

PLANNING BOARD MINUTES April 14, 2004

Chair Young 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.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

James Young, Chair
Janice Freeman, Vice Chair
Virginia Cassutt
Jim Crim
John Dewhirst
Cary Guenther (arrived at 7:10 p.m.)
Judith Works
Don Henderson

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Brian McIntosh, Acting Director, Parks, Recreation & Cultural Services Dept.
Meg Gruwell, Senior Planner
Karin Noyes, Recorder

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER FREEMAN MOVED TO APPROVE THE MINUTES OF MARCH 24, 2004 AS CORRECTED. BOARD MEMBER CRIM SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

There were no changes made to the proposed agenda.

REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE

There was no one in the audience who expressed a desire to address the Board during this portion of the meeting.

PARKS, RECREATION AND CULTURAL SERVICES DEPARTMENT QUARTERLY REPORT

Brian McIntosh, Acting Parks Director, provided a brief update on the following park projects and activities:

- The **Mid-Waterfront Bulkheads and Walkway Project** has been completed except for the final segment west of the Ebb Tide Condominiums. Staff anticipates that the design and permitting process for this portion of the project will commence by early 2005. However, it might also be pushed to a later date.
- The “**Friendship Tree**” by artist Steve Jensen was installed in February 2004 on the walkway north of the Senior Center parking lot. The sculpture commemorates the relationship between Edmonds and their sister city of Hekinan, Japan. The dedication for the carved cedar pole will take place on October 30, 2004 when the Hekinan delegation is in Edmonds.

- The Edmonds Public Facilities District has completed the construction designs and is now completing the grant and fundraising portion of the **Edmonds Center for the Arts Project**. The reconstruction is anticipated to begin late in 2004 with a final opening late in 2005. Information regarding this project can be found on the District's web site at www.edmondscenterforthearts.org.
- A consultant contract has been signed with KPPF Consulting Engineers for design of the **Edmonds Interurban Trail Project**. The City selected this firm recognizing their specialized skills in this area. The project was selected by the Interagency Committee for Outdoor Recreation to receive reallocated funds, which were re-appropriated by the Washington State Legislature in an attempt to get trail projects built by June of 2005.
- Improvements at the **SR-104 Mini Park**, located adjacent to the Edmonds Ferry holding lanes, were completed in March. The interior sidewalk pad for the temporary site of the Sound Transit art, Gerry Tsutakawa's "Standing Wave," was poured and the sculpture was installed and dedicated in March. Sound Transit had a budget of \$30,000 for art at the Edmonds Station and the City of Edmonds Arts Commission raised an additional \$33,000 in private donations to double the size of the project. The park will remain a site for public art after the Tsutakawa sculpture is moved to its permanent location at the railroad station at some time in the future.
- Over the past two years City Council bond funding has provided much needed upgrades and renovations to the **Frances Anderson Center**. Finished projects include: complete replacement of windows, asbestos abatement, potable water plumbing, all electrical service and lighting and restroom restoration. Interior painting in common areas, carpet replacement, and selected ceiling replacements have also been done. On May 13th there will be a celebration at the Anderson Center, and the public will be invited to inspect the newly remodeled facility.
- The Architectural Design Board has approved the **Edmonds Memorial Cemetery Columbarium Project** and construction designs are 95 percent complete. The specifications are currently in review by the architect in regard to cost and design following City engineering and planning review. The project will continue to move forward with anticipation of bid award in the summer and completion of the project in late 2004 or early 2005. The board has completed a feasibility and performance study, which reflects the community need and revenue benefits to the operation of the new facility. The new facility should provide positive funding flows to the current enterprise operation. Fees from the cemetery sales and services offset the annual cost of operations. The goal of the cemetery board is to insure a continual funding source to provide for the operation and maintenance of the Edmonds Memorial Cemetery.
- The Parks Department, in partnership with the Edmonds Police Foundation, the Boys and Girls Club and local youth, will continue to explore opportunities to develop a **downtown skate park facility**. The Lynnwood/Edmonds partnership skateboard park on Olympic View Drive serves a tremendous amount of youth, but there continues to be a need for a smaller localized facility in downtown Edmonds geared towards younger children.
- Support work on the **Band Shell at City Park**, a project that is being spearheaded by the Rotary Club of Edmonds Daybreakers, is continuing. Design work is well underway by Daybreaker volunteers and a formal agreement with the City is forthcoming. The band shell will commemorate the Centennial of the Rotary Club Organization and accommodate the existing summer concert series as well as other opportunities for performing arts.
- Four Discovery Ranger-Naturalists (Beach Rangers) have been hired and trained in presenting environmental programs and low-tide beach walks. The first Home School Marine Science Day is scheduled for June 7th for 100 students and their parents. Planned activities for the spring/summer include: Spring Beach Cleanup, Twilight Trail Walk, 14 public beach walks and the International Migratory Bird Day celebration at the Edmonds Marsh on May 8 co-sponsored by the Pilchuck Audubon Society. The Discovery Program's web page is one of the most heavily visited on the City's web site. The environmental education coordinator is working with the ESA Committee to present a public involvement workshop on the critical areas ordinance update as well as other environmental issues that need citizen participation.
- The popular **Yost Pool** will once again host upwards of 50,000 visitors this summer. Opening day is Saturday, May 29th and staff will be ready for a full slate of activities.

APPROVED

- Staff will be working to secure grant funding to acquire **Chase Lake Park**. In 2003 Snohomish County eliminated the grant funds and a new funding source needs to be explored.
- The **Edmonds Marsh Master Plan** will be completed in 2004.
- The **Master Plan for Hummingbird Park** will be completed and necessary planning recommendations will be developed. The City will be operating playground equipment in this park during the summer months.
- Staff will work with the Port of Edmonds to complete a **property line adjustment at the west end of Dayton Street** and in partnership with the Port of Edmonds and the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife to enter into another **30-year partnership for the Edmonds Fishing Pier**.
- The City will work to complete the 2003 Community Development/HUD Grants for **improvements to the South County Senior Center**. Specific projects include windows, furnace and entrance improvements. Staff will also complete the final details on the recently approved 2004 grant, which includes upgrades to the kitchen and new flooring.
- **Water Quality Monitoring at Marina Beach South and Brackett's Landing Underwater Park** will begin as part of the BEACH Program.

Board Member Freeman inquired regarding the financial success of Yost Pool during the 2003 season. Mr. McIntosh answered that the City received a lot of financial support from the community in order to meet their financial goal for the pool. They ended up with an excess of \$2,000.

Board Member Dewhirst noted that the 6-Year Capital Improvement Plan includes the acquisition of the Fish Hatchery. He questioned if this acquisition would take place in 2004. Mr. McIntosh said his understanding is that this project would not be done in 2005, but is still in the CIP as a project the City would like to accomplish during the next six-year period.

Board Member Dewhirst requested that Mr. McIntosh provide the Board with a short memorandum describing how the real estate excise tax can be used and what its limitations are. Mr. McIntosh agreed to provide this information to the Board.

PUBLIC HEARING ON FILE NUMBER R-04-18

Board Member Works asked that she be excused from participating in the public hearing. Since she lives in close proximity to the subject property she expressed concern regarding the appearance of fairness. She left the room for the duration of the hearing.

Ms. Gruwell presented the staff report. She advised that the application is a rezone request by Larry Deisher to rezone the property at 7023 and 7025 – 174th Street Southwest from single-family residential (RS-20) to single-family residential (RS-12). She displayed a vicinity map to clearly identify the location of the subject property. She recalled that this property was before the Board in 2000 as a proposed contract rezone to change the zoning from RS-20 to RS-8, which would have allowed three houses to be constructed on the property. The Planning Board recommended denial of the application to the City Council, and the City Council concurred with the Board's recommendation. Ms. Gruwell noted that RS-12 zoning is located on both sides of the subject property, and there was some support in the record for changing the zoning to RS-12, but both the Board and the City Council felt that RS-8 zoning would be a little bit too much even though there is some RS-8 zoning adjacent to the subject property.

Ms. Gruwell said the applicant has waited the proper amount of time and has now approached the City with another request to rezone his property. She noted that the two parcels are separate. They were divided by a previous owner without going through the subdivision process. The lots were sold separately, but the City has not allowed development to occur on either lot until their legal status has been resolved. The subject property is 28,315 square feet in size, which is enough to create two lots if the property is rezoned to RS-12, but only one lot if the property remains as RS-20 zoning.

APPROVED

Ms. Gruwell advised that the topography of the subject property is fairly flat along 174th Street, but then it drops off at the rear. There is a house located on the eastern most lot, but the garage that was located on the western lot has been demolished.

Ms. Gruwell pointed out that the City has not received any written public comments regarding the proposal, but some verbal concerns were expressed about 174th Street, which is a narrow road that weaves to follow the topography. Ms. Gruwell explained that because of the size of the proposed project, the staff would not recommend any conditions on the rezone, but any subdivision proposed for the site would require frontage improvements.

Ms. Gruwell referred the Board to the list of factors that must be considered as they review the rezone application and make a recommendation to the City Council. Staff reviewed each of these factors and believes the proposal meets all of them. Therefore, staff is recommending that the Planning Board forward a recommendation of approval to the City Council.

Board Member Freeman referred to the house that is located on the eastern most lot. She questioned if it is positioned in such a way that there would be enough setback if the rezone were approved. Ms. Gruwell answered that it appears there would be plenty of room for the lot width and setback requirements to be met.

The applicant, Larry Deisher, recalled that when he presented his last rezone application to the Board in 2000, he was a little bit under duress in that the owner of the other parcel was wanting him to create a second lot. This put him in the position of trying to legalize the situation and obtain a third lot. This seemed to be a concern of the Planning Department, the Planning Board and the City Council. Mr. Deisher said that he has now acquired the other parcel and owns both of the lots. He now wishes to correct the inadvertent subdivision situation that took place in 1971. He said the property has been in his family since 1946, and their intent is to build a home on one of the lots. It is likely that, if a short subdivision were approved for the subject property, the existing house would be replaced. It is an old frame home that was built in 1946 and is not in the greatest condition.

Mr. Deisher said his hope is that by merging the ownership and coming before the Board with a request to rezone the property to RS-12 instead of RS-8, the rezone request would receive favorable consideration from the Board. He clarified that it is his intent to only create two parcels on the site to correct the situation that took place in 1971. He noted that the actual survey that was done for the two sites indicates that there is about 33,000 square feet, which is still not sufficient to create two lots using the existing RS-20 zoning.

Bill Turner, 7118 – 174th Street Southwest, inquired if the applicant is proposing to build two new homes on the subject property. Mr. Deisher said that is his intent. Board Member Young reminded Mr. Turner that his questions should be directed to the Board rather than the applicant. Mr. Turner expressed his opinion that the proposal is a great idea. He said when he moved into his home four years ago, an old barn located on the subject property that tended to attract unpleasant people to the site. The barn has now been demolished and the existing house has been repaired to some degree. He expressed his belief that the development of two new homes on the subject property would improve the appearance of the neighborhood tremendously.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Board Member Dewhirst said he finds that the request is in keeping with the Comprehensive Plan, which identifies the area as large-lot residential. The proposed RS-12 zoning designation would fall within that category and would be in keeping with the Comprehensive Plan. The proposed rezone would also fall within the City's goal of trying to encourage infill development.

BOARD MEMBER DEWHIRST MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL ON FILE NUMBER R-04-18 BASED ON THE PREMISE THAT IT SATISFIES THE CONDITIONS THE BOARD MUST CONSIDER: CONSISTENCY WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN, CONSISTENCY WITH THE ZONING ORDINANCE, THE RELATIONSHIP TO THE SURROUNDING AREA, CONSISTENCY WITH THE SURROUNDING AREA, AND THE ADDITIONAL VALUE TO BOTH THE

APPROVED

NEIGHBORHOOD AND THE COMMUNITY. BOARD MEMBER CASSUTT SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, WITH BOARD MEMBER WORKS RECUSING HERSELF FROM PARTICIPATING IN THE PUBLIC HEARING.

Mr. Chave advised that the proposal would go before the City Council for a closed record review in the near future. Members of the audience would be notified of the date for the hearing.

Board Member Works rejoined the Planning Board.

UPDATE ON ISSUES AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE 2004 AMENDMENTS TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND CRITICAL AREAS REGULATIONS

Mr. Chave said this item was scheduled on the agenda to allow the Board an opportunity to follow up on the discussions they had at the retreat related to the Downtown/Waterfront Plan. He called the Board's attention to the extended agenda and noted that quite a few things have been added, particularly the public workshop that is scheduled for May 26th from 4 – 8 p.m. Staff intends to do a fairly substantial effort to update the public on the critical areas and Comprehensive Plan review process. Staff will prepare as much public information material as possible, and it would be helpful to have a substantial portion of the updated Downtown/Waterfront Plan available to the public for review, as well. Mr. Chave said staff has been reviewing the Board's retreat discussion and integrating their comments into a set of proposals that could be reviewed by the public at the open house. Any additional items the Board would like to add should be discussed now. He said he anticipates having some materials for the Board to review at their April 28th meeting.

Board Member Crim said he has exchanged e-mails with Mr. Chave regarding the Downtown/Waterfront Plan. He noted that the existing plan divided projects into two timeframes: short-term projects that were to take place in the first five years, and long-term projects. He said he and Mr. Chave discussed the idea of using the relocation of the ferry terminal as a dividing time for the updated Downtown/Waterfront Plan. Projects could be divided into two categories: those that could and should occur prior to the relocation of the ferry terminal and those that cannot be done until after the terminal has been relocated.

Board Member Freeman agreed that the ferry relocation project could be a benchmark or milestone for the plan. She questioned when the City would know for sure if the ferry terminal would be relocated. Board Member Works also agreed that this would be a logical separation for the plan and would help people visualize the timeline for projects.

Board Member Dewhirst reminded the Board that neither the State nor the City has money for the ferry relocation project at this time. The success of the proposed Regional Transit Investment District will have a big impact on determining if and when the relocation project will occur. If this proposal is not presented to the voters or is turned down by the voters, the relocation of the ferry terminal could be pushed out a very long time. Board Member Dewhirst agreed that there are projects that must be done before and after the relocation of the ferry terminal. But given the fact that the Board will be looking at the Downtown/Waterfront Plan from a little bit different perspective (mainly the infusion of arts and mixed use), he questioned if a different timeframe would make more sense. He noted that the plan should include some verbiage about the terminal moving and some timeframe to identify what needs to be done before and after the relocation in the immediate area of the terminal. But when the Board considers the activities that need to occur in the rest of the downtown, maybe five years is still a good breaking point. However, he suggested that until the Board has created and prioritized a list of activities and projects, it would be difficult to identify the timeline that would be most appropriate. He noted that five years in municipal planning and development is a very short time frame because of permitting and environmental review, etc.

Board Member Cassutt agreed that the timeline for the ferry relocation should not have a significant impact on the portions of the Downtown/Waterfront Plan that are related to the downtown core area. Board Member Dewhirst pointed out that the relocation of the ferry terminal could have an impact on the businesses in the downtown area, so it is important to work to expand the market right now. They need to consider how they will connect the ferry terminal to the downtown when it is relocated to the new site. It is important to find ways to get the people who use the ferry to visit the downtown area, as well. All of this work will take time to implement.

APPROVED

Board Member Crim agreed with Board Member Dewhirst, but he pointed out that some of the activities identified in the Downtown/Waterfront Plan can only be done if and when the ferry terminal is relocated. The Plan must recognize this reality. Board Member Dewhirst agreed and suggested that perhaps these projects should be set aside as a separate chapter in the plan. Board Member Freeman agreed that what takes place in the Downtown/Waterfront Plan is not really dependent upon the relocation of the ferry terminal. Activities at the ferry will continue as they are until it is relocated.

Board Member Dewhirst suggested that the construction of the second track for Sound Transit would have an impact on the waterfront and the downtown. The second track could make the connection between the two more difficult. Board Member Cassutt concurred and suggested that perhaps the connection would have to be of a visual type rather than a physical connection such as an overpass.

Board Member Dewhirst said his understanding is that Sound Transit is moving ahead with their project, and an agreement has been reached that the second track will eventually be constructed. However, no timetable for this project has been identified. Board Member Dewhirst advised that some work is scheduled to occur at the Sound Transit station later in 2005 and early in 2006, but Sound Transit cannot make any predictions on the timing for the double track. This decision is dependent upon Burlington Northern Santa Fe.

Board Member Crim advised that the double track would impact the access to the waterfront at both Main Street and Dayton Street. He said he would predict that these two access sites would remain much the same, but would be better designed and wider.

Mr. Chave asked that the Board provide any additional comments they might have related to the community business (BC) area to the north and the types of structures and setbacks they want to encourage. He said his perception of the Board's comments is that this area should look different than the rest of the downtown area. He noted that the existing height limit for the BC zone is 25 feet plus an additional five feet for a total of 30 feet. The same is true for the multi-family zones, but the roof must be pitched in order to obtain the additional five feet in height. One idea would be to keep the 25-foot height limit for this area, but require a pitched roof similar to what is required for the multi-family zones. This, combined with the setback requirements, would make development in the area appear more residential in nature. Board Member Works reminded the Board that the committee discussed that changes in the height and setback requirements could be used to make the area more pedestrian friendly.

Mr. Chave pointed out that the area is already zoned BC and RM, so reducing the height limit in this area to 25 feet would be difficult to do. However, keeping the height at a 30-foot maximum but imposing more design requirements would be an effective way to accomplish the Board's goals. He inquired if the Board would want to stick with a pitched roof requirement or if they would be open to considering a variety of design options in order to obtain the additional five feet. The Board agreed that because it is an arts area, it is appropriate to consider various design options. Mr. Chave said staff would provide some alternatives for the Board to consider at their next meeting.

Board Member Dewhirst inquired about the option of playing off the art deco theme of the theater and bringing elements of that design throughout the corridor. He questioned how pitched roofs would fit in with this concept. Mr. Chave said he could provide photographs of art deco types of buildings for the Board to consider. Board Member Works noted that Edmonds has a variety of styles throughout the City so the Board could be open to new concepts. Mr. Chave advised that pinpointing the general shapes and sizes for development in this area would be possible, but requiring a specific stylistic development type could be more difficult to implement.

Board Member Young advised that the American Planning Association has provided some good electronic articles about encouraging certain types of architecture within a community. He said he would research these articles and try to provide additional information for the Board to consider before their next meeting. He said he liked the ideas that were discussed by the Board at their retreat for certain parts of the downtown area.

Board Member Dewhirst referred to the map titled, "Potential Downtown Districts" that was distributed to the Board members at a previous meeting. He asked why the area that is located east of the arts center was excluded from the

APPROVED

downtown district. Mr. Chave said this area is part of the activity center, but it seems to be more residential in character and it might be a stretch to talk about it as more of a commercial area. However, he agreed that the Board could include this area in a downtown district. However, he noted that some of the structures in this area are fairly new, and he does not anticipate any significant change in the near future. Board Member Dewhirst said it seems to him that the police station, boys and girls club, etc. should be included in the downtown district. Mr. Chave clarified that all of this area is part of the downtown, but it is not an area that is about to readily change.

Board Member Dewhirst referred to the area that is identified on the extreme southern portion of the map. He questioned why the lots that are zoned residential were not included. Board Member Crim said there are some restrictions that restrict these lots to residential uses. Mr. Chave added that there is a significant topographical change in this area, as well. Board Member Dewhirst suggested that leaving this area that way it is looks out of place with what is going on further down on Fifth Avenue. Mr. Chave said that because of the topography, it would be difficult to do any type of commercial development that would be oriented towards the commercial street.

Mr. Chave concluded that staff's goal is to get something together for the draft Downtown/Waterfront Plan for the Board to review at their next meeting.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Board Member Young referred to the letter the Board received from [REDACTED]. Mr. Chave said this letter was provided for the Board's information. He said the Board also received a letter from Mr. Drew regarding this same issue. He recalled that the Board recently reviewed an application for a rezone of these properties. While the Board recommended approval of the rezone request, the City Council ended up denying the application. The property owners are asking that the Board consider reviewing this property as part of their Comprehensive Plan review. The Board agreed that they would like to consider options for this property as part of the Comprehensive Plan review.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Cassutt referred to the newspaper article that was printed in *THE SEATTLE TIMES* regarding the aging population of Edmonds. She said both she and Board Member Works made this same observation as part of their committee review of the Downtown Waterfront Plan. However, she noted that a member of the City Council disputed this statement.

THE MEETING WAS ADJOURNED AT 8:03 P.M.

APPROVED