

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

September 25, 2002

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

PRESENT

John Dewhirst, Chair
Jim Crim, Vice Chair
Wayne Zhan
Cary Guenther
James Young
Janice Freeman

ABSENT

Joanne Noel
Virginia Cassutt

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Darrell Smith, Traffic Engineer
Arvilla Ohlde, Parks and Recreation Director
Karin Noyes, Recorder

Ms. Cassutt and Ms. Noel were excused from the meeting.

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MR. YOUNG MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2002 AS CORRECTED. MR. CRIM SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

There were no changes made to the proposed agenda.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Diane Azar, 8202 Talbot, suggested that the Planning Board name plates be placed in front of each of the Board members so that the audience can identify who is speaking. The staff followed through with this request.

Roger Hertrich, 1020 Puget Drive, appealed to the Board to approach the City Council with a request for more funding for advertising. He pointed out that when the public hears about issues, they turn out in fairly good numbers. They are interested in the planning that goes on and they would like to contribute. However, they are not given this chance many times because of the lack of notice. He said he saw a legal notice of the meeting in the legal notice section of *THE HERALD*, but he did not find a notice in the regular area that they find City Council notices. He suggested that the postage stamp size of these advertisements is inadequate. He encouraged the Board to work on making the advertisements large enough to be readable and allow for some explanation on some of the more interesting issues.

Mr. Dewhirst suggested that Mr. Hertrich share his concern with the City Council as they do their budget review. Mr. Hertrich said he doesn't think the cost of the advertising would be that much greater.

Ray Martin, 18704 – 94th Avenue West, referred to the last meeting at which the PRD ordinance was discussed. He said it appears that some very heavy editing took place. He particularly referred to the comments from Mr. Crim, who he felt was a little bit rude and abrupt at the last meeting. However, he was man enough to call Mr. Sullivan the next day to apologize. He said he wished they had a little bit more of that from the Board. Secondly, Mr. Martin noted that Mr. Young requested a copy of the old PRD ordinance at the last meeting. Mr. Chave indicated that he did not even know if the City has this document anymore. However, the Mayor has indicated that this document is readily available. He inquired if Mr. Young has received a copy of this document. Mr. Chave answered no. He said that all of the Board members would be receiving a copy of this document when they review the code amendments for the PRD ordinance. Mr. Martin expressed his dismay that Mr. Young would have to wait until the staff decides to provide this document.

Tom Sullivan, 17041 Talbot Road, said that he and Mr. Crim exchanged telephone calls and personal communication and came to the conclusion that there was a gross misunderstanding between what each understood to be true. He apologized for the demonstration, as did Mr. Crim. He said he hopes that they can all get past it. The minutes show that his only intention is to use his first hand knowledge of dealing with PRD applications (one under the old ordinance and one under the new ordinance). He said he has no intention other than to try to help other citizens of the City to not have to go through the same thing he and his neighborhood did. He said he sincerely appreciates the efforts of the Board members and asks that the Board not rush forward so fast that they don't take into account the experiences of his and other groups. Public forums need to provide an opportunity for their concerns to be heard.

Mr. Chave explained that the minutes are not edited for content or anything else. They are an accurate reflection of the meeting. The minute taker is under contract with the City to provide the minutes on behalf of the Board. Staff does not prepare the minutes or edit the minutes.

PRESENTATION OF THE PUBLIC URBAN DESIGN/STREET TREE PLAN FINAL DRAFT

Ms. Ohlde recalled that over the past year the staff has been working with a consultant to prepare a public urban design and street tree plan. The purpose of tonight's meeting is to present the first final draft. The plan will be explained to the Board, followed by a dialogue between the Planning Board and staff. The intent is to eventually move the document on to a public hearing before the Board. She explained that this plan pertains to properties that are located within the public area. The design team included representatives from the Parks Department, Community Services Department, and Developmental Services Department (planning/engineering/building). She noted that in addition to mock up boards, a power point presentation was prepared for the report. The document can also be found on the City's web page in color format.

Ms. Ohlde said the team worked with the consultant, MacLeod Reckord, and Terry Reckord and Lauren Perry are present from that firm to aid in the presentation.

Ms. Ohlde advised that the Public Urban Design/Street Tree Plan would become an element of the adopted Comprehensive Plan. The actions are intended to occur in public spaces, and the document will be a companion piece complementary to the Design Guidelines that were recently forwarded to the City Council by the Board. It will also complement the Transportation Plan element of the Comprehensive Plan.

Ms. Ohlde said that the City has never taken a comprehensive look at what they want to do in the public areas to encourage aesthetics and beauty which reflect into economic benefit. This plan provided a chance for the City to identify past actions that have been complementary as well as other things that have been discussed but never put down on paper. This document will identify all of these issues.

Mr. Reckord pointed out that the Street Tree Plan and the Urban Design Study are two distinct and separate documents. The Street Tree Plan is straightforward and an update of the 1983 Street Tree Plan. It recommends specific species and their locations across the City, as well installation and management recommendations. The Urban Design Study is more complicated. He said their challenge was to develop an Urban Design document that was specific enough to be useful, but not so specific as to generate concern amongst specific property owners. The goal was to develop a set of design

recommendations that are applicable throughout the downtown area and that are agreed upon interdepartmentally to be used as a set of tools to implement over time. There were no project specific recommendations included in the document. They do recommend the application of some of the solutions, but the intent is that they be implemented over time as projects are done. The end result may be a set of specific design details that end up being included as specific documents within the various departments over time.

Mr. Reckord provided a power point presentation to identify some of the issues that have been raised over the course of the process, as well as a set of goals that the team reached consensus on. He said he assumes that the Board members have had an opportunity to review the document which was provided prior to the meeting. Therefore, he would not go through the two documents in significant detail.

Mr. Reckord said the first part of the process had to do with establishing the issues and recognizing the goals. They made some preliminary assumptions, one being that the City would benefit from enhancing the downtown. He explained that the City has a lot to build upon. They have a solid art program, a good downtown scale, and a proximity to the waterfront. The goal of building on the strengths is broadly shared. There were some concerns raised that the downtown assets are not always well connected in an integrated way for pedestrians and non-motorized systems. He said the circulation system currently in some areas emphasizes the needs of auto traffic at the expense of pedestrians. He said there is also a need for a series of appropriate design standards and details that everyone can agree upon that will strengthen the downtown and create a stronger sense of identity. Also, in looking at gateways and the circumstances around the perimeters, it was agreed that they need to strengthen and identify Edmonds' identity within the South Snohomish County community.

Mr. Reckord said they all agreed on a set of goals that were fairly general but provided a direction for the study. They include:

- Enhance of the street environment, which would enhance the economic viability of the downtown.
- Establish a stronger connection between the downtown community and waterfront.
- Identify and enhance gateways to establish the City's presence in the South Snohomish Community.

Mr. Reckord said the primary focus area of the report is what is known as the downtown bowl area (from the Waterfront to east of Eighth, and from Howell Street to Caspers). He said it is important to recognize the elements that influence some of the decisions for downtown such as recognizing view corridors, connections to the downtown, some of the major downtown destinations, etc. He advised that the issues have to do with the following six specific categories:

- Safety issues related to pedestrian safety, both real and perceived, in the downtown area.
- Security as it relates to safety.
- Comfort. The enhancement of the pedestrian experience downtown has a lot to do with comfort.
- Traffic and the relationship between automobile traffic and pedestrian traffic.
- Aesthetics and the character of downtown.

Mr. Reckord explained that safety and comfort have to do with the ability of the pedestrians to recognize their way around the downtown area such as signage, crossing traffic, recognition of pedestrian corridors, etc. He pointed out that there are places in the downtown where these issues need to be addressed. He said safety also has to do with enhancing the pedestrian environment to make it more safe and comfortable, both in a real and perceived way, and include things like more clarity in marking crosswalks and pedestrian routes. He said that comfort has to do with the comfort level of walking around downtown and the perception of safety and security. The recognition of need for enough room to move downtown comfortably in groups as well as individually is another issue related to comfort. Comfort has to do with being able to enjoy yourself downtown in a comfortable pedestrian environment where you feel secure. Both circulation and comfort also have to do with the relationship between pedestrian and automobiles downtown and the need to make distinctions between the two in public areas.

Mr. Reckord said the allocation of space in the downtown and the pedestrian environment is another issue that is addressed in the Plan. It is important to understand how much room is available in the public rights-of-way, given the fact that most of the rights-of-way are currently filled up with traffic lanes, parking lanes and pedestrian environments. Right now, there is

not a lot of room for expansion. He suggested that if the City can agree upon a desirable set of circumstances for the pedestrian traffic in the downtown, this situation may be changeable over time, as new projects are implemented and new streets are developed or existing streets are modified in the downtown. Mr. Reckord said that if a consensus could be reached for enhancing the pedestrian spaces and reducing the conflicts with other elements that continue to be added to the pedestrian environment, the situation would also improve. He said the selection and distribution of furniture downtown (trash receptacles, light poles, benches, etc.) should also be guided by a uniform set of design standards. Signage is also important to help people find their way around the downtown.

Mr. Reckord pointed out that Edmonds has a unique character that is all its own. It is known, already, as a pedestrian friendly downtown. The seasonal plantings, the art programs, and the street trees downtown all add to a particular character that is unique to Edmonds right now. However, they suggest that there are ways to capture those things that are positive and expand and build upon them over time. The proposed document makes a series of recommendations based on those issues. It includes a description of each of the recommendations, along with a summary of the issues they are trying to address with each recommendation. Design solutions are provided to address each of the issues, as well. He reviewed each of the recommendations as follows:

- **Traffic Improvements:** This has to do with the relationship between automobiles, service vehicles, trucks and pedestrians. He said there are some areas downtown where several driveways are located in sequence, and this disrupts the pedestrian movement. There are opportunities to reduce the noise and congestion by calming the traffic, rerouting the service traffic and reducing the number of driveways.
- **Connections:** This has to do with recognizing the connections that are of primary importance to pedestrians such as connecting down to the waterfront to capitalize on the downtown's relationship to the water and ferry dock. Dayton and Main should be recognized as primary pedestrian connections to the downtown waterfront by delineating a set of specific design solutions to make it easier for the pedestrian to make this connection.
- **Bikeways:** The City currently has a bikeway plan. However, the Urban Design Study suggests that there are ways to enhance and provide incentives for alternative forms of transportation in the downtown. One of the ways to reduce conflict and increase the pedestrian comfort is to reduce the volumes of traffic. This can be done by encouraging alternative modes of transportation. It is important to make it clear to the bicyclist where their opportunities are.
- **Corners:** The intent is to recognize the need to balance auto/truck turning requirements against pedestrian needs by reducing the turning radius at corners. This can enable the City to expand the pedestrian environment and provide more room for sign posts, etc. He noted that there are places in the downtown where there are sign posts and light standards that are exactly in the middle of pedestrian walkways.
- **Crosswalks:** This has to do with enhancing the visibility of crosswalks either through the use of alternative paving or colors within the crosswalks, themselves, to make them more visible to both motorists and pedestrians.
- **Medians:** While there is not a lot of room on the downtown streets to provide medians, it is good to have this opportunity available. Medians provide a refuge half the way across the street for pedestrians. It also provides an opportunity to modify the traffic movements to prevent cars from blocking crosswalks, etc.
- **Pavement Parking:** It is suggested that the crosswalks be marked more clearly to enhance the safety and security for pedestrians.
- **Signage:** It is important to provide clear and simple information systems for both automobiles and pedestrian to reduce the confusion in the downtown. Signs can inform, warn and regulate people. He said the plan identifies some specific opportunities for not only directional signs, but for informational signs, as well. The goal is to make the signing system downtown more pedestrian friendly. Right now, the signing system is aimed at the motorists.
- **Landscaping.** This has to do with taking advantage of the opportunities that the City has already been doing to a great extent, such as providing medians and curb extensions for plantings in a way that takes more advantage of the opportunities. He noted that some of the existing curb extensions for plant beds only extend out half the width of the parking stall that they are adjacent to. There is an opportunity to double that width to further enhance the pedestrian environment.
- **Seasonal Planting:** This is aimed at the existing hanging basket and seasonal planting programs that take place downtown, but are not codified in any document. If the document is adopted, it is suggested that this program be codified to ensure that it continues on.

- **Sidewalk Design:** This is perhaps the most broad umbrella category. There is a whole list of suggestions made in the document to enhance the street/pedestrian environment through thoughtful, consistent design.
 - Curb extensions should be expanded at appropriate intersections downtown to shorten the crossing distance, improve pedestrian visibility, calm traffic, provide more space for ramps, poles, furniture, signs, etc., and provide more pedestrian waiting spaces as suggested by the American Disabilities Act.
 - Mid-block driveways should be modified to improve pedestrian safety, increase available on-street parking and reduce traffic congestion.
 - Sidewalks should be modified by changing the paving materials and patterns to enhance circulation, identify entries and provide pedestrian scale.
 - Sidewalk widths should be expanded, where appropriate, within the right of way to allow comfortable circulation and room for street furniture, bus stops, etc.
 - A standard list should be created to identify manufactured furniture that can be applied in the downtown to provide continuity and character.
 - Development of a detailed palette of details and solutions to use throughout the downtown to establish cohesion and continuity such as: movable pots, public telephones, low walls offering seating and planting areas, consistent transit shelters, drinking fountains, news racks to reduce clutter, flower baskets, low walls to screen parking, and street clocks.
- **Gateways:** This has to do with clearly marking the City's edges and entries in a positive, recognizable way. It is important to identify and map the logical gateways (located typically at arterial intersections, but not necessarily at the actual City limits). It is also important to establish a palette of design elements for gateways that includes signs, banners, landscaping, etc. The plan suggests the following gateways: Five Corners, Westgate or SR-104 at Highway 99, Perrinville and Highway 99 intersections.
- **Distribution:** The street tree map that is found in this section assigns use zones or functional categories to the various downtown streets based on field observation of existing conditions and probable near term development. The categories are not based on current zoning and have been developed to provide a more practical criteria for the location and distribution of recommended improvements. The eight categories identified include major retail, minor retail, pedestrian mixed use, auto oriented retail/commercial, residential, civic, park/open space, and institutional/other.

Lauren Perry referred the Board to the Street Tree Plan, which is a companion piece to the Urban Design Study. It goes into more specific detail about street trees and defines a list of street trees to be used all over the City. Street trees have been selected from the list and mapped out or described in the plan for the downtown area, the gateways and Highway 99. She explained that within the City of Edmonds rights-of-way, the location of street trees should make the following contributions and meet the following criteria:

- Clarify the edges of the City.
- Enhance City gateways at key intersections and retail/commercial centers.
- Distinguish key routes of travel through Edmonds.
- Define separate street identities within the downtown retail core.
- Frame views of Puget Sound and the mountains from key viewpoints and rights-of-way.
- Maintain vehicular sight distance at intersections.
- Reinforce the sense of safety for pedestrians.
- Plant trees with handicapped accessible tree grates flush with adjacent pavement in retail/commercial areas to maximize width of "walking zone" on sidewalks.
- Allow walking and window shopping to occur next to retail/commercial frontage and allow space for weather protection of sidewalk walk zone.
- Avoid overhead power lines.
- Avoid blocking visibility of business signage, marquees and window displays

Ms. Perry said the street trees were selected based on the following criteria:

- They should be resistant to pests and disease

- Hardy to local weather conditions
- Produces minimal litter
- Non-invasive roots
- Resistant to breakage
- Thornless
- Fruitless
- Resistant to drought and heat
- Does not sucker
- Tolerates air pollution
- Readily available in adequate installation size and branching height
- Provides seasonal interest, such as flowers and fall color
- Upward branching habit
- Appropriate mature size and form for their location.

Ms. Perry advised that the report categorizes the trees into small, medium or large spreading or narrow trees. Most of the trees in the downtown are of the medium variety. Small variety tend to not be available in a large enough sizes or have high enough branching to make them compatible with the downtown area. The larger trees are generally located along the larger boulevards within the City. Also included in the Plan is a list of trees that can be approved with reservations because of different problems that they can cause such as lifting of the sidewalk or they are susceptible to some kind of disease. There is also a list of trees that are prohibited for various reasons.

Ms. Perry referred to a map of the downtown area and noted that the report describes the types of trees that are recommended for the downtown, as well as for the gateways and Highway 99. The pink dots indicate intersections that have been set aside for special treatment to be decided by the City and by special design. She said the plan is to be implemented over time, so large trees along a particular street, which happen to not be appropriate for some reason, would be phased out over time as the blocks are developed.

Ms. Perry advised that the Plan also describes some maintenance and installation criteria, including root barriers to be installed around the trees to help direct the roots downward. Also, if trees are drained underneath the tree pits along the street, it helps to encourage the roots downward. The tree grates help provide air and water to the roots for the tree's health, as well as allowing handicapped access over the top. They recommend an automatic irrigation for the trees, if possible. They also recommend isolation from utilities such as gas, which can be poisonous to trees. Installation should be done with a slow-release fertilizer. In addition, setback criteria has been identify such as distance from the curb, intersections and driveways. They also suggest that the City require a permit for pruning of trees.

Mr. Reckord summarized that the Street Tree Plan and the Urban Design Study are two separate reports. The Street Tree Plan is fairly site specific and the Urban Design Study provides a series of recommendations that over time, if adopted, becomes housed in several different places. Because numerous City departments have to deal with these issues in the downtown, he would envision that the recommendations would eventually evolve into a series of design standards for the various departments to use. He noted that the representatives from the various departments have generally agreed upon the goals, assumptions and issues. Now this document can become a set of tools that, if adopted and codified into a final form, would provide a great deal of consistency over a long period of time. This will strengthen the existing character of Edmonds.

Ms. Freeman referred to the list of criteria that was used for species selection, and suggested that an additional criteria be added "that the trees do not release any sappy substance that could be difficult to remove from the paint and windshields of cars." Mr. Reckord agreed that this an important point that should be included in the list of criteria. However, he cautioned that this is not easy to do because some of the "sticky" stuff has to do with bugs that inhabit particular kinds of trees.

Mr. Zhan inquired regarding the cost of implementing the recommended actions. Mr. Reckord said that when the recommended actions were circulated amongst the staff, this question was raised frequently. However, the study has not reached the point of identifying the costs. He said he would assume that, to a large degree, many of the recommended

actions are being done now. They are merely suggesting that they all be done in a similar way, cohesively throughout the downtown. He emphasized that the plan does not suggest that the City immediately apply all of the recommended actions throughout the downtown now. These are things to be done as projects are developed. He agreed that many of the recommended actions do have additional costs associated with them, but these costs have not been identified at this point.

Mr. Young inquired if there is any plan for the costs to be identified in the near future. Mr. Reckord answered that this would not be done within the scope of their work. The intent of this project is to establish a consensus on the good ideas. As they begin to become design standards, the costs will be identified. He agreed that it is easy to identify the good ideas, but costs must also be part of that consideration. Cost should be addressed when the City deliberates whether or not to adopt the Plan as a codified document.

Mr. Young suggested that the incremental costs of implementing the recommended actions are probably not all that great. He said he is not as much concerned about the implementation costs. But if the Board makes the recommendation that the Urban Design Study be implemented as part of the Comprehensive Plan, they need to have some sort of plan for implementation. He inquired if some portions of the implementation would become part of a particular department's budget each year. He said that is what he would prefer because this would make the adoption of the document more meaningful. He said he agrees with all of the recommendations identified in the two documents. But the implementation piece is missing. Mr. Reckord said that the City is already spending money to implement some of the recommendations such as the seasonal planting program. However, the seasonal planting program is not codified in any City document. If the Urban Design Document were adopted, then this would become an ongoing program of the City. He said that he would also expect the implementation of some of the actions to be distributed amongst various City departments.

Mr. Dewhirst agreed with Mr. Young. The ideas and concepts that are presented in the Urban Design Study need to be put into some sort of strategy to identify how they will be implemented. A lot of topics are covered in the document, but there is no information as to how the projects will be parceled out and done. He felt that if this is not identified in the document, as well, some of the ideas and concepts would be lost. Mr. Reckord pointed out that they have only a finite amount of resources available to develop the document. He agreed that the obvious next step is to get more specific about how to implement the plan. However, this was not part of the scope of their project.

Mr. Young pointed out that if this is to become a reference document to the Comprehensive Plan, then there is an obligation to budget for it somehow. Perhaps this could be part of each department's budget. The document would have more substance other than just verifying what the City likes. It is also important for the Board to stress in their recommendation to the City Council that some of the recommendations are being done by the City already. Perhaps Ms. Ohlde could identify where the funding currently comes from.

Ms. Ohlde said she would meet with the group of representatives to discuss this issue. She agreed that some of the recommendations are identified in the budget, and some are already in progress. For example, she advised there is a special fund account called the street tree fund account, and through that, the City already has a memorial street tree program. Some of the recommendations could be implemented through a similar type of gifting or memorial program for amenities outside of the traditional project improvements.

Mr. Dewhirst said the Board is not necessarily seeking a total implementation program, but rather a strategy for implementation. He felt that the City Council would also want to see a strategy for implementation. It is important to identify the programs that are already in place to implement portions of the plan. However, they need to also identify how the other aspects of the plan would be implemented. For instance, would the City or the private property owners be responsible for implementation? While they don't need to assign costs, they should provide an outline for implementation.

Mr. Crim said that a lot of good thinking has been incorporated into what has been done. Probably some of the implementation discussions have already taken place. If they could capture that thinking, to whatever extent it has already happened, and include it as part of these plans, it would be very helpful.

Mr. Dewhirst noted that the Board would be reviewing the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan later on the agenda. The Transportation Element identifies the design standards for streets, but it does not mention anything about

medians. In addition, the drawings only show one street with street trees. They need to determine how to integrate the ideas and concepts in the Urban Design Study into the design standards for the streets. There needs to be some type of strategy identified to cross pollinate the ideas in the Urban Design Study into other City programs and plans.

Mr. Young noted that the presentation made by the consultant referred to the downtown area. He pointed out that there are more business centers that contribute to the tax base in the community than just the bowl area. While he knows these areas are addressed in the plan, they are not addressed in the detail provided for the downtown area. He suggested that it is time to reach out to the other areas outside of the bowl area, which represents only a small percentage of the total commercial property within the City limits. While it may be the heart and sole of the ambiance of the community, it is not the only area that is important. He said he was pleased to see that a portion of the document addresses Highway 99 because that is where the majority of the tax dollars come from. He said he would like to use the ideas in the plan as an outreach tool for Highway 99 and the other commercial areas that make a contribution to the City. They deserve this, and the City needs these businesses. Mr. Reckord agreed and suggested that perhaps they could add a clear suggestion that some of the concepts identified in the document are applicable in other places besides the downtown bowl. In the interest of time and resources, they had to pick an area to focus on, and the downtown area appeared to be the logical place to start. But, he emphasized that very few of the ideas are specific to just the downtown bowl. They are good ideas that would work in many different circumstances in the commercial areas. He suggested that there is an opportunity to put a statement in the document to the effect in there are no geographical restrictions on the application of the good ideas.

Regarding the issue of implementation strategies, Mr. Reckord suggested that at some point, it is incumbent on the Council to identify the recommendations as good ideas and charge the various City departments to implement the programs. The City Council could also decide which concepts are applicable to areas other than just the downtown bowl.

Mr. Dewhirst said he agrees with Mr. Young, that the document should be applicable to the other commercial areas in the City, as well. He particularly referred to the Westgate area, where they are about to get a major development. He suggested that this might set off some competition on the other corners to upgrade. If some general guidelines are identified for these other areas, it would help to guide the improvements. He said he does not feel it would take a significant amount of work to differentiate those guideline that would be applicable to the other commercial areas. Mr. Reckord agreed and noted that in the specific gateways, they listed the elements that would apply. This could be expanded to other commercial areas.

Mr. Dewhirst said he has trouble with the concept of calling areas that are located in the middle of the City gateways. While these areas are certainly distinct, they are not really the gateways to Edmonds. A gateway may not be the true political boundary areas, but calling a location along Ninth Avenue a gateway to Edmonds, is sort of like saying that the other half of the City is not part of Edmonds. Mr. Reckord said that Westgate was chosen as a gateway because of the access to the City from SR-104. This seems to be the place where a person would truly feel like they were entering the City. But he agreed that they might be doing a disservice to the property owners located between the true political boundary of the City and the areas identified as gateways. Mr. Dewhirst suggested that using the terminology of "gateways" to identify areas that are located halfway into the City is misleading. Mr. Reckord said the intent is to identify to motorists, in some subtle way, that they are in Edmonds. This can be done at the political boundary as well as in obvious places such as Westgate.

Mr. Dewhirst pointed out that on several of the photographs and drawings, sandwich board signs are shown. These are illegal in the City. Mr. Reckord said that in the intent of the sandwich board shots is to illustrate the width of the sidewalk and the available space for pedestrians and traffic in the downtown area. They are trying to suggest that either the sidewalk is too narrow or there are too many impediments in the walkway for pedestrians. They were not suggesting sandwich board signs are desirable in the City. Mr. Dewhirst suggested that there be some additional labeling to make this clear. Mr. Chave pointed out that the current code allows sandwich board signs as temporary signs in the downtown area only.

Mr. Guenther said he sees the two documents as design guidelines for the City and there needs to be some way of making them a companion set to the other Design Guidelines document. The documents should not end up conflicting with each other. Mr. Reckord said the intent is that the Urban Design Study would be complementary to the Design Guidelines so that a planner reviewing a permit application could look at both to determine what is appropriate in the private and public realm. The Urban Design Study relates to public properties, and the Design Guidelines relate to private properties.

Ms. Ohlde said that Ms. Azar had asked her to reiterate, again, that this was a study done with her colleagues as groups from the various departments. But they worked with the consultant, MacLeod Reckord, who made the presentation.

Mr. Dewhirst noted that this issue is scheduled for a public hearing before the Planning Board on October 23. Mr. Chave noted that this was a tentative date, and it is up to Ms. Ohlde to confirm. Ms. Ohlde indicated that the issue would be ready for the public hearing on October 23. Mr. Dewhirst explained that after the public hearing, the Planning Board would make a recommendation to the City Council.

THE BOARD TOOK A SHORT BREAK AT THIS POINT.

CONTINUED REVIEW OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS FOR 2002 – REVIEW OF TRANSPORTATION PLAN

Darrell Smith, City Traffic Engineer, explained that the purpose of the agenda item is to hold a Planning Board work session on the draft transportation element. He said it is the staff's intent to step through each chapter of the Transportation element systematically and point out some important issues and content. At the end of each chapter, staff will answer questions that the Planning Board has. He clarified that this is not necessarily intended to be a presentation showing an overview of the Transportation Plan, since this was done two weeks ago. Tonight's discussion will be a hands-on review of the document, itself.

Mr. Smith explained that staff intends to bring the Transportation Element before the Planning Board on October 9 for a public hearing. Shortly thereafter, they will release a draft format of the transportation element for SEPA review. They will make sure the public is made aware of the document and their opportunity to comment. In addition, they have created a graphic map to show where the proposed improvements would likely occur within in the next 20 years. This will be published in the newspaper, as well. While some of the improvements may change, they have noticed in the past that maps seem to attract more members of the public than textual documents. When the SEPA review is complete, there will likely be another public hearing before the Planning Board, who will make a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council will also hold a public hearing.

The Board agreed to review each of the Sections in the draft Transportation Plan one-by-one and provide comments related to each.

Goals, Objectives and Policies

Ron Loewen advised that the first chapter identifies the goals and objectives. They have taken the previous goals and objectives and made modifications as they felt conditions were appropriate. They worked with the citizens advisory committee and the technical advisory committee to gather additional elements. He noted that changes have been scattered throughout the text.

Mr. Zhan noted that when discussing the goals and objectives at the last meeting, he inquired regarding specific mention of street safety. He said he was trying to find this information in the draft document, but was unable to locate any specific sites. He said he feels that street safety is an important issue to be addressed. Mr. Loewen said they specifically looked at items that are related to safety issues and these were identified as high priority goals. Mr. Zhan asked that Mr. Loewen specifically point out these references as he reviews the document with the Board.

Mr. Dewhirst suggested that rather than reviewing each of the goals and objectives separately, the Board members should reference those that create a specific concern for them.

Mr. Young said the goals, objectives and policies are equally applicable to the City's Comprehensive Plan and the work done by the two citizens committees. The document provides a very thorough discussion of goals, objectives and policies. While he doesn't have any major concerns related to Chapter 1, he suggested that it would help the Board's discussion if the

APPROVED

document were distilled down into the key goals and objectives. Hopefully, these are coming from the Comprehensive Plan. The capital budgeting is supposed to be done consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. But it is difficult to wade through the document to find out where the Comprehensive Plan goals and objectives are versus the goals and objectives identified by the Citizens Advisory Committee. Topics such as the existing infrastructure, safety, mobility enhancements, etc. are topics that are addressed directly in the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Loewen said the elements could become part of the Comprehensive Plan. The goal is to establish the findings in this document to guide the capital improvement program. To be clear on the financial aspect of Mr. Young's question, Mr. Loewen said that while this document looks like it can stand on its own, it will become part of the Comprehensive Plan and does guide the capital improvement selection process and funding.

Mr. Young inquired how the document before them would be turned into a budget. Mr. Loewen referred to the last section in the Goals and Objectives Chapter. He specifically pointed out that Objective 6 on Page XXIX identifies the financial objectives the City will be trying to reach. These objectives, as well as things throughout the plan that have to do with meeting concurrency requirements, will be put back together again to identify concurrency, needs and available revenue.

Mr. Dewhirst pointed out that the goals and objectives are identified up front, and then there is quite a lot of information about the inventory, definitions and recommendations for proposed projects. He suggested that the goals and objectives appear to be isolated from the rest of the implementation. Perhaps they should restructure the document by putting the survey and informational data base first in the goals, and then add the various recommendations. The goals and policies should dictate the recommendations and identify why the various projects are being recommended. But there is a lot of stuff in between the two sections.

Mr. Dewhirst said most of his concerns are related to pedestrian issues. He referred to Objective 1 on Page XVII related to sidewalks. Policy 1.1 states that the City should construct pedestrian facilities on all major streets. He questioned why just major streets. If one of the goals is to make Edmonds a walkable community, they should provide pedestrian facilities on all streets, eventually. Mr. Loewen agreed that the goal is to provide pedestrian facilities on nearly all streets. He said he would take a much closer look at the section. He noted that they identified a list of about \$7 to \$8 million worth of sidewalks that need to occur on streets that have already been developed without sidewalks. They identified about \$2 million in sidewalk improvements that could be considered very high need. In fact, he said that of the \$8 million list, there was not really an unnecessary sidewalk project identified. They all had connectivity issues, and most of them lead to parks or other highly used facilities. He said it is important to make sure that whenever there is an opportunity for new development in the City, the developers are responsible to put in sidewalks. The policies state very clearly what developers are required to do.

Mr. Dewhirst agreed that this is an issue of priority versus the resources that are available. But, from a general policy standpoint, the language in the proposed document is contrary to what Mr. Moen just stated. If the goal is to get developers to pay for improvements in front of their developments that are not located on major streets, the proposed language could pose a problem. Mr. Loewen said that while the Plan does not state that every street within the City should have a sidewalk provided by the City, it does state that the City will provide sidewalks on all major roadways and make sure developers provide sidewalks along the street frontages of new development. In addition, the walkway plan identifies the areas where the City believes walkways are essential. Mr. Dewhirst suggested that this approach is not clear in the proposed language. Mr. Loewen suggested that the Board could recommend that Section 1.1 be reworded to state that the City's responsibility and intent is to make sure that walkways are constructed on all major roadways. They could also add that the City should encourage LID's and other forms of community and neighborhood sidewalks on the remainder of those roadways.

Background and Inventory

Mr. Loewen advised that the City staff spent a lot of time completing the inventories, and they feel they are quite inclusive. The only inventory that is not completed to date is the crosswalk inventory, which will tie into the walkway inventory. He specifically referred the Board to Page 10, and noted that Table 3 identifies the existing land uses, as well as the estimations for the years 2008 and 2022. He said it is important to note the growth numbers in terms of actual units. Mr. Smith said that, from his perspective, these numbers should be conservative. It is important that the City not underestimate the growth.

Mr. Dewhirst said he is curious as to why they have gone against the state standards using 4-foot bike lanes instead of 5-foot bike lanes. Mr. Smith answered that existing road crossing standards illustrate what the City has in place now, without any changes. Four-feet is not wide enough to be painted as a bike lane. The standard should be 5-feet, and that will eventually become a recommendation in the Plan. All the new roadway projects include a 5-foot bike lane. He noted that the modifications to this standard have not been shown in the Plan, but they want to be consistent as much as possible with the urban design standards.

Systems Analysis

Mr. Loewen referred the Board to the Project Prioritization Matrix on Page 90. This matrix lists and prioritizes all of the projects that were considered as potential roadway improvement projects.

Recommendations

Mr. Loewen said that this chapter contains the specific recommendations. He referred to Figure 15 on Page 93 where classification recommendations were made. He noted that they are not recommending that the City adopt all of the Federal functional classifications that exist. They recommend that the City retain most of the functional classifications that currently exist, with a few changes. He suggested that the Board take a few minutes to specifically review the adjustments that are being proposed.

Mr. Dewhirst inquired if there is a penalty if the City doesn't follow the Federal Classification. Mr. Loewen said there is no penalty that he knows of. However, federal funds can only be spent on federal routes. So the City would only be able to use Federal money for improvements on roads that are Federally classified. Mr. Smith said that grant funding can only be spent on federally classified roadways, too. So there are some advantages to making some consistencies, and that is what they have tried to do where appropriate. He noted that, at this time, there are a few streets that are not federally classified. Right now, the City cannot do sidewalk projects on these street without federal funds.

Mr. Dewhirst inquired if the City would be able to place a road into the Federal classification. Mr. Loewen said the City would have an opportunity to get some of their roads in the Federal system. They tend to look at the overall system, county and region wide. If the City decides to increase the number of miles of collector roadways, they will want to keep their system in balance by reclassifying other roadways.

Mr. Loewen said that the plan identifies proposed improvements that would provide the most overall benefit to the City. These are shown in Figure 20 on Page 99. They include signals for 9th Avenue, a signal on 220th and 84th Streets, roadway improvements on 220th and 84th Streets, improvement to 238th Street between 84th Street and SR-104, an intersection widening at 196th and 76th Streets, and an intersection widening at 76th and 212th Streets. They are also proposing improvements to 75th Street. Because the State has a proposed project and 20-year plan that includes widening the roadway overpass over SR-104, the proposed Plan includes a widening from the overpass down to 244th Street to match the State improvements. Lastly, Olympic View Drive and 76th Street will have roundabouts.

Mr. Loewen referred the Board to Table 32 on Page 129, which lists each of the proposed projects and identifies a cost for each. He noted that the first seven projects are ongoing City Projects, and the amount of money identified is to spread over a 20-year period. He noted that the amount identified for the Citywide Walkway and Bikeway Program has been boosted to \$2 million for the 20-year period, which is \$100,000 per year.

Mr. Loewen referred to Table 33 on Page 132, which illustrates the projected revenues. He noted that the Utility Resurfacing Revenue and the Development Sidewalk Contribution Revenue have both been decreased based on more current actual contributions. The bottom line is short by \$6 million based on the projects identified on Table 32. The plan suggests that the City consider a mitigation fee, which is shown as the last item on the table. These fees could be established through the valuation based on the benefit the development would receive from a project. After taking a look at the number of

APPROVED

residential units that the City expects to gain and the number of peak hour trips, they have can come up with a mitigation fee of approximately \$900 per P.M. peak hour trip for newly developed units to accommodate the \$6 million revenue need.

Mr. Dewhirst clarified that, at this time, the \$6 million estimate is conceptual. The City would have to go through a rigorous technical process followed by a hearing process before the Council could adopt an ordinance to impose the fees. Mr. Loewen agreed, and said that the Transportation Plan would be used as the basis for this process. He said an alternative would be to delete the projects that are not required for concurrency. Another option would be to look at alternative ways to solve problems in some situations.

Mr. Dewhirst noted from the information that was provided at the last meeting, it appears that staff is thinking Snohomish County might participate up to \$4.6 million on 84th Avenue. He said he did some research over the past week, and he cautioned that the City probably shouldn't count on this money either. Mr. Smith agreed. He said the project on 84th Avenue would probably not occur for at least six to seven years. They have aggressively started talking with representatives from Snohomish County. It might be feasible to do only the section from 212th to 220th Streets up to the County line. He pointed out that there are significant safety concerns along that route that need to be addressed. Mr. Young pointed out that if Initiative 776 passes, there would be a huge hole in the budget projection. Mr. Smith agreed, and said that staff is prepared to address this issue as well as issues relate to Referendum 51 and the Regional Improvement Transportation District referendum. He agreed that the City is tight on money right now, and any initiative that takes away money makes the situation even more difficult.

Mr. Loewen said that the plan also identifies about \$1 million from the City of Lynnwood for the improvements at the intersection of 76th Avenue and 196th Street. The City's portion of that project is about \$400,000. He also noted that the strip of Highway 99 between the overpass and the south City limits may be paid for as part of the Highway 99 project, and may not have to be paid for by the City.

Mr. Smith noted that there are a few projects that are pushing into the regional improvement district. One is to get the lion share of the Edmonds Crossing project paid for through that funding opportunity. They are asking for almost \$150 million for the project. They are also asking for support on the 84th Avenue improvement project and the 238th Street improvement project.

Mr. Dewhirst said he has a concern about concurrency on Highway 99, but because it is so late, he would wait to bring the issue up during the hearing process. Mr. Loewen pointed out that he reviewed the concurrency issues on Highway 99 with the Department of Transportation, and they indicated they were comfortable with the proposed wording in the document. Mr. Dewhirst said his concern is that a good portion of the traffic on Highway 99 is pass through traffic. If they get into concurrency, it could become a two-edged sword because the State is not currently a player in concurrency. If the City of Edmonds were to land a major developer to put in some needed development for tax revenue on Highway 99, they could, in theory, be cutting their own throats. There is a balancing act that must be considered. He said he would like to make sure the proposed document does not strangle the City's efforts. Mr. Loewen said they have tried to stay away from adopting a Level of Service D on Highway 99 because this would create problems in the future. Right now, the road is identified as a Level of Service D Mitigated in any SEPA document that is produced for new development along Highway 99. The City agreed to this.

Mr. Dewhirst inquired if any of the Board members would like to have more information or questions answered before they start the public hearing at the next meeting. He pointed out that there are a lot of interesting issues contained in the report. Since none of the Board members offered further questions, Mr. Dewhirst advised that the issue would come before the Board again on October 9 as a public hearing.

Mr. Loewen said he would try to come back with a response to the safety questions that have been raised. Mr. Young suggested that the document should be broken down into macrolevels of what the proposal does. Mr. Smith said this would be much similar to what they did for the original presentation. Mr. Young suggested that the significant issues that the public will want to have addressed relate to: safety, preservation of the existing system, mobility enhancements, concurrency requirements, and pedestrian and bicycle facilities. He suggested that if they could identify where the City is going in each of these categories, it would help the public to understand the issues.

APPROVED

Mr. Dewhirst said the bottom line for him is whether or not the City can afford what it is proposing to do. He suggested that this be demonstrated in relatively simple terms at the public hearing to help the public understand the document better. Mr. Young suggested that reference be made to the license fee referendum that is up for election in November. It is important for the public to understand where this tax money would be spent.

WORK SESSION ON ISSUES RELATED TO PRD'S REFERRED TO THE BOARD BY THE CITY COUNCIL

Mr. Chave reminded the Board and public that this is a work session for the Board and no public testimony would be accepted. He advised that the Planning Board's purpose is to provide an interim report to the City Council on the Board's activities related to the PRD ordinance over the past month and a half. He recalled that the issue was referred to the Board by the City Council, and the Board is anticipating that the Council will direct them to proceed to draft code amendments and hold public hearings on potential code amendments to the PRD ordinance. However, this procedure would occur after the interim step of reporting back to the Council.

Before the Board for consideration is a draft of the Planning Board's report to the Council. The purpose of this meeting is to allow the Board to review the document and make the appropriate changes so that the report can be forwarded to the Council. He said that attached to the draft report are the minutes from the Board's last PRD discussion as well as letters that were sent to the City Council when they were considering the PRD approval process. He advised that when creating the draft report, staff attempted to incorporate the issues the Board discussed at the last meeting.

Mr. Dewhirst inquired when the Board's report would be scheduled on the City Council's agenda. Mr. Chave answered that he does not have that schedule. Staff would forward the Board's report to the City Council as soon as it is approved by the Board. The Council would then schedule the issue on their agenda. At this point, the Council has not scheduled a tentative date to review the report.

Mr. Dewhirst said he felt the staff provided a fairly comprehensive draft report of the Board's discussion from the last meeting. Mr. Crim agreed. However, one issue the Board discussed that was not included is related to the issue of the point at which a PRD becomes a spot rezone and what conditions need to be in the ordinance in order for PRD's to be classified as rezones or not. Mr. Chave said there is no real definitive information related to this. The City Attorney has been considering the various issues related to PRD's and he had a discussion with Mr. Dewhirst about the possibility of coming before the Board at one of the meetings to discuss the various options in detail, after the Planning Board starts looking at details and code language. He suggested that this level of detail is not really necessary for the interim report.

Mr. Chave said the City Attorney verified that the general idea of mandatory dedication of open space to public use as a condition of the permanent approval is an unconstitutional taking of property, and this is based on a decision made by the U.S. Supreme Court. He pointed out that there are circumstances related to SEPA that allows the City to mitigate environmental impacts and use incentives to gain public open space. But it is very clear that the City cannot do it as an exaction.

Mr. Chave advised that the City Attorney has recommended that, along with the report to the Council, the Board should provide some additional information. Mr. Dewhirst said the City Attorney would be writing an additional report for the City Council. He is very concerned that citizens are redirecting their energies in the wrong way given the GMA requirements that the City must operate under. He said he is also very concerned that the City Council is going off in some directions that could cost the City a lot of money in court settlements. He is very concerned about how the City could direct the citizen energies into areas that would be productive. He will be providing a background paper to the City Council in an attempt to address these issues. The Board will also receive a copy of his report. Mr. Chave recalled that a comment was made during a recent PRD discussion that the reason a citizen moved to Edmonds was to get away from the urban development that had been occurring. Unfortunately, Edmonds is in an urban area, as well. The City Attorney is concerned about people who want to try and preserve a rural character because that is the way development has occurred over time. If the zoning indicates that smaller lots are appropriate, then subdivision proposals that meet the requirements should be approved. A

APPROVED

PRD provides a potential method of helping this type of development fit into the neighborhood, whereas a traditional subdivision would not.

MR. CRIM MOVED THAT THE REPORT BE FORWARDED TO THE CITY COUNCIL AS WRITTEN.

Mr. Zhan referred to Recommendations 3a (preservation of critical areas or habitat as open space) and 3d (reduce impervious surfaces) and inquired if these two requirements are unique to PRD's or if they are applicable to other types of subdivision development. If they are not unique to PRD's they need to make this clear. If they are stating that these two are benefits of a PRD, they should not generally apply to other types of development. Mr. Chave clarified that the intent was that all of the things on the list could be considered benefits of a PRD, but they are not necessarily solely related to PRD's. The idea is that a PRD is a better way to obtain some of the things on the list. Mr. Zhan said the way the report is written, the intent is not clear.

Mr. Zhan referred to Recommendation 3f (reduce the cost of development through economies of efficient use of land, delivery of utilities and streets), and requested further clarification. Mr. Chave said the notion is that as the cost of development is reduced, the cost of housing would also be reduced.

MR. ZHAN SECONDED THE MOTION. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Chave explained that the Board would be asking for a reaction from the City Council and some direction regarding the process of amending the ordinance. In the meantime, the Board will have hearings on the Comprehensive Plan amendments scheduled throughout October. Therefore, the issue will probably not be back before the Board until at least November. Those citizens who are on the mailing list would receive notification of when the issue will be back on the Board's agenda.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Mr. Chave advised that the first public hearing on the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan is scheduled on the October 9 agenda, along with a work session on buildable lands and the consideration of reasonable measures and a review of Comprehensive Plan updates. The October 23 agenda includes two public hearings on requests for Comprehensive Plan Map amendments and rezones and a public hearing on the public urban design plan. Mr. Chave added that it might be necessary to hold another transportation plan hearing, depending on what takes place on October 9.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Mr. Dewhirst provided no comments during this part of the agenda.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Ms. Freeman referred to the report that the City Attorney intends to provide to the City Council describing the legal ramifications of the Growth Management Act as they relate to PRD's. She noted that they have some very well intentioned citizens groups, also. It would be useful if this document could be provided to these individuals, as well. Mr. Chave agreed. Mr. Dewhirst said the intent of the City Attorney's report would be to explain that going after individual applications, as such, is very difficult because of the way that the Growth Management Act has been structured. It would probably be more beneficial for these groups to figure out what they want preserved in the neighborhoods and get this put into the ordinance. This means the Board's review of the PRD process may be longer than originally imagined. He said the City Attorney would attempt to encourage the City Council to allocate some money for public workshops or charettes on this particular issue.

APPROVED

Mr. Dewhirst inquired if any of the Commissioners have materials from the APA Planning Commissioner Workshop that would be beneficial to provide to the Board members that could not attend. If so, they should provide this information to the staff so that it can be included in the Board's next packet.

The Board briefly discussed the APA workshop and some of the things that they learned. Mr. Young particularly noted that the Board has a responsibility to distill some of the technical information they receive from the staff down to something the public can understand. The Board members agreed that the workshop was very informative and helpful.

THERE BEING NO FURTHER BUSINESS TO COME BEFORE THE BOARD, THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 10:15 P.M.

APPROVED