this time. However, he would encourage the City of Edmonds to adopt a school mitigation fee ordinance anyway. Not because the district would qualify at this time, but because there may be situations in the future that would require this type of approach.

Ms. Langendorfer inquired if the student population figures include out-of-district students, as well. Mr. Carlstad said that the figures identify the real number of students that attend Edmonds School District, including the out-of-district students. However, he doesn't know the exact number of out-of-district students that attend the district programs. He said he could get this information, if necessary. Ms. Langendorfer expressed interest in this information.

Mr. Dewhirst inquired about the initiative that was recently approved by the voters to make the classrooms smaller. He questioned whether or not this would have an impact on the district's facility needs. Mr. Carlstad answered that this money is targeted toward the lower grades, and the district does not anticipate that it would result in a significant impact to the district's facility requirements. In fact, he said the district is not clear on how much of this money they will actually receive since funding from others sources is being cut to compensate for the additional amount approved by the initiative.

Mr. Dewhirst noted that there are five 9-12 grade schools serving the district, but he does not see any reference to the alternative high school. Mr. Carlstad said that the alternative high school is one of the five schools identified in the plan. This plan contains an inventory of the existing facilities, and does not necessarily identify the exact programs. Mr. Dewhirst said it is his understanding that the district would like to move the alternative high school to another location or new site, yet this option is not identified in the plan. Mr. Carlstad explained that this option is mentioned in the document as part of the 1998 plans. This option would have moved the Scriber Lake Alternative School Program from its current location to the existing Cedar Valley Elementary Site if and when a new Cedar Valley Elementary school was built. Since the plan was written, it was decided to build a new Cedar Valley Elementary facility on the Scriber Lake property and move the existing Alternative Program from the Scriber Lake property to the old Cedar Valley Elementary building. These changes will take place in September.

Mr. Dewhirst noted that the document does not include any plans for getting kids safely to and from school. Mr. Carlstad answered that the Growth Management Act does not require the district to address this issue in their plan. In fact, the district is not required to provide transportation for their students. The transportation requirements are generally imposed on the district through the SEPA review process or by City regulations and requirements. He noted that Table 8 on Page 17 acknowledges the district's ownership of certain transportation facilities.

Mr. Carlstad pointed out that the district's interest and tolerance for portable classrooms is very low compared to other districts in the area. This is a clear statement from the district's Board of Directors.

Roger Hertrich, 1020 Puget Drive, inquired if the district has plans to sell the Chase Lake site to the City for a park, as indicated earlier by the Parks Director. He noted that this property is considered to be wetlands. Also, he said he has a hard time figuring out what the future use of the old Woodway High School site will be. He said there are many citizens who would like to see if this property could be used as a regional type facility such as a swimming pool.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Mr. Carlstad answered that the Chase Lake property is an asset owned by the district, and it is true that the district staff is looking into the possibility of selling this property to the City for a possible park site. However, this transaction would

APPROVED

require the approval of the Edmonds School District Board of Directors. He noted that the property used to be used by the schools for field trips and outdoor lab experiences.

Mr. Carlstad also said the plan acknowledges that the district owns the former Woodway High School site. At the time the plan was written, the site was being used as a transition facility. The plan identifies the school's actual enrollment and enrollment capacity. When the school is no longer used as a transition location, it will come back on line as a high school, which was the facilities permanent use prior to the transitional uses. The decision as to what the site will permanently be used for has not been made. While he recognizes that this causes some people anxiety, the district would like to keep this facility available for transitional use at this time.

MOTION BY MS. LINDH, SECONDED BY MS. CASSUTT, TO FORWARD THE UPDATED EDMONDS SCHOOL DISTRICT CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN (FILE NO. CDC-2000-148) TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL AS WRITTEN. MOTION CARRIED.

REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO THE EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE REGULATING PLANNED RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS (PRD's) AND PROPOSED NEW REGULATIONS PERTAINING TO MASTER PLANS

Mr. Bullock briefly outlined the proposed draft PRD ordinance that was created by staff for the Board's review. He noted that the proposed ordinance only applies to residential development. He recalled the Board's recent decision to eliminate the opportunity for the PRD regulations to apply to commercial and mixed-use development and to create a separate ordinance for these uses. Commercial types of planned developments will be considered in a master plan ordinance at a later date.

Mr. Bullock said the proposed ordinance is different from the existing PRD ordinance in that it is better organized and more clear. Staff tried to give the ordinance a consistent flow, and clearly indicate what types of projects the ordinance could be applied to. Another thing that is different is that the proposed ordinance does not limit the PRD ordinance to residential developments of five units or more, which the existing ordinance does. The proposed ordinance also clearly identifies those standards that can be modified and what criteria must be met before the modifications can be approved. It provides a clear set of rules for why someone should be able to get a modification to the standards and how both the developer and the surrounding community would benefit.

Mr. Bullock said one of the most significant differences between the proposed and existing PRD ordinances is that the process is much easier. One of the reasons the existing PRD ordinance was not significantly used was because the process was lengthy and cumbersome. Staff is working with the City Attorney to create a process that is less time consuming and much more in keeping with how the City processes formal plats.

Mr. Bullock encouraged the Board members to read the document in preparation for the April 11 meeting. Mr. Chave noted that there are some options for the Board to consider which are identified in the document. Generally, one of the options is more conservative, while the other is more aggressive. He advised that a draft master plan ordinance would also be available at the April 11 meeting for the Board's review. He encouraged the Board members to provide their comments and suggestions to staff related to these two ordinances.

APPROVED

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Mr. Dewhirst advised that because of the canceled meeting due to the earthquake and because one public notice was not published in the newspaper on time, two public hearings had to be postponed. He suggested that these two hearings (definition of "street" and parking ratios for single family development) be placed on the March 28, 2001 agenda along with the public hearing related to the design guidelines. He suggested that the Board take public testimony on all three of these items and then continue the hearings to a date certain for Board deliberation. He noted that it is likely that additional public hearings on the design guidelines will be necessary. The Board agreed.

Mr. Dewhirst advised that there would be a joint Planning Board/City Council meeting on March 27, 2001. He said he met with the Mayor on February 26, and both he and the Council President have expressed their desire that the joint meeting take place early in the year. Possible agenda topics for the joint meeting could include an overview of the Board's retreat, work schedule priorities for 2001, and perhaps possible options for SR-99. He said that the mayor is interested in SR-99 and noted that there are other elements in the community that are starting to realize the importance of Highway 99 to the City of Edmonds. He said the Council is very interested in hearing the Board's desire to jump start this process. The Board discussed the concept of breaking the Highway 99 project into separate elements (i.e. marketing, organization, physical elements, etc.). Ms. Cassutt suggested that this process include the Economic Development Council and the Chamber, as well. The entire Board agreed that the City needs to focus more on this area as an integral part of the City.

Mr. Monlux suggested that another topic of discussion at the joint meeting could be the process for which the Council members provide feedback to the Board after reading the minutes. Mr. Chave explained that when items are presented to the Council from the Board, they come from staff in the form of a Planning Board recommendation. Councilmembers who have questions of individual Board members can contact the Board members directly.

Mr. Dewhirst suggested that Board members forward any additional joint meeting topic ideas to the chair or vice chair as soon as possible. Mr. Chave said he would provide each Board member with a copy of the Council's agenda for that evening, but it appears that the joint meeting will be one of the first items on the agenda. The Board members should plan to arrive at the meeting by about 7:00 p.m.

STAFF REPORT

Mr. Chave advised that staff reported to the Council regarding the issue of attached accessory dwelling units, and that the Board would be interested in considering the issue again. The Council unanimously decided that the issue should not be considered at this time because they felt the Board already had enough to do.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

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

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

There were no Board member comments during this portion of the meeting.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 9:40 P.M.

APPROVED