

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

October 22, 2014

Chair Cloutier 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

Todd Cloutier, Chair
Neil Tibbott, Vice Chair
Bill Ellis
Philip Lovell
Daniel Robles
Careen Rubenkönig
Valerie Stewart
Mike Nelson

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Karin Noyes, Recorder

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

VICE CHAIR TIBBOTT MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF SEPTEMBER 24, 2014 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. CHAIR CLOUTIER SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

There was no one in the audience.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR REPORT TO PLANNING BOARD

Chair Cloutier referred the Board to the written Director's Report. Mr. Chave noted that, since the report was written, the City Council agreed to support the Draft Shoreline Master Update, and the document will come back for final approval on their consent agenda in mid November. He also noted that the City Council is scheduled to potentially take action on the Westgate Plan at their November 3rd meeting.

DISCUSSION OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN HOUSING ELEMENT

Mr. Chave referred to the draft Comprehensive Plan Housing Element update. He advised that the majority of the proposed changes in the first half of the element are intended to update data and integrate material from the Alliance for Affordable Housing (AAH) report that was previously presented to the Board. The "Strategies" section (starting on Page 11) was also updated to incorporate a goal found in the Countywide Planning Policies that talks about jurisdictions having strategies in place to address housing affordability. In addition, formatting changes have been proposed in the "Goals and Policies" section (beginning on Page 14) to make the format of the Housing Element consistent with the format used for the adopted

Sustainability Element and other recently updated elements of the Comprehensive Plan. The goal is for all of the various elements of the Comprehensive Plan to have consistent formatting.

Mr. Chave advised that a new "Implementation Actions and Performance Measures" section was added at the end of the Housing Element. He reminded the Board of the City's goal to incorporate implementation actions and at least one performance measure into each of the Comprehensive Plan Elements as they are updated. Staff is proposing the following Implementation Action and Performance Measure:

- Implementation Action: Develop a strategy by 2019 for increasing the supply of affordable housing and meeting diverse housing needs.
- Performance Measure: Number of residential units permitted each year.

Mr. Chave explained that the City does not currently have a strategy for increasing the supply of affordable housing. However, having a strategy in place is one of the policies established by the Snohomish County Alliance for Housing Affordability (AHA). The goal is to collaborate countywide to address the problem, and the idea of the proposed action is to work with the AHA to figure out the best way to implement the policy locally. This could entail zoning requirements and/or incentives for affordable housing that are triggered at a certain level of development. However, Edmonds does not have an administrative mechanism in place to enforce, monitor and track affordable housing, and City staff does not have the ability to take on this task. Working collaboratively with the AHA could provide an opportunity for the City to contract with the Housing Authority of Snohomish County for this service. In addition to discussing zoning requirements and incentives for affordable housing, the strategy could address other housing options, as well as an implementation mechanism.

Mr. Chave said the proposed performance measure would involve identifying the number of residential units permitted each year. This can be easily tracked and would enable the City to identify whether or not it is providing more housing in general. The intent of the performance measure is to identify increases in the housing supply, but also potentially measure the City's success at meeting other housing goals such as maintaining capacity for growth within the City.

Mr. Chave invited the Board to provide feedback regarding the Housing Element so the document can be updated before the Board's next meeting in November. He noted that both he and Ms. Hope worked on the draft language, with assistance from a planner working on contract with the City.

Board Member Lovell observed that the changes proposed in the first several pages represent a statistical update. It basically compares statistics from last time the element was updated with the new data, but it does not provide a lot of commentary as to whether the City is better or worse off than it was ten years ago. For example, the average household size in Edmonds decreased by nearly half a person and is at near 2 people per household. He asked if this is considered better or worse. Mr. Chave said some of the statistical changes are consistent with national trends, and others are county and local trends. It is difficult to place a judgment on the changes in data, most of which came from the AAH report.

Board Member Lovell referred to Page 8, which makes references to the need for local jurisdictions to have a Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan in place in order to obtain federal funding from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). He asked if Edmonds has a program in place or encourages the use HUD funding for projects in the City. Mr. Chave answered that the City does not have its own HUD program. However, they are currently in a consortium with Snohomish County, which serves as the agency for community development programs for federal HUD grants. The Snohomish County agency drafted and regularly updates the required Consolidated Housing and Community Development Plan; and every few years, there is a competitive process for funding allocations to jurisdictions in Snohomish County. With the exception of Everett, all other jurisdictions in the County participate in the joint program.

Board Member Lovell requested information about the process for applying for HUD grant funding for projects in Edmonds. Mr. Chave explained that, typically, HUD projects are aimed at low income people; and as a general rule, the City does not have the right demographics to qualify for HUD funding. However, there are opportunities for block grants to fund social projects, many related to seniors. For example, the City successfully obtained block grant funding for American's with Disabilities Act (ADA) sidewalk ramps. Many of the social programs are based in Everett, but they serve a countywide population.

Board Member Rubenkonig said she likes how the Housing Element is laid out, and it is clear that the City is endeavoring to meet the local, regional and federal goals for housing. She asked if it would be possible to provide a chart to illustrate the relationship between the City's goals and the regional and federal goals. She expressed her belief that the regional and federal goals tend to shape the local policy. Mr. Chave agreed to consider the best way to provide this information.

Board Member Rubenkonig pointed out that various agencies and groups influence local policies on housing, and the vocabularies used can be very different. She said she would like the terms to be as consistent as possible throughout the Housing Element. For example, the various documents use terms such as "disabled", "physically challenged" and "handicapped person." She noted that "handicapped person" is no longer an acceptable term and should be thrown out, and the Housing Element should consistently use either "physically challenged" or "disabled." Also, there is reference to both "seniors" and "elderly," and she would prefer to use the term "seniors." She questioned what population is being referenced by the term "special needs population." Also, the terms "economically challenged" versus "low income." She noted that a person may not be considered "low-income," but could be "economically challenged" when it comes to finding affordable housing in Edmonds. Lastly, she asked where "mentally and emotionally challenged" individuals would fit into the housing goals. She questioned if "housing for the disadvantaged" would cover all of the situations listed above. She summarized that the terms need to be clarified and consistent so it is clear who the City is trying to assist in meeting housing goals.

Board Member Stewart commended staff for preparing updates to a comprehensive document. She referred to the third bulleted item from the bottom on Page 9, which talks about increasing the incidence of home ownership. She said she assumes this strategy is aimed at people who want to own their homes. However, the City must recognize that the current trend is towards rentals. She expressed the need for the strategy to address all housing needs, both owned and rental. Mr. Chave said the language was taken directly from the AHA Report.

Board Member Stewart referred to the "Housing Needs" section, starting on Page 10. She noted that the need to provide healthy indoor air quality is missing from the language. This can be addressed through the types of materials used in construction and by making sure no mold is occurring in the units. She suggested that the need for healthy living should be addressed somewhere in the Housing Element.

Board Member Stewart said she supports using the concept of "designed infill," but she questioned how the City would ensure that infill development is designed in a way that is consistent with existing development in the neighborhood. She suggested that perhaps the City could require design review for infill residential development. She observed that a lot of indiscriminate infill development has occurred that is neither consistent nor in character with the surrounding neighborhood. Board Member Rubenkonig said she supports the concept of requiring design review for infill residential development to ensure that it is keeping with the neighborhood character, but design review should not apply citywide to all single-family residential development.

Mr. Chave explained that "designed infill" was intended to be a general conceptual term used when the Comprehensive Plan was initially adopted in 1995 as required by the Growth Management Act (GMA). The principle intent of the "designed infill" concept is to encourage development to occur within the overall fabric of the City without doing wholesale zoning changes that allow multi-family residential uses to creep into single-family residential neighborhoods. It was never the intent of the City's decision makers to require design review for single-family residential homes, and it is not currently required. The City regulates single-family residential development via the bulk standards, and it would be very difficult to come up with design guidelines that identify the character of each neighborhood on a street-by-street basis. It is very rare to find a citywide single-family design review requirement in any jurisdiction. However, there are exemptions for "historic districts" and "planned developments" where the City has an opportunity to require a specific style and/or design.

Chair Cloutier agreed that "designed infill" is a conceptual term. The idea was rather than expanding the commercial and/or multi-family residential boundaries, the City would target the codes to encourage infill development in residential zones and higher-density redevelopment on Highway 99, at Westgate, etc. Regardless of what alternatives the City chooses to use, it must accommodate its allocated growth targets. He noted that jurisdictions in the region have used a number of approaches for accomplishing this goal such as skinny houses and cottage homes that intensify the density in residential zones. Many also have liberal requirements for accessory dwelling units (ADUs) that essentially allow a second dwelling on a residential lot.

Board Member Stewart questioned why the City should have a policy for encouraging infill development to be consistent with the neighborhood and community character if there is no way to implement it. She commented that developers tend to do whatever they can to build the largest structures possible on the available land, and they do not necessarily care if it is keeping with the neighborhood character. Mr. Chave said developers are not necessarily more likely to build homes that do not fit in with the neighborhood. The City has received permit applications from individual property owners who are proposing crazy designs that do not fit in.

Board Member Stewart pointed out that the proposed amendments would eliminate the concept of “cottage housing” altogether. She felt it should be put back in, perhaps on Page 15 under the goals and policies, as a potential affordable housing option, especially for people who own larger lots and do not want to subdivide and redevelop their property with larger homes. She said she would like to build a cottage on her property, but it is not allowed under the current code. Mr. Chave explained that, at the time the current Housing Element was written, the City was exploring the option of cottage housing. The intent of this section is to summarize what the City is actually doing and what has been done. Because the City is no longer exploring the concept, staff is recommending that it be removed. However, the goals and policies section could specifically mention the need to explore the concept of cottage housing.

Vice Chair Tibbott suggested that Board Member Stewart is describing an ADU or guest house as opposed to a cottage development. Mr. Chave pointed out that the current code only allows guest houses on large lot, and accessory dwelling units must be attached to the main structure. However, the City of Seattle allows detached ADU’s that are set back on the lot so the property appears as a single-family residence home from the street. Board Member Stewart expressed her desire for the City to reevaluate its ADU regulations and make them more flexible.

Vice Chair Tibbott pointed out that cottage housing projects typically consist of a number of units on a few acres of land. Board Member Stewart agreed and suggested this is an attractive option for the City to consider because it allows developers to position buildings in a way that protects the existing natural features. Mr. Chave recalled that some jurisdictions have experimented with the concept in recent years, but many no longer allow the use. In Edmonds, the Council specifically decided against implementing the option. However, the City offers the “planned residential development” concept as a way to cluster lots and homes to protect existing natural features without increasing the overall density of the property. Cottage housing, on the other hand, allows smaller homes on smaller lots, and a density bonus is traditionally offered. If the Board wants to study the concept further, they could add it into the policy section of the element.

Board Member Lovell noted that the second bulleted item under “Low-Cost Housing Types” on Page 13 indicates that mixed-use zoning has been applied in the Westgate Corridor. Other places in the Housing Element mentions pursuing revised development regulations to allow more opportunities for affordable housing at Westgate. The language is written in the context that the Westgate Plan has already been adopted, but that is not yet the case. Mr. Chave said the language anticipates that the plan will be adopted, and it is scheduled on the City Council’s extended agenda for action on November 3rd. The Housing Element will not be adopted until sometime after that, and any changes related to the City Council’s action can be incorporated.

Board Member Rubenkonig referred to Item 1.2 on Page 17 and suggested that the specific “activity centers” be called out in the paragraph. Mr. Chave noted that the activity centers are called out specifically in the Land-Use Element, with a large section talking about each one. In addition, the Comprehensive Plan Land-Use Map specifically identifies the activity centers (Medical Use/Highway 99 and Downtown). The intent is that a person would read the Comprehensive Plan as an entire document, and it would be a little out of context if you look only at the Housing Element. Board Member Rubenkonig suggested it would help the reader understand the areas referred to as “activity centers” if they are specifically identified in the Housing Element. Mr. Chave suggested that a footnote could be added to direct the reader to the Land-Use Element for more information about activity centers.

Board Member Robles commented that Board Member Stewart’s comments about ADUs and cottage housing fall within the spectrum of affordable housing options that seem to be under discussed. Allowing detached cottages or ADUs could benefit groups such as seniors who want to stay in their homes, seniors who need assisted living, children who return to live at home, etc. He expressed his belief that residential property owners should be given the same wherewithal as developers to develop their properties. He suggested that the ADU concept needs more than a mere mention; perhaps it could be an additional category. Mr. Chave referred to the proposed Implementation Action on Page 17, which calls for developing a strategy for

increasing the supply of affordable housing and meeting diverse housing needs. ADUs could be part of this discussion as one option for providing affordable housing. Ideally, a housing strategy will identify a number of different options, and not just low-income housing.

Board Member Lovell observed that, for years, it has been discussed that Edmonds is largely a residential community that is 95% built out. However, he questioned if the community, and particularly the City Council, would support a policy for allowing people to hold on to their lots by building ADUs or cottages or subdividing their properties into two lots for smaller units. He did not believe this concept would be supported, given the current demographics of the City, which is largely single-family residential homeowners with higher incomes. Board Member Stewart pointed out that older residents cannot always afford to keep their larger homes, and allowing ADUs and cottages could be a desirable option for these people.

Vice Chair Tibbott pointed out that, as per the AHA Report, the City of Edmonds (36%) has a higher percentage of people living in multi-family housing compared to the rest of the County (31%). However, the report does not provide a breakdown of how much of the 36% is owner-occupied. Conceivably, as they continue on the path they are on where they are looking at available land as the place for multi-family housing, the ratio would continue to increase in the City. This causes him to wonder what direction they may be setting in motion by not considering ADUs and other options for infill development in the single-family zones.

Chair Cloutier referred to the proposed implementation action and performance measure. Given that the City has a goal to increase affordable housing and their action is to increase the supply of affordable housing, the performance measure should relate specific to affordable housing rather than just number of units. For example, the performance measure could be attached to the census or when information from other agencies is available. Mr. Chave advised that the goal is to report on the performance measures on a yearly basis, and it would not be possible to obtain information related specifically to affordable housing that frequently. Chair Cloutier suggested that perhaps there are other, indirect indicators that would help the City find the needed information.

Chair Cloutier commented that using a performance measure that is based on the number of units would be good, but the Board discussed trying to identify the total number of bedrooms available in the City. He acknowledged that this data would be difficult to find, but it is available through the census and in the County's records. Board Member Lovell expressed his belief that it would be virtually impossible to establish how many bedrooms there are in the City. It would also be difficult to equate the number of bedrooms with the number of people. No matter how many bedrooms are identified on a title, many of them are overbooked and others are not used at all. Chair Cloutier commented that the performance measure is supposed to be related to how much available room the City has, and identifying the number of units is less direct. If the number doesn't tell you what you need to know, there is no purpose for the measurement. He suggested that both numbers should be considered.

Vice Chair Tibbott pointed out that the proposed performance measure would measure new housing stock, and not existing bedrooms or units. Information regarding the number of bedrooms could be found on the construction plans. Mr. Chave agreed that the City could measure the number of new bedrooms that are constructed in the City. Chair Cloutier felt it would be appropriate to measure both the number of new units and the number of new bedrooms each year to evaluate whether or not the City is moving in a healthy direction.

Mr. Chave questioned whether tracking the number of additional bedrooms would really tell the City anything. The better data would be changes in the number of units and the size of the average household. While the number of new units could be collected on an annual basis, the data related to the average household size would only be available every few years. Based on building permit data, the City can report details about the types of housing constructed, the number of bedrooms, and the value of the units.

Board Member Lovell stressed that the most visible strategy the City needs to achieve is creating more opportunities for multi-family residential development in the City. If they are doing that, the City, as a whole, is striving to accommodate increased population. He cautioned against adding affordable housing, size of the units and number of bedrooms to the equation, since these are unpredictable and outside of the City's control. He said he supports the vernacular that says the City is doing certain things to increase opportunities for mixed-use development and encourage multi-family housing. They need to continue strategies that support this goal.

Board Member Rubenkönig referred to the section related to “Assisted Housing Availability” on Page 10, and suggested that this paragraph is very important to address when considering potential performance measures. She questioned if the Housing Element, as currently proposed, would adequately encourage more senior housing, more assisted living, and more affordable housing. Mr. Chave clarified that assisted care is very different than assisted housing. This paragraph is intended to report information on different kinds of housing that receives some type of assistance, whether through Section 8 or another type of subsidy. Board Member Rubenkönig asked if the language adequately addresses whether the City needs more assisted housing capacity. Mr. Chave referred to the note just prior to the paragraph, which indicates that City staff is in the process of updating this section. Board Member Rubenkönig suggested that the language should clarify how assisted housing fits into the diagram of affordable housing. Board Member Lovell said Board Member Rubenkönig appears to be asking if this section would include a provision for the City to pursue more government assisted housing. Board Member Rubenkönig agreed that she is interested in increasing the capacity over what currently exists. Mr. Chave said the AHA Report identifies the City’s current needs, and this data can be added to the section. However, it is important to note that the City does not have control over HUD, but it can provide information about what currently exists and what the needs are. The future housing strategy could discuss how the City could work with HUD to address its needs.

Board Member Robles commented that if the City were to take a lot of possibilities out of the extra legal sector so someone could report current situations such as accessory dwelling units, mother-in-law apartments, etc. as permitted uses without the threat of being shut down, the City would be able to obtain a more accurate count of the number of bedrooms and units available in the City.

INTRODUCTION OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN GENERAL INTRODUCTION AND LAND USE ELEMENT

Mr. Chave advised that the General Introduction and Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan are being presented to the Board for feedback, but changes have not yet been drafted. At this time, the City’s contract planner, Mr. Shipley, is pouring through reports and finding data to update the Land Use Element, which contains a substantial amount of background information and numbers.

Mr. Chave reviewed that, as part of the update, the City is required to update its capacity numbers. The overall planned capacity they must address moves from 2025 in the current plan to 2035 in the new plan. Snohomish County, working with jurisdictions through Snohomish County Tomorrow, has established initial planning targets for this time frame, including both population and employment. Consistent with the Puget Sound Regional Council’s 2040 Plan, the population numbers must be translated into number of units. The City must match up the existing capacity with existing zoning to figure out if they have enough future capacity to meet the population and job targets of if zoning changes are needed.

Mr. Chave commented that the City is in a better place than many jurisdictions. For example, a tremendous amount of growth is targeted in Everett, and they have nowhere near the capacity. Lynnwood and Bothell are having capacity issues, as well. Because the City of Edmonds is designated as a “large city,” its growth projections are more moderate, but they do have to analyze and show their work in terms of capacity. While Highway 99 may have more capacity than has been considered in the past, not a lot of residential development has occurred in the area to justify the higher capacity number. If the City indicates that more population going forward will be handled along Highway 99, it must provide justification for this increased capacity. One example is the Planning Board’s recent recommendation on zoning changes along Highway 99 to open more of the General Commercial zoning for residential development. This could be a significant factor when looking at capacity.

Mr. Chave advised that, from a quick preliminary look, it appears the capacity numbers the County counts in the Buildable Lands Report consider that residential development would occur at Harbor Square. Because the City Council took action that eliminated this potential, the City’s capacity to accommodate growth decreased. By the same token, the Building Lands report did not take into account additional capacity for residential uses at Westgate. He summarized that he does not believe that wholesale policy changes will be needed at this point. The updates to the Land Use Element will be primarily related to updating the data.

Board Member Lovell said it appears the intent behind updating the Land Use element is to investigate and measure the City’s projections into the future to ascertain whether it can meet the GMA goals. Mr. Chave concurred. If the City finds

through its analysis that it cannot meet its projected capacity, it would be obliged to make changes in policy or zoning to show how capacity can be increased to meet GMA requirements. Board Member Lovell asked Mr. Chave where he believes the City will be. Mr. Chave answered that if the City Council adopts the Westgate Plan and proposed amendments to Highway 99 zoning, the City should be close to meeting capacity.

Vice Chair Tibbott referred to Figure 9 on Page 40 and said it appears that somewhere around the year 2025, the City will max out its capacity. Mr. Chave explained that the capacity comes from the Buildable Lands Report that is updated regularly by the County, and it is not a fixed number. It identifies how much land is actually available for development at a given point in time, and the number can change. There are assumptions that only a certain percentage of the available land within a jurisdictions is available and on the market at any given time.

Vice Chair Tibbott said he is guessing the County made some assumptions about the possibility of infill when creating the capacity chart. Mr. Chave said the County actually did an analysis using GIS looking at different parcel sizes. This analysis was matched with data from the County Assessor for value. If the value of improvements is less than a certain percentage relative to the value of the land, the property is determined to be developable because it is essentially underutilized. Vice Chair Tibbott noted that the green box within the chart would actually increase in size if land use on Highway 99 permitted more residential construction along the corridor. The same would be true for Westgate. Mr. Chave agreed that the capacity would increase as a result of these two actions. Vice Chair Tibbott noted that the height of the bars (population growth) would continue to increase, and would extend beyond the box (existing capacity) by the year 2025. Mr. Chave agreed that the bars would get higher because the City would have more population to accommodate. It is important to increase the size of the box (capacity) to contain the bars (population growth).

Board Member Ellis referred to Figure 8 on Page 38 and requested more information about the various categories illustrated on the pie chart. Mr. Chave clarified that “single-family resource” refers to the RS-12 and RS-20 zones, “single-family urban” refers to the RS-6 and RS-8 zones, ROW refers to rights-of-way, and “corridor development” refers to all corridors in the City except Edmonds Way. . He noted that rights-of-way make up a significant portion of the City’s total land area, and that is why a “complete streets” program is important to make the most use of this land.

Vice Chair Tibbott observed that 36% of Edmonds’ population lives in multi-family housing, but only 3.3% of the City’s total land area is zoned for multi-family residential development. Mr. Chave said the complicating factor is that multi-family residential development is also allowed in the mixed use zones such as the downtown commercial area, Highway 99, etc. Vice Chair Tibbott asked if it would be appropriate to add “mixed-use” as another category on the pie chart. Mr. Chave agreed that would be a better description since all of the commercial zones allow for mixed-use development, with the exception of Harbor Square. He agreed to come up with some clearer terminology as part of the draft update.

Board Member Ellis asked why the RS-12 and RS-20 zones are called “single family resource.” Mr. Chave explained that these larger zones are unique and tied to the presence of critical areas, steep slopes, and other constraints on why they cannot be smaller lots. This was done during the period of time when the Growth Hearings Board put out a rule that urban residential zones must allow at least four units per acre. The distinction of single-family resource is tied to resource protection and was added to the Comprehensive Plan to justify the need to maintain the larger lots. The rule has since been struck down by courts, so the single-family resource category is arguably less important.

Board Member Stewart inquired about the best way for her to submit her minor changes to the Land Use Element. Chair Cloutier suggested that the minor changes could be submitted to staff via email for inclusion in the draft that is presented for Commission review and discussion on November 12th. However, he encouraged the Commissioners to raise their more significant concerns and comments now. Mr. Chave requested feedback as to whether the figures and tables provided in the current draft are helpful and if there are additional items the Commission would like added. Chair Cloutier summarized that the Board appreciates the graphics provided in the Land Use Element, but they would like staff to make sure that clear definitions are provided for the terminology. They agreed that consistent terminology should be used throughout the element.

Chair Cloutier reminded the Board that a section would be added at the end of the Land Use Element to identify an implementation action and performance measure. He suggested it might be helpful to identify these two elements first and

then create graphs and charts that are consistent. For example, if they are looking to increase percentage of land in the City that is available for multi-family residential development, this should be called out in all of the graphs and charts.

Vice Chair Tibbott referred to the third paragraph on Page 49, which states that the largest, single factor affecting the downtown waterfront area is the timing and construction of the Edmonds Crossing Project. He questioned whether including this statement might lead developers and/or City leaders to think they cannot get anything done until this questions has been settled. Mr. Chave agreed they need to be careful how this language is phrased, recognizing that the City cannot unilaterally say that the project will never happen. They need to be mindful of it as a possibility, but reflect it in its proper place.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Mr. Chave advised that the Comprehensive Plan Update schedule is currently in fluctuation, given the Council's recent decision to hold a public hearing on each of the elements. Staff will present a revised schedule at the November 12th meeting, at which time the Board will continue its review of the Land Use Element and Housing Element. Also on November 12th, the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director is scheduled to provide a quarterly report.

Board Member Lovell asked if the City Council would conduct their public hearings on each of the Comprehensive Plan elements before, during or after the Board's work. Mr. Chave answered that after the Board has reviewed and created a draft update of an element, it will be presented to the City Council, as well. The City Council would like to have a public hearing before there is extensive discussion on each of the elements. Board Member Lovell pointed out that this change will make it difficult for the City to meet its target for completing the Comprehensive Plan update in 2015.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Cloutier welcomed Mike Nelson as the newest member of the Planning Board. He also thanked the Board Members for their positive approach to moving the Comprehensive Plan elements forward.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

At the request of the Board, Board Member Nelson shared some of his background, noting that he is originally from California, but moved to Edmonds four years ago with his family. He initially became interested in planning when he received a letter from the City's Planning Division asking him to share his opinions regarding the location of a sidewalk in his neighborhood. He talked with members of the Planning Board and became interested in becoming a part of the group.

Board Member Stewart announced that the Edmonds Marsh and Shoreline Salmon Recovery Tour on October 4th was well attended, with representatives from a number of groups, including the Planning Board, City Council, Sustainable Edmonds and Staff. Several students from Edmonds Woodway High School were also present. The entire tour was recorded and can be viewed via myedmondsnews.com. She said she was very pleased with the outcome.

Board Member Stewart reported that she is spearheading an Edmonds Woodway High School group called Students Saving Salmon. She briefly reviewed some of the activities and projects the students have been involved in, as well as those that are currently being planned. She said she offered participants in her group an opportunity to become student representatives on the Planning Board, and a few have submitted applications. She invited Board Members to assist her in interviewing and selecting a student to fill this position. She hopes to have the student representative in place by the first meeting in November. Board Member Rubenkönig and Chair Cloutier agreed to provide assistance.

Board Member Lovell reported on his attendance at the October 15th meeting of the Citizens Economic Development Commission (CEDC) where Dave Jaffe, CEO of Edmonds Swedish Hospital spent nearly an hour discussing the new addition that is currently underway at the hospital. Board Member Lovell shared highlights of the project, and noted that the intent is to complete the project by February 2016. The remainder of the CEDC meeting was spent talking about the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and Capital Facilities Plan (CFP). They specifically focused on the concept of providing a public restroom facility in the downtown retail district. He reminded the Board that their recommendation to the Council regarding the CIP and CFP also included a request that the City Council consider funding for a restroom facility. A private citizen made this request at the last City Council meeting, as well.

APPROVED

Board Member Rubenkonig requested technical assistance from City Staff regarding access to her City email account. Mr. Chave indicated she should contact Ms. Cunningham for assistance.

Board Member Ellis announced that Friends of the Edmonds Library will hold its annual donated book sale on October 24th and 25th. This is a wonderful opportunity to get reading material for the winter, and he encouraged Board Members to attend the event.

Board Member Robles said he recently had an opportunity to work with the Building Department and the City's public records. It was a very pleasant experience that was well in line with what Ms. Hope had presented to the Board the week prior. He commended City staff.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 9:00 p.m.

APPROVED