

APPROVED
September 26th

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES
September 12, 2007**

Chair Guenther called the regular meeting of the Planning Board to order at 7:03 p.m. in the Council Chambers, Public Safety Complex, 250 – 5th Avenue North.

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Cary Guenther, Chair
Janice Freeman
Jim Young
Don Henderson
Judith Works
Michael Bowman
John Reed

STAFF PRESENT

Duane Bowman, Development Services Director
Gina Coccia, Planner
Brian McIntosh, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director
Don Fiene, Assistant City Engineer
Karin Noyes, Recorder

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

John Dewhirst, Vice Chair

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER REED MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JULY 11, 2007 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER YOUNG SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

BOARD MEMBER YOUNG MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JULY 25, 2007 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER FREEMAN SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

The Board agreed to place Item 6b (Public Hearing and Presentation on the Conceptual Park Design and Master Plan for the Old Woodway Elementary School) before Item 6a (Continued Public Hearing Regarding ECDC 17.40). No other changes were made to the proposed agenda.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

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

PUBLIC HEARING AND PRESENTATION ON THE CONCEPTUAL PARK DESIGN AND MASTER PLAN FOR THE OLD WOODWAY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (FILE NUMBER AMD-07-15)

Mr. McIntosh reviewed that the proposed park site is 5.56 acres, which is comparable to the 5.5 acre Sierra and Sherwood Parks that have served their neighborhoods well since the early 1970's. The property was purchased by the City of Edmonds in September of 2007 with funds from the City Parks Acquisition Fund 126. Subsequent to the purchase, the City was

awarded grants from Snohomish County (\$1,200,000 from builder's mitigation funds) and the State (\$500,000 from the Washington Wildlife and Recreation Program) for assistance in acquisition. A SEPA checklist was submitted on September 15, 2006 with a Determination of Nonsignificance issued on December 5, 2006.

Mr. McIntosh reported that since last fall, the Engineering Division has completed an in-house design of a neighborhood drainage infiltration system to be constructed on site. EHS International was selected as the consultant to provide survey, specifications and project management for the abatement of hazardous materials and removal of underground storage tanks; and Reid Middleton was selected as the consultant to provide specifications and project management for the building demolition. He further reported that MacLeod Reckord Landscape Architects was selected as the consultant for the master planning and park design, development and project management. The Project Manager for this work is Ed MacLeod. Abatement, demolition and removal of the underground tanks were completed at the end of August and topographical surveying in preparation for grading and infiltration system installation began on September 4th. He noted there were no extraordinary incidences on the site, and the demolition project came in on budget and was completed earlier than anticipated.

Mr. McIntosh reviewed that a public meeting was conducted on May 3rd to vision and discuss various features that could be incorporated into the park. At a second public hearing on June 28th the consultant presented three possible alternatives that were reviewed and discussed in detail. The conceptual drawing for the neighborhood infiltration system was also reviewed. On July 11th an update of the progress to that point and the three conceptual alternatives were presented to the Planning/Parks Board for review and comment.

Mr. McIntosh advised that the purpose of the hearing is to allow the consultant an opportunity to present the Preferred Plan to the Planning/Parks Board and the public. If recommended by the Board, the plan would move on to the City Council for review and an additional public hearing in October. He noted that following approval of the design, engineering level bid documents would be produced with the project going out to bid in late 2007 or early 2008.

Mr. McIntosh referred the Board and public to a black and white map of the Preferred Plan. He noted that the plan was based on Alternative C, which seemed to be favored by the public and the Board at previous meetings. He advised that the plan includes modifications to both the active and passive recreation areas and incorporates many of the comments and recommendations from the community, staff and consultant. It recommends the inclusion of many features that Mr. MacLeod would elaborate upon in his presentation.

Given the increased demand and need for decent playfields for the younger age group, Mr. McIntosh said they are recommending the ball field be scheduled for spring and fall sports. These seasons would run from late April to mid June and late August until late October and would not include any Sunday play. He said that due to the limited outfield distance of approximately 160 feet as a result of the existing cherry tree, age of play would be limited to younger teams mostly in t-ball, coach pitch and modified soccer. He noted that this recommendation would not replace the two full-sized fields that were previously on the site, but it would help alleviate the overall need in the community. Staff feels there would be ample space available within the park even when the field is in use. Mr. McIntosh advised that the number off-street parking spaces would be increased to 30 compared to the similar sized neighborhood parks at Seaview (36) and Sierra (26) that have scheduled play. Scheduled play also occurs at smaller neighborhood parks; 1.5 acre Pine Street Park and 2.3 acre Anderson Center have limited off-street parking.

Mr. McIntosh referred the Board to the attachments that were provided in the staff report, which include the following items: Preferred Plan; July 7, 2007 Planning/Parks Board Memorandum and Minutes; Alternatives A, B, and C; Infiltration Plan Diagram; Determination of Nonsignificance; and SEPA Checklist. He concluded his report by stating that staff plans to conduct a contest to name the new park.

Mr. MacLeod provided an enlarged map of the Preferred Plan. He said he found that the public process that was used to create the plan worked well. Input was solicited from the public before any design work was done and the public was invited to comment on the three design alternatives that were created. He explained that the Preferred Plan represents a combination of various aspects from each of the three alternatives. Mr. MacLeod provided pictures to illustrate the existing conditions on the site now that the buildings have been removed. He pointed out that the site appears larger now, and the remaining

APPROVED

vegetation is easily visible and can be used to define spaces on the site. The Preferred Plan would also utilize the concept of borrowing open space from the Memorial Gardens that is located next door to the south. The effect is to at least visually increase the size of the overall park. He particularly noted the Cherry Tree that is currently located on the site and emphasized that the remaining vegetation was fenced off to protect it during demolition. He briefly reviewed each of the three alternatives and announced that the Preferred Plan incorporates many of the same elements that were included as part of Alternative C. The parking would be located on the east site, with a paved accessible trail system that would loop around the site. While Alternative C did not include a restroom facility, many have indicated their desire for a facility of this type. The Preferred Plan includes a restroom facility as part of the master plan, recognizing that it might not be constructed as part of the earlier phases of construction. In response to concerns raised by the community, the Preferred Plan shows the children's play area moved nearer to the more active areas of the park and further from the wood areas.

Mr. MacLeod advised that based on comments from the community and the Board, the size of the athletic field was reduced so it would only be suitable for scheduled play for younger children. The proposed distance from home plate to the edge of the outfield would only be 180 feet, so it would not be available for regulation play. There would be paving around the permanent backstop and a skinned infill.

Mr. MacLeod referred to the picnic area proposed for the northeast corner and noted that it would be designed as a raised terrace that looks over the green area. The cherry tree and other nice groups of existing trees would be saved as part of the park design. The proposed sport court would be located in the same place as in Alternative C, and the continuous paved loop trail would retain the same route. In response to community input, the trail would be constructed of a soft surface material and would be handicap accessible. He recalled the public felt strongly that the trail should provide an opportunity for people to walk through the wooded area, so a woodland path was included in the Preferred Plan without requiring the removal of any existing significant trees. Again, he noted the playground was moved closer to the parking lot.

Mr. MacLeod said that at the public meetings, the community and Board expressed concern that Alternative C did not provide as strong an entry as Alternatives A and B. As a result, the corner entry was reduced to one location with a boardwalk going over a rain garden, which could be used to filter stormwater runoff from the parking lot before it goes to the infiltration system on the west side of the park. He explained that because the subgrade soil at the park drains well, it is likely they would need to provide some type of irrigation to keep water loving plants in the rain garden healthy during the dry summer months. Mr. MacLeod reviewed the proposed simple design for the rain garden boardwalk, which would be located close to the surface. The boardwalk would provide a nice, welcoming element to the park and set the stage for the passive overall character of the park.

Mr. MacLeod briefly described the design for the ball field, which would include a backstop, dug outs, seating, etc. It would be located in the southwest corner of the park. The proposed sport court would be located on the east side of the park next to the parking lot. He emphasized that sport courts are typically well used by children after school, and the proposed court would include small walls to help contain the balls and provide secondary seating. A restroom facility was included near the proposed parking lot and sport court. Rather than an angle parking configuration near the plaza, the area would be used as a drop off and a kiosk and bench area would provide a safe place for children to wait for adults to pick them up.

Mr. MacLeod advised that the primary children's play area was moved from the northwest corner to closer to the more active areas. The plan envisions this area to be a standard play area with concrete edging and handicap access. The City would likely consider the newer styles of play equipment that stress interactive play. The play area would also include a swing set and a climbing rock element, which would be popular with children of all ages.

Mr. MacLeod said that moving north from the play area, the pathway would lead to the plaza and picnic shelter. The pathway would also allow a person to bypass the shelter and continue on the loop pathway. He described the design elements that would be part of the proposed shelter. Picnic tables and benches would be provided under the shelter, as well as in the plaza area. The design would be indigenous to the character of the Woodway area, and additional plantings would be provided along the trail, as well as bench seating. He noted that loop walkways tend to be popular park attractions, particularly when there are choices that can vary the distance and destination.

APPROVED

Mr. MacLeod provided a diagram to highlight the wooded loop system. He explained that the City staff has met with the developer of the adjacent property to discuss the potential of having a loop trail through the wooded area that is owned by the developer. The developer has expressed an interest in deeding this portion of the property back to the City so it could become an open space area of the park. However, this concept is purely speculation at this point since no commitment has been made on the part of the developer. If an agreement of this type cannot be reached, the wooded area would still remain as open space, but the loop path would connect back into the paved pathway earlier, resulting in a shorter loop. He noted that a PAR Course has been proposed along the soft surface track. This would provide different configurations of exercise stations and is a good way to augment jogging and walking along the loop trail.

Roger Hertrich, Edmonds, said he was unable to attend the previous public meetings related to the park design, but he has been involved in several discussions in regards to parks in southwest Edmonds. He cautioned that the Board should be interested in what has transpired in regard to Burnstead's proposed PRD development next to the new park. While the developer's studies of the treed area within the proposed PRD property indicated there were no Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas or critical areas on the site, he questioned who did the study and what areas were studied when making the determination. The City allowed the PRD project to move forward based on this determination, but their approval was appealed to the Hearing Examiner. The Hearing Examiner expressed concern that the information that was used to make the SEPA Determination was inaccurate. She indicated the City and the applicant failed to provide adequate documentation regarding the impacts to the Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area, which is located in the area where the park trail is currently proposed.

Mr. Hertrich noted that the developer and the City staff spent a short time at the site before determining there were no critical areas or specific wildlife on the endangered list. Since that time, however, there has been much testimony about the endangered pileated woodpeckers that live in the area. He expressed concern that if the wooded area is a Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area, then it should be fenced off to protect against intrusion. The proposed soft surface pathway through the wooded area would be in direct conflict with what should be done with a fragile area of this type. He suggested that before the Park Board makes any recommendation regarding the park design, they should hire a qualified professional to identify all the specific conditions that exist in the area before a walkway or public intrusion is considered.

Mr. Hertrich expressed his concern that there is already a significant drainage problem in the area. At this time, the property owners must depend on infiltration to capture and drain stormwater runoff. Whenever additional facilities are developed in a location such as this, it is critical to provide a method for detaining and managing the water. However, the Preferred Plan does not address this problem. He emphasized that the drainage and flooding problems must be addressed before any additional development is allowed to occur.

Mr. Hertrich questioned the need to construct a permanent restroom facility in a park the size of the one being proposed. He said he is not against the construction of a new restroom facility, but the City should not dedicate a lot of space in the park for this purpose. He noted that, typically, the City brings in sanicans during the busy months. He said he would be opposed to creating yet another impervious surface in space that could be used for children to play.

Lora Petso, Edmonds, pointed out that the proposed drainage facility appears to be located on the Burnstead's property to the west of the proposed park. She expressed her concern that this could result in substantial maintenance problems if the facility is located underneath homes. She said it is her understanding that in order to properly maintain a drainage facility, the City must be able to get a vactor truck to the site. Therefore, the new drainage facility should be located in an area where maintenance could occur with minimal disturbance. She urged the Board to not only consider the park design aspect of the project, but also ask details about the drainage portion of the project.

Ms. Petso advised that because the park would be designed to serve a radius of greater than one mile, it could not be considered a neighborhood park and would not be allowed in the proposed location without a conditional use permit or a park master plan. She suggested it would be appropriate for the Park Board to consider the project as a conditional use permit and place restrictions in the Comprehensive Parks and Open Space Plan to limit its use and protect the surrounding property owners. For example, it would be appropriate to require the City to provide adequate parking if a scheduled ball field is constructed. If the parking lot can only accommodate enough cars for one game at a time, then back-to-back games should be prohibited.

Ms. Petso said that although the proposed PRD development has not been approved, it appears the homes on the north side of the development would not be adequately buffered from the ball field. Foul balls could easily go into the homes. In addition, the perimeter trail would only be 17 feet from the windows of the new homes. She suggested that perhaps a ball field on this small park would not be practical.

Ms. Petso noted that the trees on the northern portion of the property have been identified as a Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area. Therefore, the picnic shelter and the spiral stone element should be moved away from this area. If the City does decide to move forward with the ball field even if it would be too small or too close to the houses, they should at least provide a safety fence. Perhaps they should provide less parking and only schedule the ball field for practices. She concluded her remarks by stating that she would provide additional written comments to the Board prior to the end of the meeting.

Steve Bernheim, Edmonds, said he likes the idea of having long open spaces where kids can expand their imaginations and play various games and sports. He said he would be opposed to a formal ball field on the park site. He would prefer to see a grassy undeveloped neighborhood park with less parking and more pedestrian access. While public restrooms would be a positive amenity, perhaps they would be too expensive and take up too much space for this small sized park. Again, he said he would like the park to remain as a neighborhood park and minimize the organized sports aspect.

Rick Good, Edmonds, said he lives near the proposed new park and has attended the planning meetings and seen the different alternatives. He expressed his belief that the Preferred Plan appears to be going in the right direction. However, encouraging people to go back into the wooded areas could create problems. He expressed concern that the ball field is not the right use for the park, either. The existing neighborhood is not developed sufficiently to handle the additional traffic associated with a ball field. He noted that problems already exist as a result of the Klahaya Tennis and Swim Club's summer activities. He suggested that perhaps it would be better to construct another picnic area instead of the ball field. He concurred with Ms. Petso's comment that no back-to-back games should be scheduled on the small field. He expressed his concern that allowing scheduled games would make the park a destination park rather than a neighborhood park. He agreed the sport court would be heavily used and should be part of the park design. He said he knows that drainage is a huge issue in the area, but the City has already removed all of the buildings and concrete from the site, and the buildings would be replaced with grass that would act as a natural filtration system. Therefore, the situation should improve.

Kevin Clarke, Edmonds, said he often has a private waterfront estate as a result of the drainage problems that exist in the area. He said he lives at the southwest corner of Woodway Meadows, which is accessed via 237th Street. The property owners in this neighborhood are concerned about drainage and have been working with the City for many years to resolve the problems. The infiltration system in their subdivision failed years ago, and they now have significant flooding issues. He explained that, currently, stormwater runoff comes from the east and flows to the west until it reaches the intersection of 104th and 237th Street where it floods every time it rains. The neighbor directly to the east of the park entrance often has a puddle in front of his home that is so large he cannot park his car on that side of the street. The catch basin in the school parking lot is often blocked and the whole intersection floods. During severe storms the water flows west and southwest and ends up in the cul-de-sac near his property.

Mr. Clarke expressed his desire that the City provide some guarantee to the property owners surrounding the park that the drainage problems would be resolved by the proposed new infiltration system. This means they must collect all of the water coming from the east and from the ball fields and direct it to the new system. He said he is also concerned about the drainage impacts associated with the proposed PRD development.

Mr. Clarke pointed out that, currently, there are no parking signs on the north side of 237th Street, but people using the school property and the Klahaya Tennis and Swim Club always park on the street during scheduled events. This presents a problem for residents who are trying to exit the subdivision. He suggested the City provide more signage to designate the street as no parking on the north side, and the rules should be enforced.

Mr. Clarke said he loves the area and believes the proposed park plan is good. The park would be a great amenity for the community, but the City must address the issues of traffic and parking. When the Klahaya Tennis and Swim Club holds their

swim meets four or five times a year, cars line up all along the streets in the area. This is an incredible invasion of parking for the neighborhood.

Mr. Clarke said he is also concerned about the small band of wooded area. He noted that a small easement area is located behind his house to provide access to the storage tanks. In order for the neighborhood to be constructed, the developer was required to pave the emergency access point. Teenagers often hang out in this area and drink, and this same situation could be true for the panhandle of wooded area that is proposed as part of the park plan.

Mr. Clarke concluded that most of the people in the neighborhood are excited about the proposed new park, and they are grateful for what the City has done. He said he likes the proposed new design, but asked that it be fine tuned to ensure they do not have any regrets in the future.

Colin Southcote-Want, Edmonds, said he attended both of the initial park planning meetings, and he is excited about the proposed new park. However, he is concerned that a sport field is still part of the Preferred Plan when nearly everybody at the public meetings voiced their opposition to the concept. He said he is also very concerned about the impacts the proposed park would have on the designated Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area. He asked that the Board consider moving all of the park facilities away from this area so it can be preserved.

Mr. Southcote-Want noted that the PRD project has not received final approval yet. Therefore, he suggested it would be premature for the City to make a final decision regarding the park's design. It appears that the proposed buffer between the PRD development and the park would be located on City property. He suggested it would be more appropriate for the PRD developer to provide a buffer on his property that could add extra space to the park. He urged the Board to postpone their recommendation to the City Council until the PRD issues have been decided.

Jennifer Gill, Edmonds, said she is concerned about the Preferred Plan for the proposed new park. She encouraged the Board to step back and look at the view from a wider range to see how the proposal would result in two large neighborhoods connected by a very small park. Before the Board makes a recommendation regarding the park design, she suggested they address the drainage issue. She said it is too early to talk about plans for the park before they have determined the drainage impacts associated with the project.

Ms. Gill expressed her belief that a small park between two neighborhoods should not bring in activities that result in a lot of noise. No matter what kind of sport field is provided, it should be noted that only one person at one public meeting indicated support for this type of facility. She concluded that most people do not want a ball field, and she questioned which demographic the ball field would satisfy. She asked if it is the City's intent to make the park a destination park. She said she would like the park design to eliminate many of the elements such as the ball field. In addition, the City should attempt to provide as much pervious ground as possible by reducing the number of parking spaces and using pervious materials. A concrete sidewalk would be okay, but the Board should note that there are no other sidewalks in the neighborhood. Ms. Gill suggested the plaza area and sport court should be eliminated from the design, as well. She noted there are plenty of ball fields around for children and adults to use. Because this is a very small park, the City should expand on the way the park is already set up to provide space for picnics, open fields for non-organized activities, and a place for people to walk their dogs. She asked if the City plans to allow dogs in the new park, particularly those that are off leash.

Rob Trahms, Edmonds, said he also attended both planning meetings for the park. He expressed his belief that the City has a great need for more playfields. He noted that when the park was going to be 11 acres, it would have been more appropriate for full sized playfields, but providing a playfield that would only serve half a purpose does not make sense. Instead, the park should be developed as a general green space that allows the neighborhood to creatively use the park.

Matt Hanby, Edmonds, noted that the old Woodway Elementary School site originally had two sport fields. He said he feels strongly that the new park should at least include a small sport field. He said there appears to be a number of voices suggesting the City create a park that would be utilized by only a few people. Even with the proposed new infrastructure, small kids would be bored within a short period of time. This would result in a park for mostly adults, and that appears to be the intent of many of the previous speakers. He emphasized that the real need in the community is for sport fields for children to play on. Many of the local groups that provide these activities for children can testify to a tremendous lack of

fields and that the demand would continue to increase. He pointed out that most of the people who support more sport fields in the City are out coaching and taking care of their families, making it difficult for them to come to the public meetings. He urged the Board to contact Sno King and other youth organizations regarding the need for more space for kids to play ball. The smaller fields can serve the younger children so the larger fields could be opened to adults and older children. He urged the Board to approve the proposed plan in order to help meet this need.

Heather Marks, Edmonds, submitted some handouts of information that has been presented over the course of working to get the park design ready. She pointed out that the first three pages are from a presentation that was done at a Southwest Edmonds Neighborhood Association meeting, where Mr. McIntosh talked to them about how they could work together to create the park design. The presentation talked about how the City of Seattle has developed parks through neighborhood partnerships. She referred to a book that was written by Jim Diers from the University of Washington. The book describes how a community worked with the City of Seattle to design Bradner Park to include the features they wanted for their neighborhood. She noted that Bradner Park is an award winning park and much of the work was done by the community. She urged the Board to keep in mind that having the citizens involved from the beginning enabled this group to leverage \$1 million to help develop the park. She provided pictures of a bathroom facility that was constructed in the park using broken dishes and glass. The community and City of Seattle understood that if everyone was involved in the project, it would not be vandalized. She quoted the following from Mr. Diers, "Neighborhood improvements are more likely to be sustained when ideas and actions come from within the community and build local capacity."

Ms. Marks expressed her concern that the Preferred Plan was created by a person who does not even live in Edmonds. The Southwest Edmonds Neighborhood Association did not hear anything from the designer other than what was presented at the two public meetings. Again, she noted that only one person at the two public meetings indicated a desire for a formalized sport field. She noted, in fact, that Mr. MacLeod originally indicated that the park was too small for a formal sport field, but someone appears to have leaned on him to get him to change his mind and include a ball field.

Ms. Marks provided a picture of a woman walking her dog and pushing a stroller, which she took just prior to the meeting. The woman indicated she used to walk her dog on the playfield, but this is no longer possible. She now has to run along 248th Street with the dog and stroller, and this is a dangerous situation. She indicated she has already had a few close calls and was almost assaulted earlier in the summer while walking in the cemetery. The people in the community who used to use the park now have to go elsewhere to continue their regular activities.

Ms. Marks referred the Board to information she provided regarding an organization in Seattle that purchases school properties and other properties in Seattle. With the help of the community, they have been able to create wonderful parks. This saves the City of Seattle a lot of money and results in parks that fit within the character of the neighborhoods.

Ms. Marks recalled there has been significant discussion about the critical areas in or near the park. She suggested the Board and staff carefully review the Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC). Chapter 23.90 states, "No development shall be allowed within a Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area or buffer in which threatened or endangered species have primary location except as provided for by a management plan established by the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife or applicable State Agency. Approval of alteration of land of a Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area or its buffer shall not occur without consultation with the Department of Fish and Wildlife." She noted that the pileated woodpecker is on the State's list of species on the boarder line for extinction. She said that while a trail would be great, it would destroy the habitat for the woodpecker and other species, and this impact must be dealt with. She urged the Board to adhere by the City's own codes.

Ms. Marks expressed her belief that children need unstructured places to play in the park. Children are much too controlled and they need a place to come up with their own ideas for play. She urged the Board to think carefully before making any decisions. She further suggested that it would be appropriate for the Board to allow the Southwest Edmonds Neighborhood Association an opportunity to sign off on the final plan.

Colin Sandwith, Edmonds, said he originally encouraged the City to purchase the entire school property and keep the two existing ball fields. He suggested there must be some compromise regarding ball fields because it is important not to forget about what the children need. They need a place for constructive play, including ball fields. If they are going to play ball at

the park, then the City should provide a restroom for their use. He noted that the proposed plan does not include any information regarding lighting and security for the park. He expressed his belief that without proper lighting, development of the park could provide a place for teenagers to hang out at night. This could result in problems at the park.

THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Mr. McIntosh thanked the citizens who participated in the public hearing and provided the following feedback to the concerns raised:

- **Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area.** Mr. McIntosh said the park property is identified on the City's map as a Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area. The boundary around the top end of the proposed new park is exactly the same as the boundaries around 10 or 12 other City parks that have active play areas and pathways. The City does not restrict people from going into these areas, and he would hate to have the wooded area at the new park off limits. He suggested that perhaps this issue has been overplayed.
- **Restrooms.** Mr. McIntosh advised that the City typically provides sanicans during the busy season in most parks where playfields are located. This is an advantage for the City because they can contract the service out without using a lot of park maintenance resources. He said a restroom would be a nice addition to the park and should be included in the park's master plan, but it is not a necessity for organized play in a park of this size. If the park becomes more heavily used, then a bathroom facility could be considered.
- **Infiltration System.** Mr. McIntosh announced that the infiltration system would be constructed prior to any park development. While the drainage facility could be constructed anywhere on the park site except under the parking area, staff understands that access is a concern. Staff is proposing that the facility be placed near the northwest corner of the ball field in an area that could be easily accessed by maintenance trucks.
- **Buffering of Homes on the West Side of the Park.** Mr. McIntosh emphasized that the Board is only responsible for reviewing the proposed park plan, and not the proposed PRD. The developer would be required to address the buffering requirements associated with his project. However, he noted that stray balls are typically not a problem at any of their parks, and he doesn't anticipate a problem at the new park, either. The proposed ball field would be used by children between the ages of 5 and 9, and they are not going to hit long foul balls that go over the fence and trees and into neighboring yards. They generally use a softer ball, as well.
- **The Park is Too Small.** Mr. McIntosh reminded the Board that there are other neighborhood parks in the City that are similar in size or smaller, and they have ball fields similar to what is being proposed for the new park. He said he coached little league for 35 years, and he particularly likes to coach the younger kids because they are out to just have fun. However, they tend to get the bottom of the barrel as far as field scheduling goes. Thee younger children would be the sole users of the new field, and he sees a vast need for this type of facility in the community, as a whole.
- **Problems Associated with the Wooded Panhandle Area.** Mr. McIntosh said he can understand the neighbors' concerns. He recalled that when the City originally considered the park design, it did not include the panhandle because it seemed too remote. It would be great to have the extra trail through the wooded area, but the Parks Department wouldn't be opposed to excluding it so they don't have to police and maintain the area because it is isolated and far away from the remainder of the park. He cautioned against targeting teens as the only ones who create problems in parks. All undesirables should not be lumped into the category of teens.
- **Dogs in the Park.** Mr. McIntosh said the City would welcome dogs on leashes in the new park. There are eight other parks in the City that are designated the same and welcome responsible dog owners. However, they will not tolerate off leash dogs in the new park because children and dogs in the same park is not a good mix.
- **Lighting and Security.** Mr. McIntosh said he has discussed the issue of lighting and security with the design consultant. However, these issues would not be fully addressed in the plan until the final design phase. He noted they would propose perimeter lighting around the park that follows the paved loop trail. Many people like to use the park for exercise during

APPROVED

the morning and evening hours when it is dark during the winter. The lighting would be on a timer so it would turn off at a given time at night and turn on again in the morning. In addition, 24-hour security lighting would be provided in the area of the picnic shelter and restroom facility because these areas typically experience a lot of vandalism. The lighting would assist the police department when driving through the parking lot to see undesirable activities. The lighting would be low level and would not attract people to recreate after hours.

- **Drainage.** Mr. McIntosh pointed out that construction of the park elements would result in a significant reduction of impervious surface. Replacing the asphalt and buildings with grass would allow for infiltration of stormwater runoff. The park would to its part to reduce the drainage problems in the community. There is also an opportunity to consider green roofs and other elements. In addition, the new infiltration system would handle any water coming from the walkway and parking areas. Staff does not envision any water falling on new impervious surfaces ever leaving the park site. In addition, the rain garden would clean up the water coming from the parking lot before it goes into the infiltration system.

Mr. Fiene explained that the new infiltration facility would be a regional drainage system that has been planned as part of the Edmonds Southwest Basin Study. He explained that when the area was annexed into the City in 1995, the stormwater drainage situation was a mess. Since that time, the City has constructed about 12 new systems with good success. The park drainage, as well as the stormwater runoff coming from properties to the east would be taken care by the proposed new system. Board Member Reed inquired if this project was identified in the City's Capital Improvement Plan. Mr. Fiene answered affirmatively. The project is scheduled to start in late 2007 and would be completed in early 2008.

Chair Guenther explained that there are two ways to treat stormwater runoff: infiltration and retention. Mr. Fiene said that, typically, infiltration systems are not feasible in Edmonds. However, this is one area where there are few choices for connecting into other systems. The City has had to spend twice as much money to address drainage in this area of the City. Fortunately, the soils that exist in the area are conducive to infiltration, which is not the case in most other areas of the City where they have to use a retention and slow release system. Mr. Fiene concluded that replacing the structures and asphalt with grass fields would help, but the new system would take care of the area to the east, as well as the park.

Board Member Works asked how often the City has to access infiltration systems for maintenance purposes. Mr. Fiene answered that the code requires maintenance to occur on a yearly basis. The City of Edmonds is actually ahead of other cities in this regard. Board Member Works asked if green roofs would help significantly. Mr. Fiene answered affirmatively and suggested the City could study the affect of how well this type of roof would operate. Board Member Works also inquired about whether or not it would be possible to use pervious surface materials in the parking lot and on the pathways. Mr. Fiene agreed this would be another concept to study. Board Member Works suggested that perhaps this park could be used as a study area for the rest of the City to learn how well pervious materials and other green concepts work. Board Member Freeman suggested it would also be appropriate to consider the benefits of using pervious surface materials for the shelter and plaza areas. Mr. Fiene said that while the City Code does not require pervious surface, it would be appropriate for the City to consider these options.

Board Member Henderson asked if there was ever a determination that the panhandle is habitat for pileated woodpeckers. Mr. McIntosh said there is no doubt the birds have been in the area, but there are no studies that identify the area as a specific habitat for the woodpeckers.

Board Member Reed asked staff to provide direction as to whether or not it would be appropriate for the Board to let the PRD process run its course before making a recommendation. Mr. Bowman explained that the PRD issue is entirely separate from the park design proposal. The developer of the PRD must comply with the code requirements, and the Hearing Examiner has resolved issues related to the northeast corner portion of his property. The only issue remaining is related to the perimeter buffering. Again, he clarified that the Board could move forward with their recommendation regarding the proposed park design now because it is not dependent on the PRD proposal.

Board Member Reed asked whose responsibility it is to deal with the parking problems that surround the park. Mr. Bowman answered that this is an enforcement issue and regulated by the police department. If no parking areas are established by code, the police department can write citations when violations occur.

Chair Guenther clarified that, at this time, the Board is only considering a master plan for the park to identify all of the desired elements. Issues related to traffic and parking are not typically addressed during this phase of the project. The same is true for the restroom. The master plan could identify a location for the restroom, but it doesn't mean a restroom would ultimately be constructed. While some elements of the plan would be built soon, others would not be added until a future date, if at all. Board Member Freeman questioned if the master plan could identify a priority list to identify which elements would be constructed first. She also suggested the master plan could note the concerns raised regarding the trail through the wooded area, and require that these concerns be satisfactorily addressed before the trail construction could take place.

THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED FOR BOARD DELIBERATION.

Board Member Young commented that the Preferred Plan was put together well, and staff provided adequate justification for the half dozen points that were raised by the public. He summarized that there is no issue related to the area being designated as a Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area, and concerns related to drainage would be resolved by the new infiltration system. Issues related to traffic and parking would be resolved as the plan evolves. He said he believes the proposed sport field is appropriate given the size and location of the park. While he is interested in learning the final outcome of the PRD proposal, it is not something that is within the Board's purview to consider. He said he would support the Preferred Plan as presented because the issues raised by the public have all been addressed by the staff with the possible exception of the parking situation, and the park is not the only place in town where parking problems exist.

Board Member Works indicated her support for the Preferred Plan. She agreed that more play space is needed for small children. However, she said she has concerns about the proposed trail through the wooded area. She recommended this element be studied further to address issues related to security. She said she would like the park to become a demonstration site for applying pervious surfaces and green elements.

Board Member Freeman said she supports the Preferred Plan, too. She recalled that she previously raised concerns about safety issues associated with the loop trail, but these would be dealt with in the future when that particular element is being considered for implementation. She said while she can understand the neighbors' concerns about the sport field, she felt it important to provide sport facilities for the younger children.

Board Member Bowman said he is very much in support of the Preferred Plan. He agreed that there is currently a significant drainage problem in the area, but the new infiltration system should resolve the situation. As a coach, he said he knows the proposed field would be more than adequate for small children playing t-ball, etc. He encouraged those who are against the playfield to go and watch the young children play ball.

Board Member Reed said he does not see the park as being conducive to having a ball field. The field would be used a significant amount of time in the summer and would make a problem situation even worse. The street surrounding the park and the parking area would not be adequate to accommodate the increased use. He said that while there are a lot of good ideas in the plan, he would rather see a less formal playfield that could be used for practices. Board Member Reed also expressed concern that he does not understand all of the issues related to the wooded area known as the panhandle and whether or not it is a Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Area. When the plan moves forward to the City Council, he suggested staff provide more information about the impacts the proposed trail would have on the habitat. He said he would support the Preferred Plan, with those two qualifications.

Board Member Henderson said he, too, is concerned about the habitat in the panhandle area. To be more reassured, it would have been helpful for staff to provide a biologist's study to support the plan. However, because it might be years before the trail is developed, it is not a critical issue right now. Board Member Henderson said he would not be in favor of constructing a permanent backstop on the ball field. Something smaller and more portable in nature could be used instead. He agreed that smaller children need to have a decent place to play, but that doesn't require a permanent, concrete backstop. He said he would support a motion to move the plan along.

Chair Guenther indicated his support for the Preferred Plan, noting that staff and the consultant addressed all of the issues raised by the public. He noted that the restroom facility would not likely be developed a part of the first phase of the project. He also noted that Mr. Fiene addressed infiltration and drainage issues adequately, indicating that the soils in the area would

APPROVED

absorb much of the stormwater. He said he sees a need for additional playfields in the City, particularly since this one would be for the smaller children and not heavily used. Chair Guenther pointed out that many other parks in the City have Fish and Wildlife Habitat Conservation Areas on their perimeter and within the parks, as well. He said pileated woodpeckers fly around his neighborhood, too, and they seem to coexist well with the residents. He said he plans to support the plan as proposed.

BOARD MEMBER YOUNG MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD THE PREFERRED PLAN FOR THE OLD WOODWAY ELEMENTARY PARK MASTER PLAN TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL FOR ALL OF THE REASONS LISTED ON THE RECORD. BOARD MEMBER WORKS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED 6-1, WITH BOARD MEMBER REED VOTING IN OPPOSITION BASED ON HIS EARLIER COMMENTS.

THE BOARD TOOK A BREAK AT 9:20 P.M. THEY RECONVENED THE MEETING AT 9:35 P.M.

CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE (ECDC) CHAPTER 17.40 (FILE NUMBER AMD-07-14)

Mr. Bowman advised that some Board Members identified changes that were supposed to have been incorporated into the new draft document, but were not. He suggested the Board continue the public hearing to September 26th. In the meantime, staff would make the changes and include Steve Waite's written comments on behalf of the Historic Preservation Commission, as well.

BOARD MEMBER YOUNG MOVED THAT THE PUBLIC HEARING REGARDING ECDC 17.40 (FILE NUMBER AMD-07-14) BE CONTINUED TO THE SEPTEMBER 26, 2007 MEETING. BOARD MEMBER HENDERSON SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

Mr. Bowman indicated that the new draft document, along with a copy of Mr. Waite's comments would be provided to the Board prior to the September 26th meeting.

PUBLIC HEARING ON APPLICATION TO REZONE PROPERTIES LOCATED AT THE SOUTHEAST CORNER OF EDMONDS WAY AND 236TH STREET SOUTHWEST FROM NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS (BN) TO COMMUNITY BUSINESS—EDMONDS WAY (BC-EW) (FILE NUMBER R-07-53)

Board Member Guenther reminded the Board of the Appearance of Fairness Rules. None of the Board Members disclosed ex parte communications, and no one in the audience expressed a concern, either.

Ms. Coccia referred the Board to the staff report. She advised that the applicant is requesting to rezone property on the south side of 236th Street Southwest and the east side of Edmonds Way from Neighborhood Business (BN) to Community Business-Edmonds Way (BC-EW). The site is approximately 0.60 acres in size and has about 210 feet of frontage along Edmonds Way and about 160 feet of frontage along 236th Street Southwest. The eastern parcel is undeveloped. While the western parcel is currently vacant, it had previously been developed with a self-serve diesel gas station.

Ms. Coccia reviewed the six criteria that must be considered when reviewing an application for a rezone. She noted that the staff report provides a response to each of the criteria. She said staff agrees with the materials and narrative provided by the applicant. In addition, the application was routed through various City departments and divisions, and no comments were received. No public comments were received, but one person did request to become a party of record. Based on the Findings of Fact, analysis, conclusions and attachments in the staff report, Ms. Coccia advised that staff recommends the Planning Board forward a recommendation to the City Council to approve the requested rezone to BC-EW.

Tony Shapiro, Applicant, provided a map to show the location of the subject property, as well as the surrounding properties. He noted that while the map illustrates a significant amount of multi-family residential development on this end of

APPROVED

SR-104, there is also a surprising amount of commercial activity taking place, including an orthodontics office, a construction company, various offices, auto repair, insurance office, and Olympic View Water District. He expressed his belief that the existing commercial activities support the request to rezone the subject property to a higher density.

Next, Mr. Shapiro provided a zoning map to illustrate the location of the subject parcels that are currently zoned BN, which only allows one residential unit per acre. With the current trend of mixing housing and commercial uses along the corridor, the proposed BC-EW zoning designation would be more up to date. He noted the change of grade that exists on the site. From the intersection at 236th Street and Edmonds Way, the property comes up about 5 to 8 feet, and the back corner of the property is up about 12 feet in some locations. He said that while a paragraph in the application talks about adjacent single-family residential homes, it should be noted that there are none. The surrounding residential development is all multi-family, and an application is pending for town house development to occur on the property just to the east of the subject property.

Mr. Shapiro provided pictures to illustrate the existing condition of the subject property, as well as the surrounding properties. He advised that a gas station used to be located on one of the parcels; but after a thorough investigation, the site was deemed clean for development. The site is deep enough to support a good strip of commercial development on Edmonds Way with two double parking islands that would be about 120 to 130 feet wide. The site is nicely proportioned for utilization of parking. The subject property is currently comprised of two parcels, with the property line going down the middle.

Mr. Shapiro referred the Board to the rezone criteria that must be considered when reviewing rezone applications and provided the following explanation of how the proposed rezone application would meet each one:

1. **Comprehensive Plan.** *Whether the proposal is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.* Mr. Shapiro reviewed the following Comprehensive Plan criteria that supports the proposed rezone application:

- ***Sufficient number of sites suited for commercial uses should be reserved for these purposes. The great majority of such sites should be selected from parcels of land already identified in the Comprehensive Plan for commercial use and/or zoned for such use.*** Mr. Shapiro advised that Edmonds Way is a primary east/west access through Edmonds. Therefore, it is well suited to support more commercial development and higher densities than the current BN zone would permit. Edmonds Way caters to a more multi-family residential type of development, which is encouraged by the BC-EW zone. The majority of the larger commercial projects are located in the Westgate area, but the subject project is of sufficient size to accommodate commercial and residential uses, too. He pointed out that the proposed rezone would allow for an eventual mixed-use building project that would house both residential and commercial uses, and the subject parcels already have an Edmonds Way Corridor Comprehensive Plan Designation. He emphasized that the proposed rezone would have minimal impact on the adjacent single-family properties to the east from a traffic, light, glare and noise vantage point. The significant grade change from Edmonds Way east would provide a separation between the project and neighboring parcels. Mr. Shapiro further explained that a mixed-use function could house commercial, parking, residential units and office space in the same structure, which would help create a more vibrant city because the parking could be utilized by the commercial uses during the weekdays and by the residential uses during the evenings and on weekends. The mixed-use concept would provide a more efficient method of utilizing property and economic benefits to the City, as well as more livable units amongst the commercial activities.
- ***Parcels of land previously planned or zoned for commercial use but which are now or will be identified as unnecessary, or inappropriate for such use by additional analysis, should be reclassified for other uses.*** Mr. Shapiro expressed his belief that this criteria would not apply to his application.
- ***The proliferation of strip commercial areas along Edmonds streets and highways and the development of commercial uses poorly related to surrounding land uses should be strongly discouraged.*** Mr. Shapiro explained that the proposed BC-EW zone would discourage strip retail development where there is a single use with parking separating the street from the building. Instead, the ground floor of any commercial development would be set back four feet, and the upper floors would be setback 10 feet. This would result in a type of urban wall that would create a more vibrant city and give commercial space a more direct view of the traffic. The ground floor of any mixed-use development on the site would likely be comprised of small-scale office space, and perhaps retail if parking allows.

- ***Design and location of all commercial sites should provide for convenient and safe access for customers, employees and suppliers.*** Mr. Shapiro pointed out that the proposed rezone would result in the elimination of two access points on Edmonds Way since the commercial and residential parking garage would be accessed from 236th Street. Pedestrian access for both commercial and residential could come from both Edmonds Way and 236th Street, which would help encourage pedestrian activity on Edmonds Way.
 - ***All commercial developments should be carefully located and designed to eliminate or minimize the adverse impacts of heavy traffic volume and other related problems on surrounding land uses.*** Mr. Shapiro noted that the site would have minimal impact on turning movements to and from Edmonds Way, and the BC-EW zoning designation would require a 10-foot step back for the upper floors. This would help support a quieter neighborhood atmosphere for the multi-family residential uses on 236th Street by keeping the access to one curb cut.
2. ***Zoning Ordinance. Whether the proposal is consistent with the purposes of the zoning ordinance and the purposes of the proposed zone district.*** Mr. Shapiro explained how his application would be consistent with the following goals of the zoning ordinance:
- ***To provide for areas for commercial uses offering various goods and services according to the different geographical areas and various categories of customers they serve.*** Mr. Shapiro explained that the proposed rezone would continue the trend of small businesses along the Edmonds Way Corridor and add multi-family housing and office space along with the commercial component. He noted that one desirable aspect of the site is its close proximity to Interstate 5, and this access is important to attracting customers and clients from outside of the area.
 - ***To provide for areas where commercial uses may concentrate for the convenience of the public and in mutually beneficial relationship to each other.*** Mr. Shapiro expressed his belief that the location of the site is ideally suited for commercial space, which would serve both the residents nearby and pedestrians along Edmonds Way. The project would also serve customers from the greater Edmonds area. While a question could be raised that they are proposing to mix too much with residential, it should be noted that there is commercial development to the south and north of the subject properties. The mixed-use nature of the site would also support interaction with the residential neighborhoods to the east and west.
 - ***To provide for residential uses, community facilities and institutions, which may appropriately locate in commercial areas.*** Mr. Shapiro explained that the aspect of having small offices located in a building of this size would help broaden the tax base for Edmonds and bring some office functions to the Edmonds Way Corridor. However, it wouldn't necessarily preclude retail development if adequate space is available to support the parking requirement.
 - ***To require adequate landscaping and off-street parking and loading facilities:*** Mr. Shapiro advised that one of the biggest challenges for a building site in this location is access for garbage and deliveries off of 236th Street. He said he believes these access points could be configured in a fashion that would interface with 236th Street in an acceptable manner, but it would pose a challenge in the final design phase. He expressed his belief that it would be best to have the functions occur off 236th Street rather than Edmonds Way. He noted that encouraging this type of building use would eliminate the conflict that current exists on Edmonds Way with garbage trucks stopping on a frequent basis.
 - ***To protect commercial uses from hazards such as fire, explosion and noxious fumes, and also nuisances created by industrial uses such as noise, odor, dust, dirt, smoke, vibration, heat, glare and heavy truck traffic.*** Mr. Shapiro said he does not expect any development on the site to create a problem in this regard.
3. ***Surrounding Area. The relationship of the proposed zoning change to the existing land uses and zoning of surrounding or nearby property.*** Mr. Shapiro advised that if the subject parcel were rezoned, it would mesh with the immediate neighborhood in the following ways:

- The proposed mixed-use building would maintain a minimum 4-foot setback from the Edmonds Way street edge, with further setbacks for the upper stories. This would bring more life to the streetscape.
 - Additional setbacks would be required along the eastern boundary.
 - The existing and surrounding land uses would include retail, residential, and service functions.
 - The proposed project would house uses of a like nature, which would support and enhance the character of the existing neighborhood.
 - Pedestrian traffic from the project could utilize the bus routes and transit facilities that are already located on Edmonds Way.
4. ***Changes. Whether there has been sufficient change in the character of the immediate or surrounding area or in City policy to justify the rezone.*** Mr. Shapiro explained that with the Growth Management Act and the desire for higher density to be achieved in the metropolitan areas, the higher density permitted in the proposed zone would be a welcome addition to the City and could be provided in a tasteful fashion based on the criteria stipulated for the zone.
 5. ***Suitability. Whether the property is economically and physically suitable for the uses allowed under the existing and proposed zoning.*** Mr. Shapiro advised that the proximity of the property to the main arterial into Edmonds makes it more suitable for a commercial use than many other areas in Edmonds. He expressed his belief that the proposed mix of both residential and commercial uses would achieve the best and highest use for this property in serving the needs of the community.
 6. ***Value. The relative gain to the public health, safety and welfare compared to the potential increase or decrease in value to the property owners.*** Mr. Shapiro expressed his belief that utilizing the property in a mixed-use fashion would mix well with the surrounding neighborhood. He said it is his contention that the existing designation does not allow the property to take full advantage of its position along Edmonds Way. The increased density proposed would also help Edmonds comply with the Growth Management Act mandates for more dense housing opportunities.

Board Member Reed requested more specific information about the amount of slope that exists on the subject parcels. Mr. Bowman answered that the grade climbs away from Edmonds Way on 236th Street, and he estimated the grade change to be between 10 and 30 feet. He referred the Board to the topographical vicinity map that was provided in the staff report for more detailed information.

THERE WAS NO ONE IN THE AUDIENCE WHO EXPRESSED A DESIRE TO ADDRESS THE BOARD. THEREFORE, THE PUBLIC HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Board Member Henderson expressed his belief that the staff and applicant prepared a thorough report to address all of the required rezone criteria. Therefore, he would support the proposal as presented.

BOARD MEMBER YOUNG MOVED THAT THE PLANNING BOARD FORWARD A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR FILE NUMBER R-07-53 BASED ON THE FINDINGS OF FACT AND CONCLUSIONS FOUND IN THE STAFF REPORT, AS WELL AS THOSE ADDRESSED BY THE APPLICANT IN HIS PRESENTATION. BOARD MEMBER WORKS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Chair Guenther reviewed that the September 26th meeting agenda would include the following: a continued public hearing regarding ECDC 17.40 (File Number AMD-07-14), an update and discussion regarding the code re-write project, and a review of a request by Harold Huston to change the Comprehensive Plan designation and zoning on property located at 110 Sunset Avenue North.

APPROVED

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Guenther did not provide any comments during this portion of the meeting.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Works recalled Mr. McIntosh's suggestion that the City hold a contest to name the new park. She reminded the Board that Don Krieman recently passed away. She suggested that perhaps the City should consider naming the park after Mr. Krieman in recognition of his years of volunteer service to the community, particularly the youth related activities. Mr. Bowman recommended the Board forward this idea to Mr. McIntosh. He noted that he attended Mr. Krieman's memorial service and was impressed by the number of people who attended, especially the youth. He had a tremendous influence in his neighborhood. Board Member Freeman agreed that it would be appropriate to forward this recommendation to Mr. McIntosh. Making the kids come first would be a great way to remember Mr. Krieman.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 10:10 p.m.

APPROVED