

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

November 12, 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
Shane Hope, Development Services Director
Jim Lawless, Assistant Police Chief
Karin Noyes, Recorder

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER LOVELL MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF OCTOBER 22, 2014 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER ELLIS SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES

The Board introduced Evan Zhao and Pavi Chance, applicants for the Student Representative position on the Planning Board. It was discussed that a subcommittee of Board Members interviewed the two applicants and found both qualified and enthusiastic. They appointed Mr. Zhao to serve as the Student Representative through the remainder of the current academic school year. Ms. Chance would serve during the 2015-2016 school year. She will also serve as an alternate representative for the current academic year.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Natalie Shippen, Edmonds, requested that the Board consider placing the sign code on their current priority list as a housekeeping issue. She expressed her belief that residents have become so accustomed to the appearance of Edmonds that they sometimes forget how it all started. She said she moved to Edmonds in 1942 when there was still a saw mill on the waterfront. Until the 1960's, Edmonds was a scruffy commercial town; the only one between Everett and Seattle. When the freeway was constructed, people began to understand that Edmonds was a fine residential area, and there have been a number of significant improvements since that time. She reviewed the following list of improvements that have occurred over time under the direction of various community leaders, business people and residents of the City:

- In the 1960s, all of the utility lines on Sunset Avenue were undergrounded. Washington State Ferries put in a parking lot and the City Council required landscaping as part of that improvement. The fountain was installed in the 1960s, as well.
- In the 1970s, the utilities on 5th Avenue were undergrounded and the corner parks were created. The Architectural Design Board and the Edmonds Arts Council were formed. There was a sign code dispute, and a pole sign that was proposed at Westgate was appealed and eventually replaced with a monument sign. Signage at Harbor Square was also appealed and upheld.
- In the 1980s, a portion of the utilities on Main Street were undergrounded and the ornamental streetlights were installed. The flower baskets were added during the 1980s, as well.
- In the 1990s, the Anderson property and the Bible College property were acquired by the City.
- In the 2000s, the City Council established a Public Facilities District, which allowed the Edmonds Center for the Arts to be constructed at the Bible College property.
- Since 2010, the remaining utilities on Main Street were undergrounded and the Five Corners Roundabout was installed. Changes were also made on Sunset Avenue.

Ms. Shippen summarized that all of these improvements suggest that the City and its citizens are concerned about appearance. The list demonstrates what can be done when individuals approach the City with ideas and the City takes action. She said she would like to see the sign code brought up to date with the effort that has been made to make Edmonds a better place to live. Signing has a stigma attached to it, and she is concerned that the current sign code allows too much signage. She asked the Board to review the sign code and said she would provide suggestions at a later time on how it could be improved.

Vice Chair Tibbott encouraged Ms. Shippen to put her notes into an article that could be published on *myedmondsnews.com* or in *The Edmonds Beacon*. Her comments present an interesting historic perspective that illustrates the transition that Edmonds has gone through. Ms. Shippen agreed that Edmonds has a long history of individual effort to make it look well.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR REPORT TO PLANNING BOARD

Ms. Hope referred the Board to the written Director's Report dated November 4th. In addition to the items in the report, she advised that the 2014 Comprehensive Plan update will be the subject of a public hearing before the City Council on November 18th. In addition, the City Council is considering a potential revision to the policy related to trees in public rights-of-way. The current policy is that trees can only be removed from rights-of-way if they are causing damage to the City's infrastructure, but sometimes they cause damage to other things like house foundations, etc. The City Council is considering potential amendments to make the policy more encompassing.

Board Member Lovell requested an update on where with the City Council is with the Westgate Plan, Shoreline Master Program (SMP), Capital Improvement Plan (CIP), Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) and Development Code Update. Ms. Hope advised that the City Council decided to table taking further action on the Westgate Plan until after the SR-104 Analysis has been completed sometime in early 2015. Regarding the Development Code Update, the City Council is considering whether to continue remaining 2014 funding into 2015, increase funding in 2015 or wait until a subsequent year to move forward with the project. The City Council was prepared to move the SMP forward to the Department of Ecology (DOE) with a buffer requirement of 100 feet instead of 150 feet. However, there has since been more discussion about how the proposed SMP would impact redevelopment of the Senior Center. In particular, they discussed rehabilitation and/or restoration of the area where the parking lot is currently located. There is an issue about whether that area is adequate going forward, and it was noted that the breakwater will probably need to be replaced or shored up. It is anticipated that some minor change will be made to the SMP to provide clarification of this issue before it is forwarded to the DOE. The SMP is on the City Council's November 18th agenda to make a decision on whether or not to forward the document to the DOE. The DOE will review the document and either approve it or ask for changes before its final adoption by the City Council. The CFP and CIP were scheduled on the City Council's November 10th agenda. However, due to the lateness of the hour, the two items were postponed to a later meeting.

Board Member Stewart clarified that the SMP currently being considered by the City Council is an interim document. Instead of a 150-foot setback and a 50-foot buffer, the City Council voted 6-0 to approve a 100-foot setback and a 50-foot

APPROVED

buffer. The vote was 5-1 related to properties that are physically separated and functionally isolated. It is anticipated that the City Council will take action regarding the SMP on November 18th.

PUBLIC HEARING ON AMENDING CHAPTER 17.35 OF THE EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE TO REMOVE REQUIREMENTS ABOUT KEEPING OF DOMESTICATED ANIMALS FROM THAT CHAPTER AND CONSOLIDATING THEM WITH CHAPTER 5.05 (ANIMAL CONTROL) OF THE EDMONDS CITY CODE.

Ms. Hope advised that the Police Department and Development Services Department staff have been working together to review various parts of the code that overlap or are complimentary. The draft ordinance represents staff's joint effort to better coordinate and consolidate the regulations regarding animals. As proposed, the amendment would move portions of the Development Code that reference animals (Chapters 16 and 17) into Chapter 5.05 of the City Code. This will consolidate all the animal regulations in a single place, which will help the understanding, interpretation, and enforcement of the regulations.

Chief Lawless explained that the Police Department's Animal Control Officers have struggled for several years with having regulations related to animals in both the Development Code (Chapters 16 and 17) and the City's Municipal Code (Chapter 5.05). The current situation creates gray areas, making the regulations related to animals difficult to enforce. The proposed amendment was created via a collaborative effort to clean up the language and put it in its proper context.

Vice Chair Tibbott asked the nature of the most common animal noise violations. Assistance Chief Lawless answered that most of the complaints have to do with barking dogs, more specifically the incessant barking that drives neighbors crazy. At this point, the Animal Control Officer's ability to address these situations is limited. Vice Chair Tibbott asked how the City typically remedies these situations. Assistant Chief Lawless answered that the Police Department's initial approach should be to educate people about the regulations and try to obtain voluntary compliance before charging people or issuing citations. However, as the ordinance is currently written, enforcement action is required. In addition, the process for categorizing a nuisance is burdensome on individuals and limits what the Police Department can do.

Board Member Ellis noted that the Noise Ordinance includes specific criteria related to dogs barking. He said he likes the idea of having standards, but he questioned if someone would actually be required to time the length of time a dog barks. Assistant Chief Lawless advised that the proposed amendments are consistent with rulings on prior court cases in Edmonds. He acknowledged that the City does not have the resources to visit a site and measure the length of time a dog barks. However, individual neighbors have the ability to record the event, using time stamps, and report to the Police Department. Adopting a standard of 10-minutes of nonstop barking will help with enforcement. He emphasized that the goal is to find a balance between addressing the concerns of the party that is being annoyed and protecting the rights of the dog owner. Again, he said the proposed language is based on previous court rulings, consultation with the City Attorney, and reviewing successful code language from other jurisdictions throughout the region.

Board Member Ellis asked if Assistant Chief Lawless believes the proposed language represents a workable standard. Assistant Chief Lawless answered affirmatively and said the language is based on experiences in Edmonds and surrounding jurisdictions.

Board Member Lovell summarized that the intent of the proposed amendments is to remove the requirements about the keeping of domesticated animals from Chapters 16 and 17 and consolidate them into Chapter 5.05 of the Edmonds City Code. Assistant Chief Lawless concurred. Ms. Hope added that the proposed amendment is intended to clean up and consolidate the existing code language, but no substantial changes have been proposed. She recommended the Board forward the proposed amendment to the City Council with a recommendation of approval as proposed.

Chair Cloutier opened the public hearing. No one in the audience indicated a desire to comment, and the public hearing was closed.

Board Member Lovell said he supports the proposed amendment that places all regulations related to animal control into a single chapter of the code. This will make the code easier to implement. He asked if this is similar to the approach staff is thinking about with respect to future Development Code updates. Ms. Hope explained that the animal regulations are just

APPROVED

one small piece of a larger effort to consolidate the Development Code requirements. Board Member Lovell agreed that this is one example of the kinds of change that can be made to the code to make it better and easier to understand.

Board Member Robles asked if anyone in the City would be worse off as a result of the proposed amendment. Ms. Hope answered no. She explained that the proposed changes will be of particular benefit to animals and their owners. The way the current ordinance is structured, voluntary compliance is not an option for animal owners. The only tool the Animal Control Officer has to address a problem is to issue a criminal citation. The proposed amendment represents a tiered approach that allows for three infractions before a criminal citation is issued. The goal is to obtain voluntary compliance first, recognizing there are extreme cases where more drastic enforcement measures will be necessary.

BOARD MEMBER LOVELL MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 17.35 OF THE EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL. AS PROPOSED THE REQUIREMENTS ABOUT THE KEEPING OF DOMESTICATED ANIMALS WOULD BE REMOVED FROM CHAPTER 17.35 AND CONSOLIDATED WITH CHAPTER 5.05 (ANIMAL CONTROL) OF THE EDMONDS CITY CODE. BOARD MEMBER ELLIS SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

RECOMMENDATION OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN HOUSING ELEMENT

Mr. Chave referred the Board to Attachment 1, which is a clean version of the draft Housing Element, and Attachment 2, which shows the edits from the current adopted Housing Element. He explained that Attachment 1 is similar to the draft language the Board reviewed at their October 22nd meeting. However, some changes were made to update the background data, update material on housing needs, update terminology, and include broader housing issues. In addition, the section on the County's Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy was eliminated as it is out of date and not useable in its current form.

Mr. Chave invited the Board Members to identify additional changes and then forward the document to the City Council for review. He noted that the Board would conduct a public hearing later in the process when they have completed their work on all of the Comprehensive Plan elements. As the Board completes its review of each of the elements, they will be presented to the City Council for review.

Board Member Nelson referred to the performance measure on Page 18 and pointed out a possible discrepancy in the number of additional dwelling units each year. Mr. Chave explained that the City's goal is to add approximately 2,800 units by 2035, which equates to 112 units per year between 2010 and 2035. Rather than identifying the total number of dwelling units in the City by 2035, Board Member Nelson suggested the performance measure could be to identify the number of additional 2,790 dwelling units by 2035. Mr. Chave agreed that change would be appropriate, but the Development Services Director has recommended that the performance measure also identify the number of additional units per year. Future reports will provide numbers for both the yearly growth and the cumulative growth since 2010.

Board Member Robles said he supports the changes that have been made to clarify that accessory structures and other forms of infill can be utilized to meet the needs of families. He specifically referred to Housing Goal F.2.b, which calls for providing accessory housing in single-family neighborhoods that address the needs of extended families and encourage housing affordability. This type of housing is particularly suitable for seniors, children, and co-living situations.

Board Member Stewart asked if co-housing development would be consistent with the language proposed in the Housing Element related to multi-family housing. Board Member Robles commented that there are co-housing developments in other cities where kitchens and bathrooms are shared, and there are proponents of this type of housing in Edmonds, as well. He noted that the housing type is not specifically called out in the Housing Element, but it does not appear the proposed language would preclude it, either. Board Member Lovell pointed out the legal problems associated with co-housing development in Seattle and cautioned against venturing into this realm in Edmonds at this time. His understanding is that the proposed language in the Housing Element encourages more multi-family residential units. He said it will be interesting to see what development occurs now that the City Council has approved the Planning Board's recommendation to allow residential development on all floors in the General Commercial (CG) and CG2 zones on Highway 99. He suggested that more investigation is needed before the Board pushes forward a co-housing concept in Edmonds. Board Member Robles agreed

APPROVED

that co-housing should not be specifically mentioned in the Housing Element, but the language should not set up barriers that impede the use, either.

Vice Chair Tibbott questioned how co-housing development would be different than single-family development that has two master bedrooms. In either case, bedrooms can be rented out or co-owned and residents share kitchen facilities.

Chair Cloutier asked staff to respond to whether or not the proposed Housing Element would create a barrier to co-housing opportunities. Mr. Chave answered that the proposed Housing Element is very open ended and encompasses a variety of housing options. It will take some effort to conduct research and match the needs of the residents versus what the codes do and do not allow and decide what direction the City wants to go. Chair Cloutier summarized that there is nothing in the Housing Element about specific kinds of development. The Housing Element clearly indicates that infill development is desirable and this policy will guide the Board and City Council when updating the Development Code in the future.

Board Member Lovell said he reviewed the red-lined draft of the Housing Element (Attachment 2) and observed that instead of trying to develop one program to deal with affordable housing, the City will work in partnership with the Alliance for Affordable Housing (AAH) to help achieve its goals. The Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan provides specific policies for the various activity centers in the City, and the activity centers will become the nucleus for various forms of development in the future. In addition, the Housing Element encourages more multi-family residential housing in the City.

Board Member Stewart said she would like the word “healthy” to be inserted into the Housing Element wherever possible. For example, Housing Goal C could be changed by inserting the words “healthy and” before “suitable.” She expressed her belief that it is important to emphasize the need for healthy living environments for all people. This would be consistent with language found in the Sustainability Element.

Board Member Rubenkönig indicated support for the draft Housing Element (Attachment 1). However, she questioned if the phrases “accessory dwelling unit,” “accessory uses,” and “accessory units” are interchangeable or should one term be used throughout the document. She specifically referred to Housing Goal F.2.b, which calls for providing accessory housing in single-family neighborhoods. Mr. Chave explained that “accessory dwelling unit” refers to a specific use, whereas “accessory uses” refers to a classification of uses. The two are not interchangeable in this section. The term “accessory uses” is broader and includes more than just accessory dwelling units. Board Member Rubenkönig said she would prefer to use one phrase that everyone can catch on to, and hear the same thing in their minds. She asked staff to consider whether all three terms are necessary or if one term should be used consistently throughout the document.

Chair Cloutier referred to the proposed implementation action and performance measure. Rather than simply measuring the number of new units permitted each year, he questioned if it would be possible to obtain a meaningful estimate of the number of units that are affordable. Mr. Chave pointed out that the implementation action calls for developing a strategy to measure both the supply of affordable housing and the City’s progress in meeting diverse housing needs. He explained that “affordability” is very difficult to assess and measure on an annual basis because data is scarce. In addition, affordable housing can change significantly, and this change can have little to do with housing stock and more to do with the economy in general. However, he agreed that “affordability” is not something the City should lose track of.

Vice Chair Tibbott observed that the entire introductory section is a study of the affordability of housing in Edmonds, so there are clearly metrics available to measure affordable housing. He agreed that the City should have some method in place to keep track of affordability. Board Member Lovell suggested that this issue could be addressed in the future in collaboration with the AAH. Chair Cloutier suggested that perhaps there could be two implementation actions: one related to a strategy for increasing the supply of affordable housing and meeting diverse housing needs and another related to a metric for accessing affordability. He acknowledged that the Board is not the correct body for solving this issue, but an action item that says someone needs to solve the issue would be appropriate.

Mr. Chave explained that affordable housing data is generally easier to come by as you scale up. Regional data is easy to obtain, but as you drill down to local data, it becomes more difficult to assess. Typically local jurisdictions must deal with multiple sets of data and figure out how it all fits together.

BOARD MEMBER LOVELL MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD THE HOUSING ELEMENT OF THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN TO THE CITY COUNCIL FOR REVIEW AS DRAFTED. CHAIR CLOUTIER SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

CONTINUED DISCUSSION OF COMPREHENSIVE PLAN GENERAL INTRODUCTION SECTION AND LAND USE ELEMENT

Mr. Chave reviewed the attachments provided in the Staff Report as follows: Attachment 1 is the proposed Land Use Element Outline, Attachment 2 provides examples of what the updated data will look like, Attachment 3 is the current adopted Land Use Element, and Attachment 4 is Board Member Stewart’s comments dated October 30, 2014. He explained that the intent of the Land Use Element is to update planning data and improve the overall organization of the element to be consistent with the more recently adopted Sustainability Element. Staff does not anticipate changes to the general policy direction.

Mr. Chave referred to the Downtown Plan, which is included in the current Land Use Element and discusses a variety of design guidelines. Staff is proposing that these guidelines be moved to the Design Element of the Comprehensive Plan. He explained that it makes more sense to group all of the design guidelines into one section and then clean up and reorganize the material. He invited the Board Members to share their additional comments and ideas related to the Land Use Element. He particularly asked for comments on the proposed outline for the Land Use Element as presented in Attachment 1.

Board Member Stewart said she supports the outline presented by staff in Attachment 1. However, she suggested that the reference to “nomadic bands of Native Americans” on Page 10 of Attachment 3 is somewhat derogatory. While it is likely that the tribes moved around depending on the season and in their search for food and shelter, the term “nomadic” is not truly indicative of the way Native Americans in the area lived. She noted that the history portion of the Shoreline Master Plan has a better accounting of local tribes living on the land. She also noted that mention of “participatory tribes” on Page 15 of Attachment 3 may not reflect the true history of occupation back then. Mr. Chave explained that some of the descriptive language that was included in the 1995 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was transferred to the Comprehensive Plan. Some of this language is still in the plan, and he invited the Board Members to highlight specific language they would like staff to consider changing and/or eliminating.

Board Member Lovell observed that the Land Use Element did not get specific about areas in the City until 1995, when the Downtown Plan was added. Again, Mr. Chave pointed out that the Urban Design Elements contained in the Downtown Plan will be transferred to the Design Element of the Comprehensive Plan where all of the other design related goals and policies are located. Board Member Lovell said it would be helpful if each of the sections in the Land Use Element that pertain to specific areas of the City could be organized the same way. This will make it easier to identify the differences in terms of what currently exists and what strategies are in place to guide future development. He noted that there are different opportunities in each of the areas that should be heralded in the Comprehensive Plan.

Board Member Lovell questioned if it would be appropriate to identify more specific strategies and policies in the Comprehensive Plan for each of the areas. Mr. Chave cautioned that developing more specific strategies and policies for each of the areas would be akin to creating a neighborhood or subarea plan for each section of the City. He explained that the goals and policies in the Land Use Element focus on two activity centers: downtown and Highway 99. There are also individual sections that talk about the neighborhood commercial areas such as Five Corners and Westgate. Indirectly, the Land Use Element discusses the different parts of town, but it does not talk at any length to the surrounding neighborhoods associated with these areas. This would require a significant outreach effort, which is beyond what the City is able to do with this update.

Board Member Robles asked if the language in the Land Use Element would allow opportunities for new technologies to be implemented. For example, the Land Use Element should not exclude decentralized businesses such as drones, Airbnb, etc. He anticipates these uses will come to the City one day. While he does not advocate that the Land Use Element specifically identify these opportunities, it should not exclude them, either. Mr. Chave said he cannot think of anything in the current Land Use Element that would preclude or limit these future opportunities. Chair Cloutier reminded the Board that they are discussing the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan and not the Development Code. The Land Use Element is intended to outline the City’s vision statement for how land in Edmonds will be used. He cautioned the Board to avoid

language that calls out specific uses. Mr. Chave suggested these uses could be better addressed in the Development Code, which will be updated in the near future. He cautioned that the line between what is allowed outright under existing zoning versus what requires a public approval process becomes very critical. This lens will make the most sense to look at the uses discussed by Board Member Robles. Again, he said there is nothing in the current Comprehensive Plan that would prohibit or limit these opportunities.

Board Member Rubenkönig suggested it might be appropriate to refer to the hospital as “Swedish Edmonds Hospital” rather than “Stevens Hospital.” Mr. Chave agreed.

Board Member Stewart suggested that the second to the last paragraph on Page 39 of Attachment 3 should be changed to read, “The City should consider using incentives to achieve development and infill goals and zoning incentives or other measures to ensure that land adjacent to infrastructure is utilized to maximize the economic and environmental benefits of that infrastructure.” Board Member Lovell defined infrastructure as “anything that is manmade that supports the livability of people.” Board Member Stewart commented that “green infrastructure” would be environmental systems that are not manmade that serve to harness nature and do the work that has previously been accomplished with engineered facilities. She said that in her experience and study, infrastructure should refer to both manmade and natural infrastructure.

Board Member Lovell said he understands the point Board Member Stewart is trying to make. However, he cautioned against creating language that serves as a barrier to a property’s development. For example, her proposed language could be interpreted to mean that trees could not be removed from a site because they are considered part of the natural infrastructure. Board Member Stewart said it is not her intent to place additional barriers on development, but she does not want to preclude the idea of using natural systems as part of the infrastructure. For example, New York City has done a great deal of work using marshes and wetlands instead of engineered infrastructure to address flooding issues. This alternative has saved New York City a lot of money, and the concept could be applied in Edmonds in conjunction with what engineers have done for decades. She does not want to look at the future and think of infrastructure as human engineered structures, only. There must be a way to implement this concept without creating additional obstacles for developers. She and Board Member Lovell agreed to work with staff to come up with language for the Board’s consideration.

Mr. Chave suggested that the paragraph referenced earlier by Board Member Stewart (second to the last paragraph on Page 39) seems out of place in its current location. The Board Members concurred, and Mr. Chave agreed to consider a more appropriate location for the language. He noted that the concept outlined in the paragraph is likely addressed in a policy contained in the Sustainability Element, but it would be appropriate to echo the concept in the Land Use Element.

Board Member Stewart referred to Item 4 at the bottom of Page 69 of Attachment 2 and requested clarification on what is meant by the term “small.” Mr. Chave advised that this is very old Comprehensive Plan language that is inconsistent with the current Critical Areas Ordinance. He suggested the language be removed from the Comprehensive Plan.

Board Member Stewart also referred to the 4th paragraph of Item A on Page 84 of Attachment 3 and suggested the first sentence be changed to read, “City beaches, including the near shore environment, represent unique habitats for marine organisms.” She pointed out that breakwaters and pilings are not desirable human artifacts for habitat purposes, and they should not be considered unique habitat. Mr. Chave advised that much of the language in this section was inserted prior to 1995. Board Member Lovell added that much of the information is covered in depth in the Shoreline Master Program, and it does not need to be included in the Land Use Element, too. Chair Cloutier observed that the language makes reference to survey data that was collected in 1974.

Board Member Lovell asked if the Comprehensive Plan Update, including the Land Use Element, is being done in house. Mr. Chave answered affirmatively and added that the City has hired a temporary planner to assist in the effort.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Mr. Chave advised that the December 10th meeting agenda will include continued discussion of the draft Land Use Element and an introduction of the Utilities Element. He noted that the quarterly report by the Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director has been postponed to January.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

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

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Stewart reported that there has been some discussion amongst City Council Members about the concept of video recording the Planning Board Meetings. She was asked to solicit feedback from the Planning Board Members as to whether or not they would be in favor of this practice. She reminded the Board that throughout the next year, they will be working on updating the Comprehensive Plan, Stormwater Code, etc. If recorded, the meetings could be available to citizens on line, and this might encourage more public participation in the process.

Board Member Nelson said he supports the concept. It is obvious that more public involvement is desirable, and video recording the meetings would make it easier for people to participate. Chair Cloutier concurred. Board Member Lovell expressed some doubt that video recording the meetings would result in more public participation.

Vice Chair Tibbott commented that the Board Meetings are intended to allow a more collaborative conversation than the City Council Meetings, and he would hate to lose that in the process. Very good minutes are taken of the Board Meetings, and information provided on-line for each of the meetings can be easily accessed by the public. Citizens can also request an audio recording of the meetings.

Board Member Stewart expressed her belief that video recording the meetings would provide an additional method of public outreach, and this would be particularly helpful given the importance of what the Board will be discussing over the next year and a half.

Board Member Rubenkonig said she would like more time to consider the option before providing her opinion one way or another. She likes that video recording the meetings would provide another measure of accountability. If the meetings are recorded, Board Members may be more careful about how they explain their thoughts. The public would have three avenues for participation: reading the minutes, attending the meetings, or watching the video recording.

Evan Zhao, Edmonds, noted that this is the first Planning Board meeting he has attended, but he will begin participating as the Student Representative on December 10th. He commented that the world is quickly advancing into an age of information and data collection, and recording public meetings will eventually become a reality. He explained that the benefit of video recordings is that it is possible for a person to fast forward to the discussions he/she is interested in. Audio recordings are not as interesting to listen to and connect with. People who watch the video recordings will feel more connected with the happenings of the Board, making them more likely to contribute by adding their voice.

Vice Chair Tibbott questioned how many people would actually view the recordings to improve the dialogue. On the other hand, he noted that it is becoming less costly to store digital media, and there may be value in collecting a video history of the Board's meetings.

Board Member Stewart noted that the City Council would likely need to make a decision on whether or not to record the Planning Board Meetings prior to the Board's next meeting. She agreed to report to the City Council that the Board discussed the concept. While they noted the benefits, not everyone was on board.

Vice Chair Tibbott said he likes what the City has done with the focus areas along Highway 99 (International and Hospital Districts). Not only is it helpful to see the areas displayed this way to provide identity, he looks forward to the planning and future redevelopment that will take place along the strip.

Vice Chair Tibbott questioned if anyone anticipated, when the 1995 growth projections were made, that the City would only add 400 new residents between 2000 and 2010. He questioned how accurate the current growth projections are for the years 2015 to 2025, and how much the City should rely on the growth projections when planning for the future.

APPROVED

Board Member Robles reported that he spoke at the Living Economics Forum in Oakland, California where a lot of great ideas were discussed. He said he is actively looking at these issues. He advised that he would also host a panel at The Future of Money and Technology Summit in San Francisco, California on the topic, "Everything That Can Be Decentralized Will Be Decentralized," and he plans to share his thoughts on Edmonds. Board Member Stewart requested a link to these two discussions.

Board Member Rubenkönig questioned when her term as Board Member expires. Chair Cloutier advised that the City has a chart showing when each of the term limits expire, and it is typically updated and presented to the Board in January of each year. The Board discussed that there is no limit on the number of terms a Board Member can serve, but reappointment by the Mayor is necessary for each term.

Board Member Rubenkönig said she was delighted to interview both Evan Zhao and Pavi Chance for the Student Representative position. Both of them love Edmonds, and it was insightful to hear what they enjoy about the City and what attracts them to the City. They are both open to understanding how things take place in the City, and they both answered affirmatively when asked if they would feel comfortable sharing their points of view with the Planning Board Members. She said she looks forward to their future involvement.

Board Member Lovell announced that he would attend the November 19th meeting of the Economic Development Commission and provide a report to the Board on December 10th. He also announced that the City Council has had continued discussions regarding strategies for constructing a restroom in downtown Edmonds. However, he is disappointed that they postponed their decisions related to the Westgate Plan, the Shoreline Master Program, the Capital Improvement Plan and the Capital Facilities Plan.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 8:45 p.m.

APPROVED