

## PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

June 26, 2002

---

---

Vice Chair Jim Crim 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

Jim Crim, Vice Chair  
James Young  
Virginia Cassutt  
Cary Guenther  
Joanne Noel  
Janice Freeman  
Wayne Zhan

### ABSENT

John Dewhirst, Chair

### STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager  
Steve Bullock, Associate Planner  
Darrell Smith, Transportation Engineer  
Karin Noyes, Recorder

Mr. Dewhirst was excused from the meeting.

### READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION BY MR. YOUNG, SECONDED BY MS. CASSUTT, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MAY 22, 2002 AS AMENDED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

MOTION BY MS. CASSUTT, SECONDED BY MR. ZHAN, TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF JUNE 12, 2002 AS AMENDED. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

### ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

There were no changes made to the proposed agenda.

### REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Ron Gard, 1114 – 8<sup>th</sup> Avenue South, said that he was before the Board on June 23, 1999 to present a letter of concern regarding a piece of property his family owns at 506 Fifth Avenue South. They want to be able to subdivide the property, but they are shy 125 square feet of land based on the current standards. The code is so strict that a code amendment would be necessary in order for the property owners in the downtown bowl area to subdivide their properties. He said he has addressed this issue before the Board and the staff on numerous occasions, but a proposed code amendment has never been drafted for consideration.

Mr. Gard reviewed that on October 25, 1999, the Planning Board briefly discussed the issue. At that time, Ms. Cassutt suggested that the issue should be considered further as an opportunity to provide more single-family housing in the downtown area. He said that the subject property is currently surrounded by a three-unit townhouse to the north, single-

family homes to the east and west, and a brand new condominium on the northwest corner. The present code seems to discourage single-family development on lots such as his. He noted that there are two neighboring properties with single-family homes that are less than the required 6,000 square feet in size. The property at 545 Holly Drive is only 4,950 square feet and the property at 535 Holly Drive is 4,792 square feet. Yet homes were allowed on both of these lots. He concluded that it would be a benefit to the neighborhood to be able to build two single-family homes on his property. He asked that the Board seriously consider this issue during their review of the Comprehensive Plan later this year.

Mr. Young inquired if there is an opportunity for a property owner to obtain a variance to allow a subdivision of properties that have areas just short of the square footage requirement. Ms. Cassutt answered that there is no variance option, and the Board has told the staff that they feel this is something that should be taken care of. Mr. Gard added that on October 25, 2000 the Board decided that this issue would be carried over to their discussion of possible amendments to the Comprehensive Plan in 2002.

Mr. Chave suggested that as part of the Board's discussion of buildable lands, they could consider potential measures to increase infill development opportunities. However, he emphasized that this is not a requirement. The Board could elect to propose no amendments this year. He informed Mr. Gard that there is no guarantee that the Board will forward a recommendation for change to the Council to address his issue. However, during the Comprehensive Plan review, buildable lands will be a major consideration, and the Board will review a laundry list of mechanisms that could be used to encourage infill if the Board feels additional measures are necessary. Mr. Gard also has the option of applying for a code amendment on his own.

Mr. Young said he believes there are other instances in the City where the inability of staff to make some minor adjustments that are in the best interest of good planning or no impact planning have actually ended up creating negative impacts. Encouraging infill development is something that should be looked at as a policy issue within the buildable lands report. The Board agreed to consider this issue as part of their discussion regarding buildable lands.

Mr. Chave reminded the Board that Mr. Gard applied for a rezone to change the subject property to a multi-family zone, but the Board turned down his request. Mr. Gard said he had asked that his previous request not be brought up as part of his subdivision request. Mr. Chave said this request will be part of the record for the subject property, but it will not have any bearing on the specific proposal when discussing buildable lands.

Mr. Gard concluded his remarks by pointing out that Councilmember Wilson, while acting as Planning Supervisor for the City, recommended that this was an appropriate issue to consider.

#### **PRESENTATION ON TRANSPORTATION ELEMENT UPDATE (FILE NO. CDC-02-04)**

Darrell Smith, Transportation Engineer, indicated that he was present to briefly review what has been accomplished thus far in the process of updating the transportation element of the Comprehensive Plan. He said they are getting close to having a very solid plan that can be presented to the Board in August. It is likely that they will hold public open houses prior that time to solicit comments from the public. He briefly reviewed the project status as follows:

- Two public open houses have been held.
- Three citizen advisory meetings have been held, which have been really beneficial to share different problems regarding transportation with the various neighborhood representatives. Each neighborhood struggles with different challenges.
- Draft transportation goals and policies have been formulated. A copy of these draft goals and policies was included in the Board's packets, and staff is getting close to finalizing the policies for the Board's review.
- A calibrated City-wide traffic model was updated. This model is very comprehensive and covers the entire arterial and collector streets throughout the City. It identifies the land uses now and what is going to happen in the future in order to judge the best solutions.
- A roadway inventory was performed, and this map shows the widths and types of all of the roadways in the City. It also identifies where improvements are necessary.

- A walkway inventory was performed to identify where all of the walkways are in the city and where they need to be. This is provided in both language and graphic format.
- Walkway selection criteria was developed through meetings with the citizen advisory committees and the Snohomish County Transportation experts. He encouraged the Board to closely review this criteria because it has received a significant amount of public scrutiny and support and will be used to help formulate where the money will be spent.
- The City staff is currently in the process of performing a walkway evaluation and prioritization plan.
- Accident data has been collected and analyzed to identify areas of specific concern related to safety.
- A draft Transportation Improvement Plan was prepared, and staff intends to update this document one more time towards the end of the review process once the improvements have been identified and public hearings have been held.
- A draft traffic-calming program has been prepared. This is in a really rough format right now, but it focuses on lowering the speed in the neighborhoods and getting the traffic onto the arterial streets.

Mr. Smith advised that public comment forms are available for Board members and other citizens to provide their comments, suggestions and recommendations to staff regarding the transportation element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Next, Mr. Smith reviewed each of the maps that have been prepared throughout the process. The first map illustrates the traffic volumes projected out into 2008, with the current transportation plan in place. Even with the improvements in place, there are some level of service concerns such as 212<sup>th</sup> and 84<sup>th</sup> (Five Corners). The staff is also starting to see more and more congestion at Ninth and Caspar. They are extremely concerned that the congestion encourages aggravated drivers to make the left turn early, possibly resulting in a serious accident. Also, the intersection at Highway 99 and 244<sup>th</sup> and the intersection of 76<sup>th</sup> Avenue and SR-104 are both located at the City's border with the County. Part of the roadway is in the City of Edmonds, and part is in a little sliver of King County. On the other side is the City of Shoreline. The staff is working with King county and the City of Shoreline to possibly annex this roadway into the City of Shoreline. This would mean that Edmonds would no longer have the responsibility of maintaining the intersection. This would also help the City of Shoreline meet their traffic flow requirements in that area.

Mr. Smith explained that the second map identifies the level of service out to 2022. It shows very similar trends as the previous map, but it shows more impact and indicates that the problem intersections would get worse. The four intersections discussed previously would be operating at a service level F, which is not something the City wants to have happen. The staff is trying to come up with alternatives to get the "hot spots" under control again. Once the appropriate fixes are in place, they will run the model again to see if the proposed improvements are really working.

Mr. Smith said the third map identifies where most of the accidents are happening in the City. He noted that there is one red spot which had over 20 accidents in a three-year period from 1998 to 2000. This is at 76<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 212<sup>th</sup> Street. Staff is considering if there is something that can physically be done to help this situation. Ms. Noel said that one of the problems is that people dropping off students actually stop in the middle of 212<sup>th</sup> instead of driving into the school drop off area to let their kids out. Mr. Smith said that this same problem occurs at the elementary school down the street on 76<sup>th</sup> Avenue. Staff is currently seeking grant funding to improve the safety in this area.

Ms. Noel noted that none of the Community Transit schedules mesh with the actual high school schedule, and the drop off points are really far away. More frequent Community Transit buses that are in sync with the high schools students' needs would help to improve the situation, as well. Mr. Smith said he would bring this idea up with the Community Transit representatives who will be partnering with the City at the next open house. They will be providing a booth to share different transportation opportunities with the public to better serve the smaller employers in Edmonds.

Mr. Smith said another accident trend is on 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and staff will be applying for grants to install lights at the intersections of 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue and 220<sup>th</sup> Street, 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Walnut and 9<sup>th</sup> and Main Street. In addition, staff is moving forward with the 220<sup>th</sup> Street project that has received significant grant funding. They will be going into the design phase of this project shortly, and this will involve a significant public outreach program.

Mr. Smith said the next step is to model the Transportation Improvement Plan to see how the concepts and projects identified in the plan will work effectively. Public open houses will be held to present the traffic models to the public and allow the public to participate in brainstorming sessions with the staff. Next, the staff will begin to prioritize road and walkway improvements. They will also be updating the arterial system map because there are a few streets that need to be reclassified or clarified. There are also some streets that the City does not classify as collector streets, but the Federal Government does. These streets need to be recognized on City maps as Federally classified collector streets because this opens the door for further funding opportunities to do safety and walkway improvements.

Mr. Smith said the staff anticipates that they will be writing the true draft Transportation Plan Update Document in the very near future, and he would like to share this document with the Board the next time he comes before them. Open houses and public hearings regarding the proposed plan will be held prior to adoption.

Mr. Young suggested that perhaps it would be helpful to the Board if staff were to provide further information regarding the funding options that are available for transportation and walkway improvements. Maybe if the Board had a better understanding of these opportunities, they could help the City gain public support, which is really important. Mr. Smith indicated that when he comes before the Board again, he would provide a list of the grant opportunities available to the City for transportation related projects. He reported that the City received close to \$3 million in grant funding for primarily two projects, and the City's transportation revenues are only \$1 million. He said it is important that the staff continues to seek grant opportunities. He briefly described some of the grant opportunities that are available to the City.

Mr. Zhan inquired if the plan would include any policies related to new technologies or construction materials that might be used such as pervious pavement. Mr. Smith said the pervious pavement technology is new, and there are some great applications for this material such as parking lots and alleys. He said the staff would have to talk to the Department of Ecology to get them to buy into the new technology. However, he said he hasn't seen enough data to determine whether it works well on roadways or not. They are also pushing some other more innovative types of intelligent roadway systems forward such as linking all of the signals on SR-104 together. However, he noted that when staff did the modeling work to identify the congestion on SR-104, they found that it isn't as bad as originally thought.

Mr. Smith said the intent is that the transportation plan become a footprint that is easy to understand to move the City forward no matter who is responsible to implement the plan.

Mr. Guenther inquired how the new mixed-use zones would impact the traffic plans. Mr. Smith answered that when the staff did the models, they projected some higher land uses and traffic patterns in these areas. Some of the challenges of mixed-use development is trying to help the residential streets nearby remain as residential streets.

**CONTINUED REVIEW OF PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ESTABLISH A REVISED PROCESS AND GUIDELINES FOR ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN REVIEW (FILE NO. CDC-00-153/CDC-01-27)**

**Design Guidelines**

Mr. Chave referred to the various documents that were provided to the Board. He said that Sections 20.11, 20.12, 20.13, and 20.14 are related to the Design Guidelines. Sections 20.10 and 20.60 are related to the design review process. He also distributed a copy of the additional recommendations that were provided by Mr. Dewhirst, who was unable to attend tonight's meeting. He said Mr. Dewhirst recommended that the Board review the proposed Design Guidelines and attempt to reach an agreement on a recommendation they could send to the City Council. Then they could consider the review process issue. He pointed out that the Board cannot send a recommendation to the Council regarding the design review process at this time because a new public hearing is required. He explained that the design review process that is now being considered is totally different than what was considered at the previous public hearings.

Mr. Bullock referred to the document provided by staff outlining the changes that were made to the proposed Design Guidelines. The following changes were discussed by the Board and staff:

Section 20.11.020.B.5

Mr. Bullock advised that staff modified the language in this section to soften the regulation regarding retaining walls to allow for flexibility when the walls are not visible from public ways or adjacent property. Another option would be to change the word "shall" to "should." Mr. Bullock explained that the intent of this section is to minimize the impact of retaining walls that face adjacent properties. However, if the retaining wall is facing the development, the developer should be allowed flexibility to go higher than seven feet. The Board agreed with the proposed language change from staff.

Section 20.11.040.D.1

Mr. Bullock advised that in Section D.1.a staff added "22 feet" to indicate the minimum drive aisle width allowed. The staff's recommendation for Section D.1.c to add an incentive and provide greater flexibility for buildings that are proposing underground parking. The proposed language would allow parking structures up to 60 percent of the lot size in multi-family zones.

Mr. Young inquired how the staff arrived at the numbers being proposed in this section. Mr. Bullock answered that the 45 percent lot coverage requirement is already in the Code. Staff felt it would be reasonable to allow underground parking to have up to 60 feet of lot coverage. This would allow the parking structure to fill almost the entire area of buildable land after the setback and buffer requirements have been deducted.

Mr. Young suggested that as long as the parking is provided underground, the parking structure could be as large as the property line allows. Mr. Chave replied that right now, the code allows underground parking structures in BC zones to have 100 percent lot coverage. He suggested that perhaps if this is allowed in the BC zones, it might also be appropriate to allow in the multi-family and other commercial zones, as well. The Board agreed that if the parking structure is located underground, the developer should be allowed to have as much parking space as possible, with no maximum lot coverage limitations.

Mr. Guenther pointed out that during construction, this would require the excavation of property located within the public rights-of-way. Mr. Bullock agreed, but pointed out that the construction permits that are required for this type of development would address this issue adequately. However, he noted that if the lot coverage requirements for underground parking are changed, they would also have to change the code requirements to allow parking structures to extend into the setbacks.

Mr. Chave said another issue to consider is that, often times, there are trees that are located within the setback areas that can be retained. If an underground parking structure is allowed to encroach into the rights-of-way and setback areas, these trees could be destroyed or would have to be removed. Ms. Freeman agreed that there are trees along the streets that could experience damage to their root structure if the ground underneath were excavated for a parking structure. Mr. Bullock pointed out that the trees that are planted in the rights-of-way now will be located as close to the curb line as possible so in many cases the trunks would be ten feet away from the buildings. He said that when trees have to be removed, the City requires them to be replaced at a substantial size because of their location. They have to make sure there is adequate branch height to allow pedestrians to transverse the sidewalk and to keep site angles open at intersections, etc.

Mr. Bullock said that if the Board agrees that parking structures that are underground can extend from lot line to lot line, they will need to consider the other code changes that would be necessary to implement this option because an underground parking structure is a structure as defined by code, and structures have to meet the setback requirements.

The Board agreed that the exception for underground parking structures should be expanded, and that the City should distinguish between underground and above ground structures. Mr. Guenther said this exception should be limited to underground parking and should not include basements, etc. The Board agreed.

Ms. Freeman said she is all for encouraging underground parking, but she did not want well established trees that are an asset to the City to be destroyed to make room for a parking garage. The Board agreed.

Section 20.11.060

The Board agreed that the word “should” would be changed to “shall” in Section B.2. The Board also agreed with the changes proposed by staff to Section B.3 in order to make it consistent with the engineering standards for site distance requirements.

Section 20.11.080

Mr. Bullock advised that staff is recommending that the reference to underground parking structures be deleted in Section B.1.a. The setback limitations for driveways would stay the same.

Mr. Crim noted that the driveway to underground parking structures should have to meet the setback requirements. Mr. Bullock suggested that this would depend upon the situation. If the structure is located in a BC zone, there are no setback requirements for driveways. In the other zones, it would be easy for a developer to provide a driveway that complies with the setback requirements.

Mr. Bullock suggested, and the Board concurred, that the illustration showing a building setback 2 feet to provide for a wider sidewalk should be deleted from Section B.1.d

Section 20.11.110

Mr. Bullock explained that Section C.1 gives some incentives for providing awnings and weather protection. However, this is in conflict with Section 20.12.040.G.1, which completely gives these incentives away. He said that based on comments from the public and the staff’s own review, he would recommend that this section remain and that Section 20.12.040.G.1 be modified or eliminated.

Mr. Young recalled that the modulation issue came up in the context of developers having a difficult time insuring their buildings if they have to cut too many corners into the weatherproofing. He said that as he reads these two provisions, he feels there needs to be some tweaking done on one or the other.

Ms. Cassutt pointed out that one refers to weather protection such as awnings, etc. The other refers to permanent weather protection built into the building, itself. Mr. Crim suggested that the picture shown on the right on Page 15 is more of a permanent type of weather protection that perhaps should warrant more incentives than structures such as awnings that are attached after the buildings are constructed.

Mr. Guenther said it is confusing to deal with weather protection issues in two separate places in the Design Guidelines. He suggested it would be more appropriate to combine these provisions into the same section. The Board agreed that both types of weather protection should be dealt with in the same section, but clear definitions must be provided to distinguish between the two types of weather protection. They also agreed that the term “steel” should be changed to “metal” to include all of the various types of materials that could be used.

Mr. Bullock recalled that Mr. Greg’s comments regarding weather protection at the last meeting had nothing to do with awnings, etc. Rather they were more related to the modulation of walls and roofs and the difficulty this creates in weatherproofing a building. Mr. Chave recalled that the public comments were that these sections were too lenient.

In addition, Mr. Bullock advised that staff is recommending that the awning requirement table on Page 15 should be relocated to be under the general awning requirements. The Board concurred.

Section 20.12.010

Mr. Bullock advised that the objectives for height (Section A.1) were modified where they address views. He recalled that at the public hearing there were several concerns expressed regarding the issue of view protection. Staff suggests this section be modified to state “Preserve views to mountains and Puget Sound from public places.” The Board agreed with the modification as proposed by staff.

Mr. Bullock pointed out that in Section C.1.b.iii staff proposes that the word “enclosed” be replaced with “screen” as per the recommendation of the public at the public hearing for rooftop equipment.

Ms. Freeman said that in some cases, some sort of screening should be required on the top of the equipment, as well. In Edmonds the rooftops can be seen from properties above, as well as from the sides. Mr. Bullock said the word “screen would not preclude screening on top of the equipment, but it would not require it either. Ms. Freeman suggested that the section be changed to require that rooftop equipment be screened from view, and that would include the view from the top.

Mr. Bullock explained that if a developer proposes a structure that is 25 feet in height with a parapet wall around the roof that is 3 feet in height, the actual roof would be at 22 feet. If the equipment is less than 3 feet tall, the staff would consider it sufficiently screened by the parapet walls. The City would not typically require anything more than that. Ms. Freeman again stated that the City is built on a slope, and views downhill are very important.

Mr. Young said his understanding was that the City requires screening around equipment to block it from anyone’s view. Mr. Chave suggested that this type of requirement would be difficult for staff to administer because they would have to guess whether the equipment could be seen from any view. Mr. Guenther added that rooftop equipment needs air to circulate through and above. If the City requires screening on the top of the equipment, as well, they may end up limiting the number of floors a developer can build.

Mr. Young suggested that one of the intentions for allowing an additional three feet in height for structures is to provide space to enclose the rooftop equipment. If the rooftop equipment is screened on all sides so that it cannot be seen from the street, perhaps that should be sufficient.

Mr. Crim suggested that the words “screen from view” should be used in this section. If a question arises, the issue can be sent to the ADB for review, and they can render a judgment.

Mr. Bullock explained that when a building design is submitted for the design review process, the developer has usually not done the specs for the rooftop equipment that will be used. The building permit application is submitted before they have even designed this equipment. When the heat and ventilation contractor applies for a mechanical permit, he usually does not know how the architect plans to screen the equipment. This plan comes way down the road, and sometimes the applicant finds that the equipment is taller than what he had anticipated. If a screen is required on the top of the equipment, as well, this will add an additional six feet to the height of the structure. He said that in his experience, mechanical equipment usually ends up being at or near the top of the height limit. While the developers should design their buildings with this in mind, the reality is that this is typically not done early in the process. This additional requirement could impact a developer’s plans significantly.

Mr. Young said that while he participated on the ADB, they did not have a problem with developers who were required to screen rooftop equipment from the view of those above. He suggested that the City should require that rooftop equipment be screened from view and noise as applicable. This requirement has always been directed towards protecting the views from above, as well. The Board agreed that the rooftop equipment should be screened from above if it can be seen from properties up hill.

Mr. Bullock advised that staff also modified the illustration on Page 21 to clearly indicate a 30-foot tall building.

Section 20.12.020

Mr. Bullock referred to the modified massing requirements for medium-sized buildings on the table at the bottom of Page 21. Rather than requiring two building masses, one building mass could be allowed with no departures for wall modulation requirements. Another option would be to leave the table as is, but allow an exception for buildings in the BC zone. This would leave the limitation for wall modulation alone, allowing a wall modulation request to stand or fall on its own merits.

Mr. Bullock recalled that the massing requirements for medium buildings was a particular concern at the public hearing—especially in the downtown area where the majority of the buildable lots are only sufficient enough in size for medium or small buildings. The concern was that a developer would have to give a large amount of space away by having to make multiple building masses.

Mr. Chave said staff feels the simplest approach would be to provide an exception for buildings in the BC zones. Medium buildings would only have to have one building mass and large buildings would only have to have two. This would give a bit of a break in the downtown area. The Board agreed.

Mr. Bullock said that staff also recommends the elimination of Item 4 and the illustration that goes with it. The Board concurred.

Mr. Guenther referred to Item b.1, and inquired if the criteria refers to the total area of the building or the footprint. Mr. Bullock answered that it refers to the footprint of the building. The Board agreed to change this section by replacing “total area of the building” with “total footprint area of the building” to make the language more clear.

Mr. Guenther suggested that the items in Section B conflict with the items in Section C on Page 22. Mr. Chave explained that Section 3 describes general ways for telling what the options are for meeting the massing requirement. Section 4 further defines each of the options in more specific details. The Board agreed that the examples and descriptions should be made more clear. Perhaps the illustrations should be moved to Section C.

THE BOARD TOOK A TEN-MINUTE BREAK AT 9:00 P.M. THEY RECONVENED AT 9:10 P.M.

Ms. Noel referred to Section D.1 and requested that staff clarify whether or not the concern raised by Mr. Gregg at the public hearing has been addressed. Mr. Bullock said that Mr. Gregg expressed this as a concern at the public hearing because he could be allowed to eliminate massing by creating public open spaces, but it is not worth the loss of building space. Now that the requirement of two building masses has been eliminated in the BC zone, this should no longer be a significant issue.

Ms. Noel suggested that Section D.2 needs to be changed to address the concerns expressed at the public hearing regarding historical places. Mr. Bullock said this was addressed by staff in a different location, but needs to be corrected in this section, as well.

#### Section 20.12.030

Mr. Bullock noted that Section F.1 was modified to indicate that the noise from all mechanical equipment shall be shielded to comply with City standards. The Board agreed with the modification as proposed.

#### Section 20.12.040

Mr. Bullock advised that staff has modified Section G.1 to reference historic buildings by specifically referencing the Edmonds Register of Historic Places. Staff suggests that the Board consider the option of exempting a new building from the massing requirements, but still require wall modulation consistent with the design of the historic structure. This would allow a departure if there is a historical building so that the whole site can become an integrated consistent development.

#### Section 20.13.020

Mr. Bullock advised that staff has modified Section D.2 to state that windows on the ground floor commercial spaces shall cover at least 65 percent of the street-facing building wall area. He said this is consistent with other State building requirements. Mr. Guenther said that, in his experience, it is not difficult to get enough glass on the façade of the building. Mr. Chave said if the standard is high, but a departure is allowed, the expectations would be very clear, but flexibility would still be allowed for difficult situations. The Board agreed with the staff’s recommended change.

Ms. Noel referred to the table at the bottom of Page 27, which states that in mixed-use zones five types of windows are required for medium buildings and six for large buildings. She recalled that there was some concern expressed at the public hearing that this requirement may be too high. Mr. Bullock replied that in the BC zone there are not very many lots where a large-sized building could be constructed. Medium buildings only have to have five types of windows in mixed-use zones. Staff does not feel this requirement would be difficult to meet. Mr. Chave added that window types and variety are broadly defined. Therefore, it is not difficult for developers to meet this requirement.

The Board agreed that the staff should make the changes to the Design Guidelines as per the Board’s discussion and provide a new draft for their consideration on July 10.

Mr. Chave distributed a copy of a memorandum from Mr. Dewhirst, who was unable to attend the meeting, providing some ideas about conditions that could be included in the Board's recommendation to the Council. He said that because they are not sending the Design Guidelines to the Council at this time, the Board does not need to make this decision now. They could postpone their discussion to the next meeting. The Board concurred.

### **Design Review Process**

Mr. Chave reminded the Board that at their last meeting, they discarded any further discussions regarding the new proposed design review process. They decided, instead, to recommend to the City Council that the City continue to use the current process, with some modifications to make them work better with the proposed new Design Guidelines. He briefly reviewed the changes that were made by staff to the existing language.

Mr. Chave referred to the table in Section 20.10.010.B.1 and said that if the Board recommends that no significant changes be made to the design review process, they must decide how to address concerns about design review and make the changes that are appropriate to implement the Design Guidelines. The concept that has been discussed is that if the Design Guidelines are effective, small or minor projects could be approved administratively by staff without requiring an ADB review unless staff feels there is a significant issue that needs to be addressed by the ADB. Staff would review each of the small or minor projects using the Design Guidelines and make a decision with no notice required. This is similar to the way the ADB's consent agenda now works. There would be no advertisement requirement except for the advertised consent agenda.

Mr. Chave further explained that the table in this section would also require that all major projects go through the ADB design review process regardless. The ADB would also review all Design Guideline departure requests that are related to building form, façade, etc. The staff would consider the departure requests related to the site design standards, but they would provide notice to people living within 300 feet of the subject property.

Mr. Chave said the proposed changes would integrate the Design Guidelines into the existing design review process. Developers doing large projects already know how to follow the design review process, and there will be very little impact to the design review for large projects. However, the most significant impact will be on the smaller projects because these will no longer be required to go through the ADB review process. Instead, they will be approved administratively by the staff.

Mr. Chave said it is important that the Board make their point clear to the City Council and public that the proposed changes will improve the design review process. The City will retain the ability of the ADB to review and hold public hearings on the larger projects that have more impact to the surrounding properties and the community. The smaller projects that have much less impact would be streamlined.

Mr. Crim said that, given the comments made in the minutes of the last meeting, the proposed process appears to comply with the direction given to the staff by the Board. He pointed out that, if approved, it would not preclude the Board from changing the process later on. However, it would give the ADB an opportunity to work with the Design Guidelines before any significant changes to the process are made.

Mr. Chave said the way the codes are set up, it can be a real challenge to figure out exactly what the process for each proposal is. The proposed changes will make this much more clear. If an application exceeds the SEPA threshold, the applicant would be required to go through the ADB review process. If not, the project could be approved administratively if it meets the Design Guideline requirements.

The Board agreed that the proposed language is suitable to present to the public at a hearing on July 10. They noted that they still have the ability to send both documents to the Council at the same time. Mr. Chave noted that all appeals would go to the Hearing Examiner instead of to the City Council, as was discussed by the Board at the last meeting.

### **Sign Code**

Mr. Chave referred to Section 20.60 which relates to the sign code requirements. Staff has proposed some amendments to this section to make it clear that signs do not need to go through the ADB review process. He said a lot of applicants become frustrated trying to obtain permits for signs. The proposed design review process should make it much easier, and the intent is to combine the sign permit and the building permit into one permit if they are clearly both administrative functions.

Mr. Chave referred to Section 20.60.025.A.5, which limits the number of signs for commercial sites to three. Staff feels this change was unintentionally made when the sign code was reformatted. He said it is not realistic to limit the number of signs to three for commercial properties that have multiple tenants. Staff recommends that this section be modified to allow three signs, or one per tenant on commercial sites with multiple tenants. The Board agreed with staff's proposed change to this section.

Next, Mr. Chave referred to Section 20.60.030.B, which is a table that limits the height of attached signs in commercial zones to 14 feet. He explained that if buildings are over 14 feet in height, in order to place the sign higher on the façade, an applicant must obtain a variance. Because the signs on these higher buildings clearly belong above the doors on the main façade, staff suggests that in the BN, BC, CW and CG zones the maximum height of attached signs on commercial buildings be limited to 14 feet or the height of the façade of the building on which the sign is located. The Board agreed to staff's proposed change.

### **REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA**

The Board reviewed that a public hearing for the proposed Design Guidelines and the design review process amendments would be scheduled on July 10, at which time the Board could take action and forward a recommendation to the City Council. Mr. Chave added that an update regarding buildable lands, as well as a continued review of the Comprehensive Plan Map amendments are also scheduled on the July 10 agenda. The Board agreed that they might have to push the Comprehensive Plan Map amendment issue to the July 24 agenda.

### **PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS**

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

### **PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

There were no Planning 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.