

APPROVED JUNE 26TH

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

June 12, 2013

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

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

John Reed, Chair
Valerie Stewart, Vice Chair
Kevin Clarke
Todd Cloutier
Ian Duncan
Bill Ellis
Philip Lovell
Neil Tibbott

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Development Services Director
Stephen Clifton, Community Services/Economic Development Director
Karin Noyes, Recorder

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER LOVELL MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF MAY 22, 2013 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER ELLIS SECONDED THE MOTION. THE MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, WITH BOARD MEMBERS CLARKE, REED AND DUNCAN ABSTAINING.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

There was no one in the audience.

PUBLIC HEARING ON ORDINANCE 3921 – ADOPTING AMENDMENTS TO ZONING REGULATIONS TO ALLOW PUBLIC MARKETS IN THE COMMUNITY BUSINESS (BC), DOWNTOWN BUSINESS (BD), AND GENERAL COMMERCIAL (CG) ZONES

Mr. Clifton advised that because there was no one present in the audience, he would keep his presentation short. He reminded the Board that he initially presented interim Ordinance 3921 and Ordinance 3922 to the Planning Board on May 22nd. He advised that the City Council adopted interim Ordinance 3921, amending Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC) Chapters 16 and 21 related to public markets on May 21st. The interim ordinance is good for six months, allowing time for the Planning Board to conduct a hearing and make a recommendation to the City Council and for the City Council to conduct a hearing and adopt a permanent ordinance. Mr. Clifton said that also on May 21st, the City Council adopted Ordinance 3922, which amended Edmonds City Code (ECC) 4.90 relating to licensing provisions for public markets. Ordinance 3922 is a permanent ordinance and no action is required of the Board. The ordinance was provided in the Staff Report for the Board's information only.

Mr. Clifton explained that although ECDC 16 allows “community-oriented, open-air markets” within the BC, BD and CG zones, the term is not included in ECDC 21. The definition is contained in ECC 4.90.010, but the markets are restricted to daylight hours on Saturday and Sundays during the months of July, August and September. No other open-air markets are permitted. In addition, the term “farmers’ market” is not specifically defined or listed as a permitted use within the BC, BD and CG zones in either the ECDC or the ECC. “Seasonal Farmers’ Market” is defined in ECDC 21 as an allowed use, but the activity is permitted only during the period between May and September. This provision conflicts with the current Edmonds Historical Museum’s Garden and Summer Markets that take place each Saturday from May through October. It also precludes the ability to establish a year-round farmers’ or public market.

Mr. Clifton reviewed the goals of the proposed amendments to ECDC 16 and 21 as follows:

1. Create one definition for “public market” in ECDC 21.80.103 that would apply to all “community-oriented, open air markets,” “farmers’ markets,” “seasonal farmers’ markets,” and “public markets.”
2. Allow public markets to operate as open-air activities, within a building, or both.

Mr. Clifton advised that Goals 1 and 2 can be met by deleting the term “community-oriented, open-air market” from ECC 4.90 and adding a new section ECDC 21.80.103 entitled, “public market.”

3. Allow public markets to operate in public rights-of-way, private property and public property.
4. Establish operational hours to minimize disruption to traffic and residential properties. Currently, outdoor public markets are limited to daylight hours only.

Mr. Clifton advised that Goals 3 and 4 can be met by revising ECC 4.90.020 to allow operating hours to be extended until 10 p.m. for any day of the week for outdoor markets on private or public property not located within public rights-of-ways. Operating hours for public markets that occur inside a building will not be restricted.

5. Allow public markets to operate for longer periods of time.

Mr. Clifton said Goal 5 can be met by amending ECDC 16 and 21 and ECC 4.90 to remove restrictions on what months a market can operate. As proposed, public markets would be allowed to operate year round.

6. Relocate provisions in ECC 4.90.060 that are more land-use oriented to ECDC 16.43 and 16.50.

Mr. Clifton reminded the Board that some City Council Members expressed concern about allowing public markets in BC zones that are located adjacent to single-family residential (RS) zones. The Board specifically discussed this issue on May 22nd, as well. It was suggested that public markets located adjacent to RS zones should be restricted to inside a building to minimize disruption to neighborhoods.

Board Member Ellis pointed out that the definition for “public market” (ECDC 21.80.103) in Ordinance 3921 is different than the definition provided in the Staff Report. Mr. Clifton said the definition contained in the ordinance is the one proposed for adoption.

Board Member Ellis observed that, as per the proposed definition for “public market,” vendors would be allowed to sell items other than food products. However, he suggested that the word “or” at the end of the definition should be changed to “and” to make it clear that a vendor could sell any combination of the types of items listed. This would allow public markets to exist even if no food items are sold. Mr. Clifton suggested that an even better solution would be to replace “or” with “and/or.”

Board Member Lovell recalled that, at their last meeting, the Board discussed the Edmonds Historical Museum’s role in the proposed amendments. He asked if the museum is still the sponsor of the public market at Salish Crossing, which just opened today. Mr. Clifton explained that the Edmonds Historical Museum Board decided that their current insurance policy would not allow them to sponsor the Wednesday public market at Salish Crossing. However, the Edmonds Community College (ECC) Foundation has agreed to sponsor the event, instead.

APPROVED

Board Member Lovell asked if the provisions for “public markets” would apply only to public markets sponsored by non-profit organizations. Mr. Clifton answered that the markets must be sponsored by non-profit organizations, but the vendors could be for-profit.

Board Member Lovell recalled that, at their last meeting, Mr. Clifton pointed out that the proposed amendments respond to at least two Strategic Action Plan items. He asked if the proposed amendments would allow the City to create a year-round, enclosed market. Mr. Clifton said the language would allow the City to partner with a non-profit organization as a tax-exempt entity, but the sponsor of the event market would have to be a non-profit.

Mr. Clifton reported that tonight was the first night of the public market at Salish Crossing. He said he visited the site and found there were approximately six vendors. He said he anticipates more vendors as the event becomes more established. He reported that the application was processed quickly, and the applicant was able to meet the conditions required by the City.

Chair Reed referred to the Board’s previous discussion about allowing public markets to operate in BC zones that are adjacent to RS zones. He asked if it would be possible to modify the code to place specific restrictions on public markets in these areas. Mr. Clifton answered affirmatively and suggested that one option would be to restrict public markets adjacent to RS zones to inside only. He noted that this provision is not currently included in the draft proposal. Board Member Cloutier suggested that rather than placing this restriction specifically on BC zones, the restriction could apply to all public markets in the BC, BN and CG zones that are located adjacent to RS-zoned properties. The remainder of the Board concurred.

Chair Reed said his understanding is that the proposed ordinance would allow public markets in any BD, BC or CG zone. Mr. Clifton pointed out that any uses allowed in the BC and BD zones are also allowed in the CG zone by default. Chair Reed suggested that perhaps the ordinance could be more specific by restricting public markets in some areas of the three zones.

Board Member Clarke asked if the proposed ordinance is designed to permit multiple public markets throughout the City. Mr. Clifton answered affirmatively. He noted that, as of today, there are currently two public markets in the City, the Saturday Edmonds Historical Museum’s Summer Farmers Market and the Wednesday ECC Foundation’s Farmer’s Market at Salish Crossing. He reminded the Board of an article he referenced on May 22nd about the trend in cities throughout the world to have small public markets located in neighborhoods. He noted that the current proposal is not suggesting that public markets be allowed in the Neighborhood Business (BN) zones at this time. This issue will be addressed as part of the Westgate and Five Corners District Plans. The proposed amendments would only apply to the BC, BD and CG zones.

Chair Reed noted that there is a large public market located near the Sound in Olympia. He asked if this same type of use would be allowed on the Edmonds waterfront, as long as it is sponsored by a non-profit organization. Mr. Clifton said it is not the intent to preclude indoor or outdoor public markets in any of the BN, BC or CG zones, but the market would have to be sponsored by a non-profit organization. Mr. Chave clarified that a for-profit organization or entity could establish a year-round public market, but it would have to be located indoors and operated as a general retail use. For example, the antique mall is a form of public market that is allowed as a general retail use but it restricted to inside sales.

Board Member Lovell asked if the ordinance would allow the City to partner with a property owner to develop a permanent location for a year-round public market. He also asked if the City would be allowed to recover funds spent to create a market. Mr. Clifton answered that the City could enter into a mutual agreement with a developer to create a permanent public market, and they would also be allowed to recover their investment. However, the City would not be allowed to make a profit from the project.

Mr. Clifton advised that a gentleman previously expressed interest in doing a Calgary-style public market at Salish Crossing before it was purchased by the current owner. Unfortunately, the previous property owner was asking so much for the property that the project did not pencil out. He summarized that there is an interest for public markets in the City. The challenge is trying to find another individual who wants to move the concept forward.

Board Member Clarke asked if the City can control the use of the name “Edmonds.” Mr. Clifton noted that “Edmonds” is used in the name in a lot of different businesses, and he is not sure the City would want to corner the name unless they are in partnership with someone who wants to use that name. Board Member Clarke pointed out that farmers markets in Seattle are generally identified by the neighborhood in which they are located. Using the name “Edmonds Farmers Market” does not give a clear indication of where the activity is located. Mr. Clifton pointed out that everyone seems to know where the Pike Place Market is located even though it is not called the “Seattle Market.” A market will become known by whatever name it is given, whether it includes a reference to a geographic location or not. Vice Chair Stewart asked what the public market at Salish Crossing would be called. Board Member Cloutier said the official name of the market is the Salish Crossing Farmers’ Market.

Mr. Clifton summarized that the proposed and adopted amendments to ECC 4.90 and ECDC 16 and 20 have cleared up the code language extensively. It will be fairly easy to incorporate additional minor amendments that come up later.

CHAIR REED OPENED THE PUBLIC HEARING. AS THERE WAS NO ONE IN THE AUDIENCE, THE PUBLIC PORTION OF THE HEARING WAS CLOSED.

Board Member Clarke pointed out that some of eliminated terms are fairly common and are used to describe a specific type of public market. He asked what the new permit application would be called. Mr. Clifton answered that the “public market application” would be used for all permits for farmers’ markets, open-air community markets, etc. He noted that all of these common terms were included in the definition for “public market” (ECDC 21.80.103).

BOARD MEMBER LOVELL MOVED TO FORWARD THE PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO ECDC 16 AND 21 TO THE CITY COUNCIL AS OUTLINED IN INTERIM ORDINANCE 3921 WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL. THE ORDINANCE WOULD ALLOW PUBLIC MARKETS IN ALL BC, BN AND CG ZONES. BOARD MEMBER CLARKE SECONDED THE MOTION.

BOARD MEMBER LOVELL AMENDED HIS MOTION TO INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING AMENDMENTS TO ORDINANCE 3921:

- **AMEND THE DEFINITION FOR PUBLIC MARKET (ECDC 21.80.103) BY CHANGING “OR” IN THE LAST SENTENCE TO “AND/OR.”**
- **ADD A PROVISION THAT RESTRICTS PUBLIC MARKETS LOCATED ADJACENT TO RS ZONES TO INDOORS ONLY.**

BOARD MEMBER CLARKE, THE SECONDER OF THE MOTION, ACCEPTED THE AMENDMENT. THE MOTION, AS AMENDED, CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

DISCUSSION ON INCENTIVE ZONING OPPORTUNITIES AND HIGHWAY 99 ZONING INCENTIVES/ISSUES

Mr. Chave advised that during the Strategic Action Plan (SAP) process, Highway 99 was prominently mentioned as an opportunity for some initiatives to encourage development along the corridor. The purpose of this agenda item is to continue that discussion. He specifically suggested the Commission discuss ways to promote and encourage transit-oriented development (TOD), particularly in association with Community Transit’s SWIFT Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) service that is currently in place along Highway 99. He said the Highway 99 Task Force has also discussed the TOD concept, and they have an interest in station-oriented planning around the two BRT stations in Edmonds. He referred to the attachments provided in the Staff Report which includes a summary of the SAP (Attachment 1), minutes from the Highway 99 Report dated April 24, 2013 (Attachment 2), TOD-101 Guidebook (Attachment 3), Sound Transit’s TOD policy (Attachment 4), and TOD design guidelines for the Capital Hill area in Seattle (Attachment 5).

Mr. Chave recalled that, previously, the Planning Board proposed some targeted zoning changes for properties near the Highway 99 Corridor. The current code allows medical uses in the multi-family residential (RM) zones near the hospital, but a conditional use permit is required. This requirement can and does discourage the expansion or development of medical uses. He expressed his belief that the previously-proposed zoning was not targeted well enough and the proposed height limit (55 feet and more in some locations) raised concerns amongst the multi-family residents and property owners in the area. He

APPROVED

suggested the Board reconsider the concept. A type of Business Residential (BR) zoning might be appropriate for properties in this area to allow some degree of business development without requiring a conditional use permit. He reminded the Board that the mixed-use zoning concept applied to the Highway 99 Corridor does not require commercial development on the ground floor. Instead, it allows a developer to intermix the uses in different ways.

Board Member Lovell said he currently serves on Sound Transit's Citizens Oversight Panel. He referred to Sound Transit's TOD Policy (Attachment 4), which was issued in December of 2012. He said the panel studied the policy, particularly the policy that requires Sound Transit to sell any land it purchases to build the rail system or anything that goes along with, including extra land for staging, storage, etc., as soon as the project is done. The panel discussed that Sound Transit should do more than just sell the land; they should leverage the sale of the land to promote TOD in conjunction with the transit system. This will create more ridership, and ridership will help the community grow.

Board Member Lovell referred to the chart on the last page of Attachment 4, which identifies both agency TOD strategies and community TOD strategies. He suggested they could cobble the language in the "Community TOD" column to fit the City's needs for both Highway 99 and the waterfront where the TOD concept came up in conjunction with the proposed Harbor Square Master Plan. His thought is that the City should attach some verbiage to various zones within Edmonds to make them more amenable to TOD and perhaps even force TOD in some situations. As an example, he referred to a TOD policy initiative that was adopted for the properties around the Roosevelt Station at 65th and Roosevelt in Seattle. The initiative involved a long public process, and there were some attempts to try and beef up the station structure so that buildings could be constructed on top. Although it was later determined that the option would not be economically feasible, the process resulted in a plan to essentially rebuild the area. The height limit was increased to allow eight to ten-story buildings, and Sound Transit recently awarded a contract for the tunnel. They anticipate that station construction will get started soon, as well. He noted that a similar process was used for the Northgate and Capital Hill stations. He recommended the City consider a similar planning process for the Highway 99 Corridor and perhaps other areas in Edmonds.

Board Member Tibbott asked Board Member Lovell to identify areas in Edmonds where the TOD concept could be applied. Board Member Lovell advised that TOD would be supported by the SWIFT BRT line, particularly near the two stations in Edmonds. He said the demand for TOD would increase if and when the light rail is expanded to 220th Street in Edmonds. He noted that the medical area could become another TOD nucleus. He said the City should also pay attention to the potential expansion of Sound Transit's light rail service through Lynnwood. With the rail service, ferry service and bus service, the waterfront area may be another good location for Edmonds to apply the TOD concept. Board Member Tibbott questioned if it would be appropriate to apply the TOD concept to the Westgate and Five Corners commercial areas, as well. Mr. Chave pointed out that the Westgate and Five Corners commercial areas are of a different scale than the commercial area along Highway 99. While TOD may be a factor in these areas, opportunities would be more limited. Board Member Lovell said he envisions these areas providing more low-cost residential housing that would allow people to live in Edmonds at a reasonable price.

Board Member Tibbott asked Board Member Lovell to share information about Sound Transit's plan to expand rail service along the waterfront. Board Member Lovell pointed out that another station in Seattle is indicated in order to expand ridership of this rail line. Sound Transit must also address issues related to the frequent mudslides that interrupt service. Mr. Chave pointed out that any TOD in the downtown/waterfront area would not be based solely on the rail service. It would be designed to take advantage of a combination of transit opportunities, including the ferry and bus service.

Vice Chair Stewart asked the timeline for light rail coming to 220th Street. Mr. Clifton answered that Sound Transit's goal is to have light rail service to Lynnwood by 2023. He said he serves on Sound Transit's Multi-Jurisdictional North Link Community Advisory Committee. He wrote a letter to Sound Transit on behalf of Mayor Earling, publicly requesting a station at 220th Street, and the City's request has received support from Mountlake Terrace, as well. He noted that 220th is a busy east/west corridor, and a station in this location would make sense. He said Sound Transit has agreed to study the proposal as part of their Phase 3 work.

Board Member Ellis said that as he read through the materials contained in the Staff Report, he got the impression that TOD depends on increased residential density. He asked how this would fit in with the reluctance of many people in Edmonds to accept change in areas such as Harbor Square and Highway 99. Mr. Chave explained that the capacity for future growth on Highway 99 is already available through existing zoning along the corridor. The bigger question is whether the zoning

regulations allow sufficient flexibility for the potential growth capacity to be realized. He pointed out that TOD is more doable on Highway 99, where it is supported by the SWIFT BRT service. Board Member Ellis pointed out that Edmonds' share of the anticipated growth in Snohomish County is small. Mr. Chave reminded the Board that, rather than increasing density in residential areas, the City is relying on redevelopment along the Highway 99 Corridor where there is a tremendous amount of capacity to help them meet their growth targets.

Mr. Clifton recalled that when he previously presented information to the Board regarding the Highway 99 Corridor, he highlighted the Behar proposal that was presented a few years ago to the City Council as a potential redevelopment concept. The developer had planned to move the project forward in 2009 before the economy tanked. The project is still alive, but the developer needs commitment from future tenants before it can move forward. He said this project would result in five or six-story development at the intersection of Highway 99 and 220th Street and is a good example of redevelopment interest along the corridor.

Mr. Chave explained that, historically, Edmonds has never met its targets for projected population growth. Although it has the capacity to accommodate the growth, sufficient development to meet the growth targets did not occur. He noted that Edmonds must compete in a regional market, and development typically occurs where it is most feasible first. He expressed his belief that a catalyst project would help to spur redevelopment along the Highway 99 Corridor, and that is why it is important for the City to revisit its zoning regulations to identify any unnecessary obstacles that might discourage redevelopment.

Mr. Chave said a few property owners on Highway 99 between 236th and 238th Streets have indicated a desire to move forward with a mixed-use development, and they approached the Highway 99 Task Force to discuss modifying the zoning around the station area to accommodate their project. The issue was presented to the City Council at their spring retreat, and some interest was expressed about studying the option further. He suggested that perhaps it would be appropriate for the Planning Board to meet with Economic Development Commission's (EDC) Land-Use Committee, as well as members of the Highway 99 Task Force to discuss the options. He noted that other communities are planning for TOD, as well, so the City would not have to reinvent the wheel.

Board Member Clarke said he has done a lot of professional work in locations where TOD is taking place. He pointed out the importance of having flexible codes in place to allow the market to determine what is developed in any given location. For example, the City of Lynnwood made the decision that the southwest corner of 196th Street and Highway 99 would be a good place for TOD. Their zoning regulations indicated that mixed-use development, with multi-family residential units, was desirable, but the land owner decided to develop a shopping center instead. The developer had to convince the Lynnwood City Council that a shopping center was a better choice in that location. The City Council determined that the retail and property taxes generated by the proposal would have a significant benefit to the community, and they overturned the previous TOD plan to accommodate the new shopping center.

Board Member Clarke said he has appraised several of the new buildings along the light rail route. He said it is amazing how much property values increase when a city changes zoning regulations to allow taller buildings and greater densities and to remove the requirement for commercial space on the ground floor. He summarized that having flexibility allows for maximum development, which is needed along Highway 99. He encouraged the Board to look at a bigger vision for Highway 99 and create zoning or districts that provide the maximum flexibility possible.

Board Member Clarke pointed out that the Behar proposal is for a large-scale, mixed-use development with retail space, office space, transient lodging, etc. He commented that TOD includes a broader scale of uses than just multi-family residential, and providing as much flexibility as possible will encourage development and perhaps stop the sprawl of medical uses to inappropriate locations. Mr. Chave clarified that TOD does not mean that every project must be mixed-use with residential units, but it does usually require higher densities.

Mr. Chave pointed out that the current zoning along Highway 99 is generally consistent with Board Member Clarke's comments, but perhaps it does not go far enough to provide flexibility and more options to developers and to encourage TOD development. Staff is hoping that is the direction the Board would like to go with Highway 99. He agreed with Board Member Clarke that mandating a certain type of TOD development would not be productive because it is impossible to predict when the market will change in such a way that more transit-friendly development will occur. He commented that

TOD is not a one-size-fits-all concept. It is more about whether or not an area supports transit opportunities, and it is possible to help populate an area or site by providing incentives to encourage the type of development desired for a particular area.

Board Member Clarke said it may be necessary to redraw the natural boundaries of zoning along Highway 99. He pointed out that many of the commercial properties along Highway 99 are challenging to develop because of topography and because the east/west depth is shallow. He recalled that the expansion of Valley Hospital in Monroe required the City to realign the zoning to include a portion of a residential neighborhood in the hospital zone. He also recalled that zoning boundaries were changed to accommodate expansion of Overlake Hospital. He summarized that redevelopment started to occur once these cities started to look at the entire neighborhood as a medical campus. He suggested that the City should consider this approach, as well. It is important to plan long term for expansion and change. They are very fortunate to have a hospital located within Edmonds, and they need to support its changing needs.

Vice Chair Stewart agreed with Board Members Lovell and Clarke. It is important to look forward and be somewhat flexible, particularly on Highway 99, to enable forward thinking ideas that embody TOD. She noted that Highway 99 is also a good location to target affordable housing, public amenities, green space, gathering places, etc. to make the area more attractive for people to live and work.

Board Member Tibbott referred to an article he recently read in *THE WALL STREET JOURNAL* about how Seattle's light rail system has impacted the cost of housing in areas near the stations. Housing near the stations is no longer affordable. This article suggests that affordable housing is more likely to be in places like Five Corners and Westgate. As long as there are opportunities to access transit in these locations, they will be suitable for lower-cost housing.

Chair Reed pointed out that the zoning along Highway 99 is all CG or CG2, and the Comprehensive Plan includes an extensive element about the Highway 99 Corridor. He suggested that Board Members review this information in preparation for future discussions. He further suggested that the best approach would be for the Board to appoint a subcommittee of members to discuss the issue further. Perhaps the subcommittee could meet with the EDC's Land Use Subcommittee and members of the Highway 99 Task Force.

Board Member Tibbott questioned how the form-based code concept could be implemented in some areas of the Highway 99 Corridor without applying it to all the CG zones. Mr. Chave said the concept could be applied to areas within a ½ mile radius of the SWIFT stations or the International District as an overlay or it could be applied to the entire CG zone. Board Member Lovell asked if the overlays would have to coincide with property lines. Mr. Chave said that would generally be wise, but would not be a requirement. Board Member Lovell pointed out that most of the current development on Highway 99 is single story. If the zoning is changed to encourage taller structures with more density, property owners may start to assemble properties to create larger developments that make economic sense.

Board Member Lovell agreed it would be appropriate to form a subcommittee to study the issue further and put together a list of things the City could allow to provide greater flexibility and encourage redevelopment. The list could include taller buildings, lower parking requirements, maximum flexibility for uses, incentives for green elements, and reduced setbacks. Mr. Chave agreed that would be a good approach. Once the list has been created, the subcommittee could meet with members of the Highway 99 Task Force and perhaps the EDC's land-use subcommittee to solicit additional ideas and feedback. Mr. Clifton suggested it would be beneficial to start the process with a meeting with representatives from the three groups so they can reach a collective agreement on how to move forward. He noted that the Highway 99 Task Force has discussed this issue at length, and their input would be helpful.

Board Member Clarke asked what process the City of Shoreline used to move their Highway 99 planning process forward. Mr. Chave answered that Shoreline had an extensive public process, but their project was much more substantial than what the City of Edmonds is currently considering.

Board Member Cloutier asked if there are infrastructure limitations that would prevent more density on Highway 99. Mr. Chave said he does anticipate this would be a problem. He noted that greater density and taller buildings on Highway 99 have been part of the Highway 99 zoning for quite some time. When various elements of the Comprehensive Plan are updated, they are supposed to look at capacity to accommodate the maximum development allowed under existing zoning.

Board Member Duncan said he grew up in a small town in South Carolina that was located along a State highway. When development occurred along the highway, it became a barrier to the downtown area. He cautioned that the City should avoid a similar situation from happening on Highway 99.

Board Member Lovell and Chair Reed agreed to serve on the Planning Board Subcommittee to study the Highway 99 issue further. They agreed to work with staff to set up a meeting with representatives from the Highway 99 Task Force and the EDC's land use subcommittee. Board Member Lovell said he would attend the next EDC meeting, where he would share the Board's proposed approach for moving the discussion forward. Once again, Board Member Reed encouraged Board Members to review the Comprehensive Plan elements related to the Highway 99 Corridor and CG zoning.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Chair Reed reviewed the extended agenda as follows:

- Three public hearings are scheduled for June 26th: a public hearing on a rezone application for properties located at 403 and 405 Third Avenue North, a public hearing on the Sanitary Sewer Comprehensive Plan Element Update, and a public hearing on the park naming for the SR-104 Mini Park. Mr. Chave reminded the Board that the public hearing for the rezone application is quasi-judicial, so Board Members should avoid discussing the proposal with anyone outside of the hearing.
- On June 25th, Vice Chair Stewart will present the Planning Board's quarterly report to the City Council.
- The City Council has scheduled a mini retreat on June 17th, and the agenda has been published on the City's website. The meeting is open to the public. Mr. Chave advised that a representative from the Washington State Department of Transportation will speak to the City Council about potential corridor studies for SR-104 and how they might relate to the Westgate code. Chair Reed noted that after the retreat, the City Council may be ready to give the Board direction for moving forward with either the Westgate or Five Corners plans.
- A public hearing on proposed amendments to the Commercial Business – Edmonds Way (BC-EW) and Multi-Family Residential – Edmonds Way (RM-EW) zones is scheduled for July 10th. Continued work on either the Westgate Plan or the Five Corners Plan is also tentatively scheduled for that evening, pending direction from the City Council. The Board will also discuss implementation strategies for the Strategic Action Plan.
- The Board will have a discussion regarding the telecommunication regulations on July 24th, and the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director will present the quarterly Parks Report.
- The August 28th meeting was cancelled.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Reed thanked Vice Chair Stewart for chairing the May 22nd meeting in his absence. He also thanked Board Member Tibbott for agreeing to judge the sandcastle contest.

Chair Reed reported that he and Vice Chair Stewart met with Mayor Earling and Council President Petso to review the Board's extended agenda. He said the meetings are helpful to get insight from both the City Council and the Mayor.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Tibbott requested an update on the outcome of the meeting with representatives from the Planning Board, City Council and Port Commission regarding the Harbor Square Master Plan. Board Member Lovell explained that at the May 21st City Council meeting, Council President Petso recommended, and the majority of the City Council concurred, that three members of the City Council should meet with representatives from the Planning Board and the Port. He said he was present to represent the Planning Board, and Council Members Petso, Fraley-Monillas and Peterson represented the City

APPROVED

Council. The Port was represented by Commissioners Orvis and Faires. The substance of the discussion was that the Port was not interested in participating in a City plan or subarea plan being worked on by the City Council. There is some desire on the part of the City Council to keep the review process going, but the Port representatives reiterated that the Port has withdrawn the plan so there is no need for the City Council to spend more time on the matter. In the Port's mind, the entire proposal is dead and nothing more should be done. Board Member Lovell said Council Member Petso will report the outcome of the meeting to the City Council, and he assumes the City Council will table the issue with no further action.

Board Member Tibbott advised that the Park Naming Committee will meet prior to the July 24th public hearing on the SR-104 Mini Park name.

Board Member Clarke recalled that throughout the Board's review of the Harbor Square Master Plan, he repeatedly raised the concern that the Port is allowing illegal parking to take place in the buffer setback area to the marsh. Since this was included in the public record, he asked why the City has not addressed the issue. Mr. Chave noted that code enforcement is done on a complaint basis. Board Member Clarke asked Mr. Chave to consider his comment as a complaint for the City to investigate.

Board Member Clarke inquired regarding the status of the Shoreline Master Program Update. Mr. Chave said the City Council has conducted one public hearing on the plan. They will have one more work session and a final hearing before taking final action. Board Member Clarke asked if the multi-family residential component (Urban Mixed Use III Environment) that was identified for the Harbor Square property would be adopted as part of the plan. Mr. Chave said that would be a topic of the City Council's continued discussion.

Vice Chair Stewart announced that the organization Imagine Edmonds has changed its name to Celebrate Edmonds. The group is intended to be a community enhancement organization, and its purpose is to enable the visioning that has been going on at the citizen level. The group has 12 members at this time, and they are currently pursuing 501c3 status, as well as grant funding. They have partnered with Swedish Edmonds and the Edmonds Senior Center to create a wellness program. She concluded that the group is moving forward in a positive direction. She said it does not appear that another hotel will be constructed anytime soon in downtown Edmonds, and the group has asked the Harbor Inn to consider developing their facility into a boutique-type motel.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 9:58 p.m.

APPROVED