

## PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

March 27, 2002

---

---

Chair John Dewhirst called the regular meeting of the Planning Board to order at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Public Safety Complex, 250 – 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North.

### PRESENT

John Dewhirst, Chair  
Jim Crim, Vice Chair  
Virginia Cassutt  
Beverly Lindh  
Joanne Noel  
Cary Guenther  
Wayne Zhan  
James Young

### STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager  
Arvilla Ohlde, Parks and Recreation Division Manager.  
Dave Gebert, City Engineer  
Don Fiene, Assistant City Engineer  
Darrell Smith, Traffic Engineer  
Karin Noyes, Recorder

### APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION BY MS. LINDH, SECONDED BY MR. DEWHIRST, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 13, 2002 WITH THE TYPOGRAPHICAL CORRECTIONS AS NOTED. 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 who desired to address the Board during this portion of the meeting.

### PUBLIC HEARING ON AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 20 OF THE EDMONDS DEVELOPMENT CODE ADDING A NEW CHAPTER 20.45 ESTABLISHING THE EDMONDS REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES (FILE NO. CDC-02-52)

Mr. Chave advised that the Historic Preservation Advisory Committee completed its work and presented its final report to the City Council on January 15. After a public hearing on February 19, the City Council adopted an ordinance establishing a permanent Historic Preservation Commission. The roll of this permanent Commission is to promote, educate and develop programs pertaining to historic resources in Edmonds. One of their key responsibilities will be the administration of the local register of historic properties and sites.

The proposed amendment before the Board for consideration at this time would create an Edmonds Register of Historic Places. Buildings, structures, sites, objects or districts may be designated for inclusion on the register. The ordinance establishes criteria and the process for designating properties. This process includes the nomination of a property, the evaluation of a property by the Commission, public notification and owner consent, and lastly, the approval of the nomination of the property by the City Council. In addition, the ordinance identifies the effects of listing a property on the register and establishes a review process for changes to register properties.

Mr. Chave said that if approved, the ordinance would result in the City being recognized by the State as a Certified Local Government, which would enable the City to seek grant funding, obtain training and assistance, assess special tax incentives, and officially register participating properties. Mr. Chave particularly noted that participation on the register is entirely voluntary. The property owner of the potential historical property must agree to its being listed. The Commission would then make a recommendation to the City Council, who is responsible for making the final decision. Therefore, the Commission would play an advisory role in the process.

Mr. Chave advised that the advisory committee has discussed a number of benefits that could be provided to property owners who choose to be listed on the register, including monetary benefits. The newly formed Historic Preservation Commission would be charged with the responsibility of reviewing these programs and making a recommendation to the Council for consideration and approval.

Ms. Ohlde cautioned that as this process is developed and the Historic Preservation Commission is established, the City should keep in mind the facilities they own that could become part of the register. They should clearly understand that the City, out of respect for the Historic Preservation Commission, would likely need to offer to place their historic sites on the register. However, the City's programs for recreation are functioning in historic structures throughout the community. The ordinance would include both the exterior and interior of the historical structures, and not only the buildings, but the sites they are located on, as well. She cited the Puget Sound Christian College, Bracketts Landing and the Francis Anderson Center as examples of buildings and sites that could be considered historic, but need to continue as functioning facilities. It is important as policies and processes are identified by the Historic Preservation Commission, that they not impact the City's ability to use these facilities as they currently function.

Charles LaWarne, 20829 Hillcrest, said that he participated on the advisory committee. He said he does not believe that such changes as electrical upgrades or relatively minor changes in the building would impact the designation of a structure on the Historical Preservation Register. However, modifications that change the character of the building or site could create potential problems if a building or site is listed on the register. However, he noted that a site or building could be removed from the register if changes are done that destroy the historic character. Mr. LaWarne asked that the Board move forward with a favorable recommendation to the City Council. The proposed ordinance is the result of a considerable amount of work with continual review and contact with the State officials. It is not a radical proposal, and is very much in line with what many communities have already done. The property owners will be given an opportunity to achieve some benefits if they follow the guidelines that are established, but no one will be required to participate. He noted that Snohomish County is in the process of establishing a similar program.

Roger Hertrich, 1020 Puget Drive, said that he has the County's ordinance, and can provide a copy to the staff. He noted that the County's ordinance includes reference to archaeological sites, but the ordinance before the Planning Board at this time does not. He suggested that at some point in time, the City should create a separate chapter for the protection of archaeological resources using the County's ordinance as an example. He said there could be situations during earth movement or grading and clearing, etc where individuals might come across something that has great value. Mr. Hertrich emphasized that no one would be forced to list their property on the register. The Commission will inventory and list the facilities within the City that would qualify for the program, but they will not force anyone to participate. He concluded that the proposed ordinance is a positive step for the City, and he urged the Board to recommend approval.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Mr. Chave pointed out that Page 9 of the ordinance (Section 20.45.050) would prohibit any changes to the building or structure that is on the Register of Historic Places without review by the Commission and without receipt of a Certificate of

**APPROVED**

Appropriateness or waiver as a result of the review. However, it is also important to note that this requirement would apply to all features of the property, interior and exterior, that contribute to its designation and are listed on the nomination form. He explained that at the time a property is nominated for inclusion on the register, a property owner will be required to fill out a form listing what portions of the site or facility they are nominating for the list. A property owner may want to nominate the exterior of a structure as a historical site, but not the interior. He cautioned that it is important that the property owners clearly understand the ramifications of having their properties listed on the register—particularly those related to future changes of the site or structure.

Mr. Dewhirst said that he was surprised, when reviewing the definition section, that there was no definition for the term “adaptive reuse.” He said this term has usually played a large role in other historical preservation ordinances he has read. He said he feels the proposed ordinance is a good starting point, but there is a lot that is still missing such as guidelines. He suggested that as the City gets into the program, it is likely that changes will be made to meet the individual needs of the City. He said he plans to support the ordinance as proposed.

Mr. Young said that he has been working with the Pioneer Square Preservation Board over the past year since the earthquake, and it has ended up being a significant process. He noted that in working with historical issues, the City of Seattle has gone so far as to designate their own Historical Preservation Officer. He said that while he supports the ordinance, it is important for the City to understand what they are getting into if they want to make the program successful. The review process will be difficult to establish because it will need to be strong enough to protect historical properties, but not so strong that it will discourage people from asking to place their property on the register. The whole review process can sometimes become very elaborate and can almost become akin to the ADB review process—particularly in the case of commercial buildings. He said that when buildings on the register are sold, the future owners often want to make changes. At some point in time, the City will need to determine whether or not the property can remain on the register. He said it is important that the City understand the amount of staff time that will be required to administer the program, but he concluded that the program is wonderful and comes just in time for the City.

Ms. Cassutt advised that she participated on the advisory committee. She recalled that the intent was to get an ordinance before the Council for approval that would establish the Historic Preservation Commission and the Historic Register before establishing the review criteria, etc. The committee felt it would be more appropriate for the permanent Historical Preservation Commission to take charge of this effort. The intent was to use the State guidelines as an interim solution, and then allow the appointed commission to work with the ordinance and go forward. She agreed that it is likely that changes will be made in the future, but they need to take the first step now by approving the proposed ordinance.

Mr. Young said the advisory committee did an excellent job in preparing the ordinance that is now being considered. It is very objective in the way it is written, but he is always a little bit leery because of his personal experience.

Mr. Zhan inquired how a property owner would go about removing his property from the register at a future date. He questioned if this would require the approval of the Historic Preservation Commission. Mr. Chave answered that a property owner could request that the Commission remove the property from the register, but it is up to the commission to approve the removal. A property owner cannot remove their structure or site from the register on their own. Mr. Zhan inquired why this would require the approval of the commission. Mr. Chave pointed out that properties that are listed on the register would receive quite a few benefits as a result of the listing, such as a reduction of taxes, property valuation or parking standards, etc. The advisory committee did not feel it would be appropriate to allow a property owner to obtain these benefits over a number of years and then suddenly decide to take the property off the register at a future date. Mr. Chave emphasized that this is a voluntary program, and property owners need to understand that it is not easy to get off the register.

**MOTION BY MS. CASSUTT, SECONDED BY MS. LINDH, TO FORWARD FILE NO. CDC-02-52—ESTABLISHING A REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES, TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**PUBLIC HEARING FOR ADOPTION OF 2002-2007 SIX-YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM AS PART OF CITY OF EDMONDS COMPREHENSIVE PLAN (FILE NO. CDC-02-04)**

**APPROVED**

Mr. Fiene briefly reviewed the proposed 2002 through 2007 CIP program, using a power point presentation showing the spread sheets for the following funds:

|              |   |
|--------------|---|
| Fund 112     | Combined Street Construction Improvement – Arterial Projects  |
| Fund 113     | Multi-modal Transportation                                    |
| Fund 116     | Buildings Maintenance   |
| Fund 125     | Parks, Open Space, Recreation Beautification                  |
| Fund 126     | Special Capital Projects                                      |
| Fund 130     | Cemetery Improvements   |
| Fund 326     | Public Safety Building Construction.                          |
| Fund 330     | Street Limited Tax General Obligation Bond Projects           |
| Fund 412-100 | Combined Utility Construction Improvement – Water Projects    |
| Fund 412-200 | Combined Utility Construction Improvement – Drainage Projects |
| Fund 412-300 | Combined Utility Construction Improvement – Sewer Projects    |
| Fund 414     | Wastewater Treatment Plant                                    |

Mr. Fiene advised that over the past few years, staff has created a “Project Description Booklet” listing each project and providing details. In addition to the project description, each contains a cost breakdown. He reviewed each of the significant projects identified in the booklet. He provided an overhead map identifying the location of each of the projects, with a description of the project listed beneath.

Mr. Zahn inquired regarding what other jurisdictions use the sewer treatment plants located within the City. Mr. Fiene answered that Olympic View Water District, Ronald Sewer District, the Town of Woodway and Mountlake Terrace all pay about 50 percent of the cost for these facilities. The City of Edmonds pays for the remaining 50 percent of the cost of any improvements.

**MOTION BY MR. CRIM, SECONDED BY MS. CASSUTT, TO FORWARD FILE NO. CDC-02-04—2002-2007 SIX-YEAR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM TO THE CITY COUNCIL AS PRESENTED WITH A RECOMMENDATION FOR APPROVAL. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

### **TRANSPORTATION PLAN INTRODUCTION AND POLICY OVERVIEW**

Mr. Smith advised that the City is in the process of updating the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan. He explained that the Growth Management Act requires the City to perform a major update to the transportation plan every six to ten years. The City’s last major update was in 1995. He further explained that the transportation element establishes goals that the City wants to accomplish and priorities that they want to do first. It also identifies how the City will accomplish the goals and plans. He noted that the City has limited resources that have to be budgeted out to the various projects.

Mr. Smith advised that one of the first activities of the update is to carefully review the goals, policies and objectives to find out what they want to accomplish. He referred to the draft copy of the goals and policies as they stand midway through the process. He said there is a lot of room for putting in more ideas or trimming back policies they do not want to move forward. He emphasized that public involvement will be the key factor in this review process. It is important for the staff to work with the citizens the entire way through the process. Staff plans to hold public open houses, the first being April 4, 2002 at 7:00 p.m. in the Plaza Room of the Edmonds Library Building. The staff will aggressively market this particular meeting through mailings and newspaper articles. They will also send out notices in the water bills.

Mr. Smith announced that a technical advisory committee has been formed to help with this project, and it consists of professionals in the Snohomish County area. There is also a citizens steering committee to help the staff identify the values of the community as they relate to transportation projects. This committee will help the staff understand the passions of the

community. For instance, walkways have been identified as very important elements to the community, and the plan needs to promote this use.

He reviewed that the new update will include additional features such as a traffic calming program to discourage unwanted traffic in neighborhoods. He referred to the large map which provides an inventory of the City's road network. He explained that the smaller map is an inventory of the controlled intersections. The map also identifies locations where proposed traffic calming devices are being considered.

Mr. Smith advised that staff intends to spend a significant amount of time reviewing the walkway system in the City. He referred to the 2002 walkway inventory map, and said that staff has inventoried every roadway in the City to identify the walkways that currently exist and where the deficiencies are. The City is spending a tremendous amount of effort to close these gaps, particularly in areas near schools and where there is high volumes of traffic such as 220<sup>th</sup> Street.

Mr. Smith said the updated plan will also include a section regarding traffic concurrency, which will focus on new development. This process will identify areas where development might occur and a process that can be used to determine the developer's fair share of the transportation improvement costs based on the impacts associated with the development. It is important that the developers pay their fair share of the transportation improvement costs, but the City should also be careful not to place too great a burden on them. In addition, Mr. Smith reviewed that the process will include an update of the computer model, as well as consolidation of the 2000 bike plan into the transportation plan. Once all of the improvements have been identified, the City will need to prioritize each one.

Mr. Dewhirst requested that Mr. Smith review the process that will be used for this project and identify what the Board's role will be. Mr. Smith explained that the very early stages of the plan would involve the staff seeking feedback from the community so that the community values and problems are identified clearly. Now that a lot of the inventory background work has been completed, staff will begin to consider solutions to the problems that have been identified. Hopefully, at the end of the public input process, goals will be identified and a vision for the City created. At that point, staff will bring the issue before the Board for review. They will then complete the computer modeling work and begin to make sure everything balances out before starting the task of evaluating each of the projects on the wish list. During this evaluation, it will be determined that some of the projects are not financially viable or a high enough priority to be included in the plan. The prioritized list has to be very objective and easy to defend. Each project must meet the goals and objectives that are identified early in the process. Staff anticipates that by fall, they will be able to hold public hearings before both the Planning Board and the City Council before creating the final draft of the document and recommending approval.

Mr. Zhan asked Mr. Smith to describe how the staff will prioritize the projects that are identified. Mr. Smith said a good example of prioritization is the walkway program. One thing they like to do is create a selection matrix which becomes a visual tool to list all of the different components that might be involved with the walkway program such as pedestrian safety, school access, transportation access, available rights-of-way, etc. They also factor in the City's ability to implement the project and consider issues such as environment, etc. He said that, often times, the projects are divided into selection groups. One group would be major projects, and only a few of these can be done each year. Another group would be mid-sized projects, and more of these can be included on the list. Small projects can be even more numerous and can provide a significant benefit to the community without costing a lot of money. The staff also considers certain factors that have more weight than others. For instance, pedestrian safety is probably the most important aspect of walkways. Therefore, projects that improve pedestrian safety would likely be found higher on the priority list.

Mr. Dewhirst inquired if it would be appropriate for Board members to bring issues or concerns to the attention of the engineering department for inclusion in the transportation element as a possible goal or objective. Mr. Smith encouraged the Board members to review the document and provide their comments regarding the goals and objectives that have been identified to date. If they have a particular concern, they should contact the staff, as well, to share ideas and possible solutions.

Ms. Lindh expressed concern that people are cutting through her neighborhood streets to get from Bowdoin to 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Mr. Smith said there are options being considered to address this problem, but the City must also consider improvements to arterials and collector streets so that traffic can flow better, thus discouraging people from using neighborhood streets.

Ms. Noel expressed her concern regarding the intersection of SR 104 and 232<sup>nd</sup> Street. The kids that go to Edmonds/Woodway High School cross Edmonds Way in this location and go up the hill to catch the Community Transit bus instead of going up to the light. Additionally, you have pedestrian traffic crossing there because of the bus stop. She suggested that a pedestrian light, in addition to the fire light, would be good in this location. Mr. Smith agreed that this would be an excellent idea, and said that staff is considering this option. They have a limited budget, but they want to install an emergency signal that can be upgraded to a full-blown traffic signal in the future. They are also considering pedestrian improvements right now. However, he noted that the WSDOT has control of this intersection.

Mr. Young inquired about what kinds of designated revenue sources the City has to provide for transportation improvements and what the long-term prognosis is for these funds in regards to volume and health. Mr. Smith said this is a tough question, and staff will be coming back before the Board with more information regarding this issue in the future. Right now, the City is within the range of where they need to be. The staff will be frugal to push as many projects as they can through. He said he is more nervous about funding for walkway projects, because he is not sure there is sufficient funding to accomplish all of the pedestrian goals. Because the City is growing at a slower pace than other communities in Snohomish County, they do not have to spend the volume of dollars for traffic improvements, but there will be large expenditures related to the ferry terminal and the SR-104 route. Mr. Dewhirst suggested that one problem is that WSDOT has been significantly underfunded for the past several years. Previously, there have been a lot of dollars available for transportation improvements, but it is projected that this funding source will take a huge hit in the coming years.

Mr. Young said that staff has done a great job of laying out how the transportation needs will be identified, and he would like to think that the community will be able to afford all of the improvements identified. However, they may get to the point where the citizens of Edmonds will have to make decisions on their own as to whether they want to pay for the projects. If this becomes necessary, it would be helpful to have pie charts available to identify what the current funding is being used for and where they anticipate that the funding will come from. He said the public is becoming increasingly aware of these issues, and they tend to be very supportive if they clearly understand the situation. Mr. Smith agreed that pie charts would be helpful to clearly identify where the City was previously in regard to transportation issues, where they are now and where they need to go in the future. In addition, they could also illustrate the staff resources that will be required for future projects.

Mr. Fiene noted that on the spreadsheet for fund 112, various capital projects are identified. He pointed out the footnote at the bottom of the page indicates that in order for all of the projects that have been identified to be funded, grants and other outside funding will be necessary. He agreed that a pie chart showing where the funding would come from and where it would be spent would be helpful.

Mr. Young inquired if there is any sentiment about dedicating a certain portion of the real estate excise tax for transportation projects. He explained that this is a legislative policy made by the City Council, but these funds can be used for anything that is considered to be maintenance. He noted that the public is really taking an interest in what these tax dollars are being used for. That is why he suggested that it would be appropriate to provide pie charts to clarify the City's transportation expenditures. He suggested that it would be helpful to have a pie chart showing how much of the transportation funding is being used for pedestrian walkways, safety issues, etc.

Mr. Smith announced that the City of Edmonds has been able to obtain over \$2 million of the \$16 to \$17 million available for transportation grant funding in the Puget Sound area. He said he hopes the committee will be able to explore innovative ideas to bring to the City Council for funding in addition to grants. Mr. Young agreed that they need to consider other sources of funding such as the excise tax. He suggested that the transportation element should clearly indicate that if the community wants additional services, they might have to pay for them themselves. Mr. Fiene noted that only \$600,000 comes in per year from car registration fees and fuel tax revenue. This should be noted in the plan.

Mr. Chave agreed that preparing charts as part of the transportation plan would be appropriate. He said the public is going to be highly aware of transportation issues over the next few years, and it will be important during this planning process to make it clear as to what the overall funding picture is.

## **REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA**

Mr. Chave reminded the Board that the Planning Board retreat would be held on April 10, 2002. This will be in place of the regular Planning Board meeting originally scheduled for that night. The April 24 agenda will include a public hearing on the design guidelines and the new design review process. Also, Mr. Fiene will present the Draft Water Comprehensive Plan in preparation for a public hearing on May 8.

Mr. Dewhirst noted that the master plan ordinance was removed from the extended agenda. Mr. Chave said that there is an application for a development code amendment and rezone of the UNOCAL property coming up in the near future. The code amendment would create two master plan districts for the upper and lower yards, and the rezone would change the designation of the properties to those identified in the master plan. This issue has taken precedence over the general master plan ordinance.

Mr. Chave explained that the proposal is that the upper yard of the UNOCAL site be designated as mixed-use residential and the lower as multi-modal and commercial uses. Essentially, they are asking the Board to consider something similar to what they did for the intersection along the Westgate corridor where they created a BP-Planned Business zoning designation. He said UNOCAL has made application to do the same kind of thing for their large property at Point Edwards. A SEPA Checklist has been submitted and they are relying on the EIS that was done for the Comprehensive Plan because they claim that their request would implement and is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. It is anticipated that the master plan and rezone application will go hand-in-hand with the cleanup activity to facilitate future development of the site.

Ms. Cassutt inquired how this application might impact the Brightwater project. Mr. Chave said that at this point, there has been no formal application or proposal from King County Metro regarding the Brightwater Project. UNOCAL is pursuing action and development under the current Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Cassutt suggested that there is a possibility that the UNOCAL property could be sold and developed before Brightwater is ever approved.

## **PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS**

Mr. Dewhirst referred to the draft agenda he prepared for the Planning Board retreat on April 10. He asked that the Board members provide their comments as soon as possible. He suggested that staff invite the new members of the Architectural Design Board to attend the first part of the meeting at which time the City Attorney will review the roles and responsibilities of the Board. He briefly reviewed the proposed agenda. The Board agreed that the meeting should start at 6:30 p.m. in the Brackett Room of Edmonds City Hall.

Mr. Chave noted that the State APA Conference would be held in the Puget Sound area. Staff will provide more information in the future so that Board members can consider attending some of the sessions.

Mr. Dewhirst handed out a copy of an article in *THE SHORELINE ENTERPRISE* about more work the City of Shoreline is doing on their Highway 99/Interurban Trail segment. This is a new concept that he thought the Board members might find interesting.

Mr. Chave noted that there was an article in *THE SEATTLE TIMES* related to cottage housing.

## **PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

Mr. Young complimented the staff on the quality of the presentations that have been provided to the Board since he has been a member. Everything has been very well laid out and explained. The presentations have been very professionally done, and this enables the Board to make good decisions.

**APPROVED**

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:55 P.M.

**APPROVED**