

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

March 28, 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
Bruce Witenberg
Jim Crim
Joanne Langendorfer
Stan Monlux
Cary Guenther

ABSENT

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Duane Bowman, Development Services Dir.
Karin Noyes, Recorder

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION BY MR. CRIM, SECONDED BY MS. LINDH, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 14, 2001 WITH THE FOLLOWING CORRECTIONS:

1. PAGE 5, FIFTH PARAGRAPH, CHANGE “CENTRAL IRRIGATION COSTS” TO “CITY PARK COSTS.”
2. PAGE 6, THIRD PARAGRAPH, SECOND LINE, CHANGE “\$15,000” TO “\$50,000.”
3. PAGE 9, THIRD PARAGRAPH, END OF THIRD LINE, ADD “HAVE.”

MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

There were no changes made to the proposed agenda.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

There was no one in the audience wishing to address the Board during this portion of the meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENT ADDRESSING INCONSISTENCY OF DEFINITION OF STREET AND SUBDIVISION AND STREET STANDARDS (FILE NO. CDC-2001-3)

Mr. Chave explained that the current code identifies driveways as serving one to four lots, but the street standards and the definition of a short subdivision apply to properties of five lots or more. The current definition of a street is “more than three lots” which doesn’t match with the street standards or the definition of a short subdivision. The proposed amendment would change the definition of a “street” by replacing the words “more than three lots” to “five or more lots.” This definition would make it clear that any public or private access easement serving five or more lots is defined as a street.

Mr. Dewhirst inquired what would be the name of access easements serving fewer than five lots. Mr. Chave answered that these would be identified as access easements or driveways, and would not be required to meet the normal street standards.

THERE WAS NO ONE IN THE AUDIENCE WHO WANTED TO PARTICIPATE IN THE PUBLIC HEARING. THEREFORE, THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

MOTION BY MR. CRIM, SECONDED BY MR. MONLUX, TO RECOMMEND THE CITY COUNCIL APPROVE FILE CDC-2001-3, AMENDING THE DEFINITION FOR STREET STANDARD, AS PRESENTED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO ECDC 17.50.020 CONCERNING PARKING RATIOS FOR SINGLE-FAMILY AND MULTI-FAMILY DEVELOPMENT (FILE NO. CDC-2000-144)

Mr. Chave explained that the current development code (ECDC) requires two parking spaces for each multi-family unit, regardless of size. Single-family units only require one space each. He said staff has reviewed parking information from other cities in the area as well as information from the national literary magazines that are available. They found that the multi-family parking requirements varied, but the single-family requirements were uniform at two spaces per unit. The ratio of parking for multi-family development depended upon how many bedrooms each unit had. Mr. Chave referred to the proposal which provides a graduating scale to identify the parking requirements for multi-family development. These range from 1.2 parking spaces per unit for studio apartments to two spaces for each unit of three bedrooms or more.

Seth Hale, CDA Architects, 19524 Ballinger Way Northeast, advised that CDA has completed many projects in Edmonds. Therefore, they have a significant interest in seeing the parking requirements reduced. He referred the Board members to two previous letters he sent to the Board dated March 30, 2000 and February 9, 2000. Mr. Chave indicated that these letters were considered by the Board during their previous deliberations for coming up with a recommendation.

Mr. Hale said he also has the data that was provided to the Board by staff. He noted that the average rate for a weekday peak parking space occupied verses dwelling units is 1.04, and that goes up to 1.2 on weekends. Based on the data that was provided, Mr. Hale said it would be wise for the City to reduce the parking ratio. Doing so would create a better balance between the required parking stalls; increase the opportunity for greater density in the RM zones; provide for a better use of the existing mass transit; utilities and infrastructure; reduce urban sprawl; and provide an economic benefit to the area.

Mr. Hale referred the Board to the list of projects CDA has completed in the surrounding jurisdictions based on the number of bedrooms and the parking spaces required. He said that in addition to allowing for an increase in density, neighboring jurisdictions have offered other incentives to developers, as well. The City of Seattle allows developers to use lease car systems, car pools, etc. to reduce the parking requirements. Shoreline has allowed for a 20-percent reduction in the number of parking spaces required because of a development's proximity to mass transit facilities. They have been able to provide additional landscaping and open space because the parking requirements were reduced.

Mr. Hale also referenced the issue of parking stall size requirements. Currently, the City requires an 8.5’ by 16.5’ space. Once this space requirement has been met, the City allows the developer to reduce the stall size by 50 percent, but this does not allow them to increase the density. It only reduces the size of the lots, themselves. He asked the Board to consider allowing a developer to utilize the smaller stall size option earlier in the design phase of a project.

APPROVED

Doug Dewar, 110 James Street, said he is speaking as a residential landlord in the City. He distributed a list of the properties that he has been active in the management of for the past ten years, which were all developed before the code required two parking spaces for every multi-family unit. The projects range in size from 10 to 88 units, and the actual parking ratios range from 1.2 to 1.82 spaces per unit, which is well below the two that are currently required. Only one of these developments has any parking problems now and that is because no street parking is available. Mr. Dewar said the proposed amendment is better than what currently exists, but it is still more than what is actually needed. He said the chart shows what portion of the parking space tenants actually use.

Mr. Dewar said that in a suburban setting, two stalls per unit is overkill and takes away from what could otherwise be attractive landscaping. In an urban setting like the downtown area, the current requirements severely restrict the type of development that can occur. He emphasized that code flexibility is imperative because each zone is different. He suggested that a ratio of 1.5 to 1—even if all of the units are two bedrooms—is generally adequate, particularly if there is on-street parking available. For smaller units, 1 to 1.25 parking spaces per unit or less is very adequate.

Karen Wiggins, Chair of the Downtown Parking Committee, recalled that the committee asked the Board to consider the parking ratios about three years ago, and they have been working on the issue for quite a while, too. The committee previously proposed that one-bedroom units should require 1.5 parking spaces and that units with two or more bedrooms should require two spaces each. If the parking requirements are greater then more on-street parking space can be reserved and used for commercial parking instead of residential parking. It would also allow a greater opportunity for guest parking to be provided on site instead of on the street.

Roger Hertrich, 1020 Puget Drive, said he has attended many parking committee meetings. He provided a handout of a memorandum from the committee dated in 1999 related to this issue. He said the memorandum indicates that the parking places that are not part of the two per unit ratio could be used for guest parking. In the memorandum, Ms. Wiggins suggested that they keep the required two parking spaces for two bedroom units and larger, which the proposed ordinance does not do. Mr. Hertrich next referred the Board to the information he provided from the Hermosa Beach zoning code which highlights guest parking requirements for each unit. This code also requires an additional guest parking space for each curb cut that is made which eliminates a street parking space. He also noted that there are several jurisdictions in the area that have maintained a two to one ratio for multi-family units. Mr. Hertrich concluded that he believes the proposed change is reasonable for units that have less than two bedrooms, but they should keep the two spaces per unit requirements for all units that are two bedrooms or greater.

Bruce Nickelson, 9829 Cherry Street, said he recently completed a condominium project on Bell Street, between Sixth and Seventh Avenues, that has underground parking. He said he was required to provide ten parking spaces, of which only six have ever been used. He also provided four additional spaces for guest parking. He said that had the parking requirements been similar to what is now being proposed, the project could have been much nicer for the City and for the people who purchased the condominiums. He noted that of the five units, three have two bedrooms and two have three bedrooms.

Bob Greg, 16550 – 76th Avenue West, said he is currently developing the property at Fifth and Walnut. They are providing two parking stalls per unit, not only because of code requirements but because that is what they want to do. However, he agreed with the previous speakers that the parking requirements should be reduced. He noted that it costs about \$30,000 to develop each parking stall, and that money could be spent on more open space or landscaping, etc.

Stan Peha, 2141-4th Avenue, Suite 250, said he is in favor of the amendment, and he commended the staff for their rational and realistic approach to the issue. He said his company is developing about 1.8 acres of property in Edmonds. The zone allows up to 52 units to be built, but because of the parking, setback and landscaping requirements, they can only place 48 units on the site. While it would be possible to place smaller units on the site or to provide underground parking, they do not feel these options are economically practical. He noted that this property is outside of the downtown district and does not face the same issues as those in the downtown area. He suggested that if the concerns over the amendment are related to the downtown area, then a downtown overlay district should be considered.

Mr. Peha stated that the proposed amendment would enable them to build their project with the density allowed by code and add modern rental housing to the existing stock in the City. The amendment meets the general objectives of the region by encouraging citizens to make use of public transportation and neighboring services without adding additional vehicles to the roadways. In their particular situation, Mr. Peha pointed out that their project is within a single block walking distance to grocery and drug stores, restaurants and other services. Within this same one block distance is the Community Transit bus stop. He added that even the proposed amendment does not go as far as several other cities that allow off-street parking and compact stalls to be included in their count mix. The general market conditions alone will provide available parking stalls simply due to the normal vacancy factor found within the area. He concluded by asking the Board to send a recommendation of approval of the proposed amendment to the Council.

MOTION BY MR. WITENBERG, SECONDED BY MS. LINDH, TO CLOSE THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING AND CONTINUE THE BOARD'S DELIBERATION TO APRIL 11, 2001. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

PUBLIC HEARING ON DESIGN GUIDELINES AND POTENTIAL CODE AMENDMENTS TO IMPLEMENT THE DESIGN GUIDELINES (FILE NO. CDC-2000-153)

Mr. Chave advised that the design guidelines were developed through a joint effort by the staff, the consultant, the ADB and the Planning Board after numerous meetings, including one public open house. The Council authorized the publication of the current draft document for the purpose of holding a public hearing, recognizing that there will likely be numerous changes to the document. He noted that the Board will hold at least two public hearings on the issue: one related to the design guidelines document as a whole and the other related to what portions of the document should be placed in the ECDC and what parts should be in the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, the Board recognizes that the document implies certain code amendments that must be approved in order to implement the design guidelines. The Board anticipates that they will forward a recommendation on each of the code amendments to the Council, along with their recommendation for the design guidelines, themselves.

Mr. Chave advised that, as currently drafted, the guidelines do not grant a great deal of flexibility. They only identify a ten-percent change to the numerical standard. The Board has set this low threshold for public hearing purposes to obtain feedback from the public regarding just how flexible the guidelines should be. He reminded the Board and public that the guidelines are process neutral and do not make any assumptions as to what the review process will ultimately be. The City Council is on record that they would like the design review to be conducted early in the process. However, this decision will involve another set of hearings and proposals that will come after the design guidelines are completed.

Next, Mr. Chave referred the Board to the sign matrix that was included in the design guidelines which is more specific regarding the types of signage allowed in various zones of the City. Since this is not so clearly spelled out in the code, a code amendment would be necessary. The landscaping requirements are significantly different than what currently exist, as well. Also, the document speaks to different scales of development. Larger scale buildings will be expected to do more as far as design options than smaller scale buildings. However, the guidelines provide a menu of options that the developer can choose to use to meet the criteria.

Lastly, Mr. Chave said the guidelines suggest a new idea for addressing sites that have a steep grade. The Board is considering whether a developer should be allowed to split the height average into more than one location on the property. For example, a property that fronts on two streets would be able to have development oriented towards both streets so that both sides of the development can be in scale with the surrounding properties.

Mr. Monlux pointed out that the table of context is off by one page.

James Chalupnik, 540 Dayton Street, Suite 201, said that he is president of the Architectural Design Board (ADB). He said the ADB has been studying the proposed guidelines for quite a while. They have worked with the staff, the consultant and the Planning Board to make numerous suggestions. He referred to the latest memorandum from the ADB to the Planning Board dated January 3, 2001 outlining their concerns and comments. He said he is pleased that the current draft has

APPROVED

addressed most of the ADB's issues. The ADB feels the guidelines are workable and they would like to see them implemented as soon as possible. The ADB feels that the more the guidelines are codified, the easier they will be to implement. However, the more flexible the document, the more flexible the design of buildings and construction in the City can be. The ADB is concerned that they clearly understand the desires of the community and the City and they would like to be able to implement the guidelines to the best of their ability. The guidelines are a significant improvement over the existing situation.

Mr. Chave emphasized that if the guidelines are adopted in the code they can still be flexible, if flexibility is granted within the code. It is also true that if the guidelines are adopted as policies in the Comprehensive Plan, they can either be specific or flexible, depending upon how they are written. He said it does not make much difference whether the guidelines are in the code or in the Comprehensive Plan. The Board is interested in learning how much flexibility should be allowed no matter where the guidelines are located. They are also interested in hearing public comments regarding how much authority there should be to grant departures from the code.

Rob Morrison, 215 Beach Place, referenced Page 16 related to the waterfront pedestrian route and setback requirements. He specifically referenced Olympic Beach Park and explained that he recently met with Ms. Ohlde, Mr. Bowman and engineers from CH2M Hill to discuss the style of the bulkhead. As a result of that meeting the step down design was ruled out. The determination was made that there would be a vertical bulkhead with a concave face. The cap of the bulkhead would be two feet and there would be another two feet that would be extended inland, giving a total of four feet for the walkway to the edge of the bulkhead. A bench, with a cap of 18 to 24 inches would follow the walkway the entire length of the bulkhead. Mr. Morrison said it was determined that six feet would be the total width the pedestrian area would move back into the lawn. He recalled that at a previous meeting with the Planning Board there was considerably discussion that the public did not want to have too much intrusion into the lawn area. Six feet would only encroach into the grass about 10 to 15 percent instead of 30 percent as originally proposed.

Mr. Morrison inquired if an exception to the standard on Page 16 could be made for the Olympic Beach property so that a 15-foot setback is not required along the bulkhead.

Mr. Bowman said that, in general, Mr. Morrison's comments are correct. There was a meeting in January regarding Olympic Beach Park. However, there was no decision made that the design was absolutely set. There was some good discussion with the coastal engineer that raised questions as to whether the step down design would or would not work and Ms. Ohlde was charged with figuring out what the design should be. The group talked about how to design a walkway that would minimize the encroachment into the grass area. However, no specific plan was formalized. Mr. Dewhirst inquired regarding the time frame for this work to be completed. Mr. Bowman said that Ms. Ohlde is working with the engineers at this time. They will report back to the Board in the near future, but no specific date has been scheduled.

Rob Michel, 7907 – 212th Street Southwest, said that he and Tony Shapiro recently participated with 20 other individuals in a stakeholders meeting last week to discuss the proposed design guidelines. As a result of the meeting, he and Mr. Shapiro were asked to represent the group's concerns: He asked that those who participated in the stakeholders meeting stand.

Mr. Michel said he is a member of the ADB, but he did not come before the Board in that capacity. He has been building in Edmonds for over 17 years and has completed more than a half dozen projects in the City. He agreed with the Cedar River Study that it is time for a change. However, the proposed guidelines fail to prove that the changes will be for the better. Developers are able to build better projects with incentives rather than restrictions, and they believe the guidelines should be more flexible.

Tony Shapiro, 600 Main Street, Suite C, said it should be the objective of the citizens, as well as the Planning Board and the ADB, to create a building environment with variety and a pleasing appearance. He said some of the criteria within the design guidelines would do just the opposite and encourage the more "vanilla" type appearance that has taken place over the past several years.

Mr. Shapiro recalled that another goal of the design guidelines is to streamline the review and evaluation process. The architects applaud the effort to have design review early in the process, but they are concerned that having to submit

conceptual designs to the City will slow the process and require the City to review more fine points. He noted that there are 141 new criteria within the draft guidelines document. If staff is required to evaluate each project based on all of the criteria, it will take more staff time. He said the stakeholders group recommends that the design guidelines be more performance based. If the City could create more general guidelines that are judged on the appearance of the end result they will end up with a better product.

On behalf of the 20 Edmonds Stakeholders, Mr. Shapiro and Mr. Michel provided the following comments related to the design guidelines.

- **PAGE 4:** If the City truly believes in design flexibility and associated code departures, the allowable dimensional difference between the guidelines and a proposed project should be in the 30 to 50 percent range instead of ten percent as proposed in the draft document.
- **PAGE 2:** The requirement that drawings be stamped by the appropriate licensed professional should be eliminated. This is a building permit requirement, not a design guideline. Stamped plans do not ensure a better product.
- **PAGE 2:** Replace the phrase, “all physical structures within a 300-foot radius” with “all buildings within a 100-foot radius.” It is onerous to expect developers to contact every property owner who has a structure within 300 feet of the proposed project.
- **PAGE 7:** The standards state that all significant trees of six-inch caliper or greater must be saved. This is unrealistic. The design guidelines should encourage retention of trees. Item 2 should be replaced with the following: “Evergreen trees, 18-inch caliper or greater, and other decorative trees which are in good health, shall be protected and retained if at all possible. If significant trees are cut, a three-to-one replacement is required (one 18-inch caliper tree is equal to two, three-inch trees or three, two-inch trees) if these fit reasonably in the landscape plan.” However, the stakeholders believe that this type of requirement should be placed in the landscape plan and not in the design guidelines.
- **PAGES 8 THROUGH 10:** Because buffer requirements are adequately set forth in the ECDC, this section is redundant and unnecessary.
- **PAGE 11:** The vehicular alley access standard is unduly restrictive. The intent can be accomplished by eliminating the second sentence (at a minimum, the exit route must use the alley) from the General Standard 2a.
- **PAGE 11:** The proposed vehicular access point criteria found at the bottom of the page are too restrictive, specifically with regard to sharing a vehicular access with adjacent properties. This poses monumental management problems for condo and homeowner associations in mixed use and multi-family projects. The language should be changed to encourage access sharing, but not require it.
- **PAGE 17:** The proposed general standards for garage entry setbacks are much too restrictive. General Standards 1 and 3 should be eliminated since these are safety related criteria and not design guidelines. The word “shall” in General Standards 2 and 5 should be replaced by a softer word that does not imply a requirement. The proposed language specifically sets forth that entries be set back 25 feet with a 15-foot setback from the back edge of the sidewalk. 25 feet of the site would be “chewed up” by a level area. It is counterproductive to mandate that entries to garages be set so far back from the street. Safety issues can be addressed through the use of a site triangle similar to what the City of Seattle uses. This could be located within the engineering criteria.
- **PAGE 18:** The requirement for garage entries in General Standard 8 is too restrictive and doesn’t take into account large projects. This requirement needs to be more flexible as far as relationship to the size of the building and not just limited to one entry. The term “are permitted to have a maximum of one. . . garage entry” should be replaced with “are encouraged to have one. . . garage entry.”
- **PAGE 20:** The proposed standards for trash and utility storage locations are too restrictive. It appears that the new guidelines want to locate the trash dumpsters inside the building. The phrase “are not allowed to encroach” should be replaced with “are encouraged not to encroach.”
- **PAGE 21:** The proposed 2-foot setback for front yards in the BC zone is too restrictive and would discourage both window shopping and interaction between pedestrians and storefronts. If the City chooses a more restrictive standard, they should be willing to provide incentives to developers who comply, thus achieving the City’s goal of design flexibility. To accomplish the City’s goal to provide a pedestrian friendly character and variety along the street front, the phrase “encourages the creation of niches along these street fronts” would be more acceptable. Not all buildings should be designed with a plaza. An urban wall, especially within the downtown zones, can be a desirable trait in the City. The shops that are set back from the street do not get nearly the amount of exposure or foot traffic as the shops closer to the street.

APPROVED

- **PAGES 22 AND 23:** Delete the open space requirements, particularly in the BC and RM zones, since the open space goal is currently achieved via setbacks, buffer and landscape requirements already in the ECDC. Because of the high land costs in the BC and RM areas, maintaining a significant amount of open space is not economically desirable. It is also not desirable to the City, the business owners, or the citizens because it tends to decrease the general activity along the street.
- **PAGE 24:** The lower drawing is the best example for building site identity. However, it also has 23 less parking spaces than the upper drawing. If the document is going to compare the two drawings, they should contain equal elements.
- **PAGE 25:** Item 2 in the second section which states that “ceiling heights should be a minimum of 9 feet clear” should be deleted. The City should continue to use the Uniform Building Code (UBC) as the governing code for developing retail space. The UBC does not have a minimum ceiling height since the market tends to regulate this. The design guidelines should not get into establishing the minimum ceiling height for retail spaces.
- **PAGE 26:** Objective A regarding covered walkways in the BC zone is viewed as unduly restrictive. The ADB can impose this on every BC development project. The City should either find words that truly soften the “onerous” nature of this goal or eliminate it. Sidewalks are a desirable element and the market in the downtown area will drive landowners to put in covered space because of the weather.
- **PAGE 31:** The mechanical equipment placement requirement is a Universal Mechanical Code requirement and not a design guideline. Therefore, it should be deleted. If mechanical equipment is required to be 20 feet from the property line, smaller lots will not be able to have this equipment at all.
- **PAGES 33 AND 34:** It is strongly suggested that the City consider increasing building heights in the BC zone to accommodate better building designs that do not adversely impact views. It is the stakeholders’ impression that the 30-foot maximum building height limit with 25 feet as the base height seems to be a “number pulled from the air.” A 35-foot height limit would be a more natural height similar to what most cities currently allow for smaller scale buildings. While it will be a real challenge to modify the height limit, increasing the height in areas that are not associated with the view corridor would allow developers to maximize a site’s potential. The City of San Francisco has established view corridors, and the City of Edmonds should consider doing the same.
- **PAGE 33:** The language in Item 1a.i related to terraced roofs is overly prescriptive and handcuffs the developer. A more performance type objective would be better. This should be replaced with “Provide vertical breaks in the parapet line in order to attain variation in the building form.”
- **PAGE 33:** The requirement of 1a.ii is too restrictive. The City should delete all but the first sentence of this section.
- **PAGE 34:** The specific criteria for sloped roofs are unduly restrictive. This section should be replaced with “it has a pitch of 4:12 or greater along the perimeter of the building and at least 40 percent of the roof facing the frontage street should be modulated by elements such as dormers, gables of 8:12 or greater, barrel vaults, chimneys or turrets.” As proposed, this section would allow an 8:12 roof over the entire building without any modulation.
- **PAGE 35:** The definitions for small, medium and large buildings do not fit in the BC zones and possibly other zones. An FAR-based standard should be applied, wherein the above-ground gross building area is used to define FAR. The City staff should determine an appropriate FAR delineation for small, medium and large projects on a zone-by-zone basis. The FAR can be calculated relatively easy and can be flexible in responding to different site sizes. They are concerned about the blanket criteria on Page 35 which would allow massive sized duplexes to side step the code because they are not included in this requirement.
- **PAGE 40:** For small-scale commercial and residential projects, the wall modulation requirements are unduly restrictive. While it is acknowledged that language on Page 20 suggests that such modulation can occur within the setback areas, it does require a code change. The conditions stated on Page 40 are acceptable if, and only if, the code changes proposed on Page 20 are enacted. On a small site, the maximum building area is everything outside of the setback area. If modulation is required, the amount of buildable area will be reduced unless there is the ability to put the modulation into the setback areas. Also, if some buildings are going to be covered by the design guidelines, then any building that is significant in nature should be included, as well. This would snag the duplex projects that are going through the process and having a significant impact to the neighborhoods.
- **PAGES 43 THROUGH 48:** The façade requirements are overly restrictive. As stated the three façade element categories on Pages 44, 45 and 47 contradict the “requirement matrix” on Page 43. If each façade element requirement must be met for each sized building, then the matrix on Page 43 is misleading. These five pages should be rewritten to better reflect the City’s intent. The Vancouver guidelines, which have five criteria that apply to provide modulation and color, have been successful. One of the criteria is that the windows have to be trimmed. This can be done in a variety of ways, but one way that has been successful and inexpensive is painting a four-inch border around the windows. Another

criteria is that each unit must provide a vertical element going up the façade to break up the building. Another is that the entrance to the units must be from the street, with front doors facing the street creating a more residential appearance. These criteria have been effective, but general. They let the developer be creative when responding to the criteria. For instance, requiring trim painting around the windows would have the same result as the complicated matrix recommended in the design guidelines.

- **PAGE 44:** While window variety and articulation are important to the design of a building, the illustrations given on Page 44 and the criteria for minimum different types of windows does not meet the intent. In fact, it could result in just the opposite.
- **PAGE 46:** It is strongly suggested that the section on “restricted materials” be deleted since it appears to be unduly prescriptive and does not meet the intent of the design guidelines. It appears that the consultant has worked hard to get materials that he does not like prohibited in the City.

THE BOARD TOOK A TEN MINUTES BREAK AT 8:35 P.M.

Bob Greg, 16550 – 76th Avenue West, referred to Page 20 of the proposed design guidelines. He pointed out that an additional two-foot setback for sidewalk area in the downtown/commercial area will have a significant impact. He said that this would impact his project on Fifth and Walnut significantly. It is only a 110 by 12- foot corner lot. Because of the slope of the lot and the need for underground parking, the parking has had to be extended under the 15-foot setback area. The additional two-foot setback would require him to significantly reduce the amount of prime retail/office space on the site by about 400 square feet. He asked that the additional setback requirement not be applied to the mixed-use zones unless the lots are larger in size.

Bruce Nickelson, 9829 Cherry Street, said that he has lived in Edmonds for 55 years and is trying to speak on behalf of what is good for the entire City and not just the builders. He is in the process of finishing up a building between Dayton and Walnut. Due to the codes and restrictions currently in place, he has ended up with a substandard building. The current code allows mixed use in the RM zoned areas and that is what he chose to construct. He has had to comply with all of the setbacks that are required in the RM zone. Because of the grade conditions and the garage access, he has ended up with ceilings of 7’6” within the center of the building and 7’ on the perimeter of the building. He said this is ridiculous, and he won’t ever build another project in Edmonds under the current conditions. He has found it to be economically unfeasible. He has had to spend between \$75,000 and \$100,000 extra to complete the project, and these costs cannot be passed on to the new owners if the units are to be competitively priced.

Dawn Runyan, 1036 – 8th Avenue South, said she was involved in the stakeholders group and would like the opportunity to summarize their views. Obviously, their main concerns have been related to the BC and RM zones in the downtown area. She referred to a map of the areas that are left for development, which are very few. The City and the developer have an obligation to make the best use of the sites that remain, both from an economic and aesthetic standpoint. Developers try to get homeowners to buy condos because they are maintenance free, but the obstacles that are being required lessen the advantages. The cost of the requirements has to be passed onto the potential condo buyers. Instead of encouraging people to come live in Edmonds, they are becoming more and more prohibitive. The condo owners are the people who generate activity in the downtown area. The goal should be to get to a point where flexibility is allowed so that the precious few sites left can be developed to their maximum aesthetic and economic benefit.

Phyllis Becker, 524 Magnolia Lane, expressed her interest in sidewalk construction. She said she hopes to see a basic design priority for pedestrians and their needs. She observed that it is very common to add various encumbrances to sidewalks such as trees, grates, planters, telephone poles, guy wires, etc. Some of these are unavoidable, but some are not. Of particularly concern to her is the new sidewalk on two sides of the new assisted living facility at 2nd and Dayton Street. There are 52” tree holes and grates and 37” of sidewalk between the grates and the curb. Near the corner by the toll booths, the sidewalk become a real obstacle course. The most that is left of the sidewalk is 56”, much of which is over the grates. This is not enough for two wheelchairs to pass. She concluded that this is not a good sidewalk for this location. Without the trees and grates it would have been grand. Ms. Becker asked that the design guidelines require sidewalks that are wide enough and as free of encumbrances as possible. She specifically referenced the bottom of Page 51 and top of Page 52 and stated that sidewalks are not streetscape, they are vital to pedestrians.

APPROVED

Doug Dewar, 110 James Street, said he is a member of the Edmonds Alliance for Economic Development. He said the Board is made up of representatives from the Port of Edmonds, the City of Edmonds, the business owners and the Arts Community, as well as representatives from the community. They hold at least one board meeting per month with the focus being on economic development in the downtown area. The Alliance sponsored the Hyatt-Palma study that surveyed the citizens and shoppers in Edmonds. One of the desires expressed in the survey was a more viable business community with more diverse businesses. He said that this cannot be done within the constraints set forth in the current code. The City must be flexible so that properties can be fully developed. For example, the City should consider the issue of height. Allowing 35-feet in certain areas of the City would be appropriate. Issues such as this must be explored if the City is to encourage economic development and design diversity.

Peter Beck, 723 Park Road, said he has lived in Edmonds since 1951 and was a member of the ADB for eleven years. He agreed with Mr. Nichol森 and Mr. Dewar, that it is time for the City to consider changing their height limits and allowing for creative design and maximum use of the land in Edmonds.

Roger Hertrich, 1020 Puget Drive, said that he has reviewed the draft document and attended many of the meetings in which the Board discussed the design guidelines issue. He presented the following concerns.

- **PAGE 4:** What is the definition of the term “minor impact.” Also, he would hope that the 10 percent variation would not be applied to the height or the setback requirements. They need to preserve the existing views and open space in the City.
- **PAGE 8:** Allowing trees that will grow to 45-50 feet high at maturity is too high. He suggested that a better height limit would be 30 or 35 feet. If the City is concerned about views and holding buildings to a certain height, they should not allow trees to exceed this height, either. He suggested that the type and height of the trees should be determined by an expert in the field.
- **PAGE 7:** Retaining walls are used to either retain the soil or to build up a lot height. This section should indicate that retaining wall are allowed to retain the soil, but not to build up a lot height.
- **PAGE 11:** Item 3 states that the Department of Public Works shall decide the required number and locations of any additional access points. He suggested that it would be more appropriate for this to be decided by the Engineering Department.
- **PAGE 13:** This section does not make an allowance for the larger grocery store type businesses that are set back with large parking areas in front. He suggested that the percentages are not realistic in all of the uses.
- **PAGE 14:** This section does not identify how much the lot coverage may be increased if parking is provided under the building. He questioned whether it is appropriate to increase the amount of lot coverage. Developers who put parking under a building do so to get more units on the lot.
- **PAGE 16:** He agrees with Mr. Morrison’s concerns about the walkway. He does not believe the design guidelines for buildings should deal with the walkways on the waterfront.
- **PAGE 17:** Unfortunately, if a single entrance is done in an RM development, the City may be forcing these people to use tandem parking.
- **PAGE 20:** He referenced Objective A and said that if the setbacks are allowed to be changed and more large buildings are created, it will be even more important to maintain open space areas. He suggested that they not allow a project to encroach into the setback areas.
- **PAGE 30:** He does not believe that banners and pennants are good sign elements for the City to allow in any zone. He said he does not have a problem with allowing banners to advertise single events such as community projects.
- **PAGE 33:** He endorses the roof modulation element. He recalled that when the Code was changed to allow modulated roof designs, the complaint was that the City had boring, flat roofs. But the way things are now, you can have nearly flat roofs at 30-feet.
- **PAGE 54:** There is no mention of the mature height for each of the different types of landscaping. While this is listed somewhere else in the Code, it should also be provided in this section.
- **PAGE 52:** He referenced Description A, and noted that six feet is the height allowed for fences and hedges. If the row of trees becomes a solid obscuring mass, it should also be limited to a lesser height.
- **PAGE 52:** The term “square footage” needs to be described further. He would hope that all of the area of a building would be considered.

APPROVED

Careen Northlin-Rubenkönig, 19505 81st Place West, commended the Board for the opportunity they have provided for public participation. She particularly appreciates Mr. Michel's and Mr. Shapiro's efforts in working with the community to provide a response to the proposed guidelines. She also thanked the other members of the public for participating. The Board has a tough job ahead of them, and they are looking for high accountability from the guidelines. They want things to be fair, so they are taking the time to consider everyone's point of view.

Ms. Rubenkönig stated that the ADB has reviewed the design guidelines with the staff and Planning Board, as well. The ADB feels the guidelines can help them provide a better direction for future development. However, she cautioned that the City should be careful in how they propose the application of the design guidelines. She noted that the guidelines would not just apply to downtown Edmonds. The guidelines are a step towards focusing on the needs of the City, as a whole. She said it is difficult to put a building into the current fabric of the City, and the guidelines should have a great deal of respect to this process. As proposed, the guidelines are designed to meet the City's Comprehensive Plan concepts.

As to whether future proposals will be reviewed by the ADB or not, Ms. Rubenkönig said it is important to decide who the City is going to trust with the future development of the City. The guidelines will help to guide the review process, but they need to be flexible to allow developers to craft projects to fit into the current fabric of the City.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Mr. Dewhirst suggested that if there are any questions or concerns the Board would like the staff to respond to at the next meeting, they should make that request as soon as possible.

Mr. Crim said the Board has been faced with a number of specific issues that need to be considered. The staff can probably review the minutes and prepare to address each of them at the next meeting. He suggested that a general discussion of some of the alternatives to these issues needs to be brought forward at the next meeting.

Mr. Monlux said that Board came to the public hearing with the idea that there would need to be several changes made to the existing code. However, the number of changes he anticipated was smaller than what tonight's discussion indicates. He suggested that the Board needs to carefully consider the suggestions presented by the public, particularly Mr. Shapiro and Mr. Michel.

Ms. Lindh suggested that staff review each of the suggestions and explain why they could or could not be implemented in the document. Perhaps the ADB could also participate in this process. It would be helpful for the staff to partially digest the comments that were made before the Board discusses them further. The consultant could also provide feedback.

Mr. Witenberg agreed with the previous Board members' comments. There has been testimony about the intent of particular portions of the guidelines and interpretations. It would be helpful if staff could review these comments topic by topic and indicate the intent of each of the guidelines and whether the testimony that was provided is correct or not. This information should be provided to the Board in written format before the next meeting.

Ms. Langendorfer agreed with Mr. Witenberg and Ms. Lindh that the Board and staff should put together a systematic way to review the document with input from the ADB and the consultant. She also requested that the staff obtain a copy of the five guidelines from Vancouver, B.C. as referenced by Mr. Michel.

Ms. Cassutt noted that Mr. Michel is a member of the ADB. She questioned why he has waited so long to provide input into the design guidelines, since they have been available for his consideration for quite some time. She said she is disappointed that the information presented by Mr. Shapiro and Mr. Michel did not come out sooner. She suggested that the Board needs to meet again with the ADB and staff to review the document further.

Mr. Guenther said he finds that the intent of the guidelines is to provide for well-designed buildings, but he hears that there needs to be flexibility, as well. The proposed document is rather prescriptive, which works against the concept of flexibility. He said he hopes that during the Board's review process, they can move away from the prescriptive and more towards a performance based design code.

APPROVED

Mr. Chave said there is only so much that staff can prepare before the April 11, 2001 meeting. The ADB comments will not be available by that date. However, the Board and staff do have an obligation to look at each comment that was made and try to provide some feedback. He said there were a lot of good comments made, but by and large the bulk of the guidelines are still effective. Even with all of the changes, they would still have a document that is very much like it is now. The Board should expect to make changes through the public hearing process, and he is not discouraged by the comments that were made.

Mr. Crim said one thing that was not communicated well to the public was that the intent is to gather all of the documents that currently exist into one, single source. Inevitably, this will result in changes to the code. Once the guidelines are identified, they can begin to highlight the changes that are necessary to the Code.

MOTION BY MR. CRIM, SECONDED BY MS. LINDH, TO CONTINUE THE PUBLIC HEARING TO APRIL 11, 2001 FOR PLANNING BOARD DELIBERATION ONLY. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Mr. Dewhirst noted that the next public hearing for the design guidelines is May 9, 2001, but it is likely that this hearing will be postponed to a later date. The Comprehensive Plan discussion that was scheduled for April 11, 2001 was postponed to accommodate the Board deliberations regarding the design guidelines.

Mr. Witenberg inquired how the waterfront walkway issue best fits into the design guidelines or if this should be a separate issue that is not applicable to the design guidelines. Mr. Chave answered that staff would provide a response at the next meeting as to whether the waterfront walkways should be included as part of the design guidelines as well as in the Waterfront Plan.

Mr. Dewhirst inquired when the Board could expect to see the first draft of the new Comprehensive Parks Plan. Mr. Chave said they have not yet received a request from Ms. Ohlde to place the issue on the agenda, but staff will contact her for more information.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Mr. Dewhirst reported that the City Council joint meeting went well. He also announced that on May 11, 2001 between 1:00 and 5:00 p.m., the City will be participating in a Walkable Communities Workshop sponsored by the Puget Sound Regional Council. Mr. Bowman clarified that the Puget Sound Regional Council applied for and received a grant to conduct Walkable Community Workshops throughout the area. The City of Edmonds expressed their interest and was selected as one of the communities to participate. The Planning Board is invited to attend this workshop. The size of the active participants will be about 50, but others can attend and listen. It will be held in the Great Room of City Hall. Ms. Lindh indicated that she would like to be a participant.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

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

MOTION BY MR. CRIM, SECONDED BY MS. LINDH, TO ADJOURN THE MEETING AT 9:50 P.M. MOTION CARRIED.

APPROVED