

APPROVED MARCH 9th

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

February 24, 2016

Chair Lovell 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

Philip Lovell, Chair
Carreen Rubenkonig, Vice Chair
Matthew Cheung
Alicia Crank
Nathan Monroe
Daniel Robles
Valerie Stewart
Samuel Kleven (Student Representative)

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Karin Noyes, Recorder

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Todd Cloutier

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER STEWART MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF FEBRUARY 10, 2016 BE APPROVED AS WRITTEN. BOARD MEMBER CHEUNG SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

There were no audience comments.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR REPORT TO PLANNING BOARD

Chair Lovell referred to the written Director's report, which was included in their packets. He specifically noted the summary of what has been done to date to implement the Strategic Action Plan, and he encouraged Board Members to review the document.

DEVELOPMENT CODE UPDATE

Mr. Chave advised that Ms. Hope and the consultant team provided a progress report on the Development Code Update to the City Council on February 23rd. For the Board's information, he played a video recording of the presentation. The following is a summary of the presentation:

Ms. Hope advised that the Development Code Update is intended to make the code more readable, accurate and consistent; make inadequately-addressed code topics more complete; address new issues as appropriate; clarify roles and processes and resolve conflicts/overlaps. She recalled that the Planning Board previously identified criteria by which the update would proceed, and the City Council allocated \$150,000 for the project. About \$110,000 of the funds were used in 2015, and \$40,000 will be carried over into 2016 to continue the project.

Ms. Hope said the update is significantly influenced by staff resources. While they have helpful consultants, a large amount of staff time is needed to work through the topics. Staff time is influenced by other projects on the work program, as well as ongoing development review and special projects. The update is also influenced by the Planning Board principles and objectives, the public process and input, stormwater low-impact design (LID) integration, and the changing legal environment (new laws and court cases). Ms. Hope introduced John Owen of Makers, the consultant for the Development Code Update.

John Owen, Makers, advised that he has been working with City staff on a number of code sections in tandem with each other. One, in particular, is the Subdivision (land development) Code, which is a topic that has received a lot of comments from the Planning Board, City Council, citizens, and development community. When reviewing the Subdivision Code, he considered three different types of land use actions: short subdivisions, formal subdivisions and binding site plans for commercial properties. The proposed concept at this time is to re-define short subdivisions as 8 lots or less rather than 4 lots or less, while adding stronger design standards and clearer criteria. It is believed that this approach will cut out incentive for property owners to do two, side-by-side, 4-lot (short) subdivisions and instead have unified design that results in better land utilization and more opportunities to mitigate impacts of development.

Mr. Owen explained that there are several different design options to consider. The current code allows for conventional design, as well as Planned Residential Development (PRD), which relaxes some of the requirements for subdividing properties. Under the proposed new language, it is anticipated there would be less need for PRDs because the updated code would allow some flexibility that would make some aspects of land division easier. The current code also allows for modification requests, leading to what is commonly called “staff interpretation” or other review actions, and he proposed that this option be substituted with LID requirements or options. This approach would allow greater flexibility to cluster lots and achieve more conservation or enhancement for existing trees, natural areas; greater setbacks next to adjacent properties; stormwater and LID features; native vegetation protection and solar access. Relaxing the internal subdivision requirements will allow for greater outer buffers, more LID features, and a greater opportunity to save large trees. The idea is to do what is important for the environment and surrounding property owners, but allow more flexibility with regard to how the buildings relate to one another and how they are arranged internally on the lot.

Mr. Owen observed that some may interpret the proposed changes as making it easier for property owners to subdivide by allowing short subdivisions of up to 8 units. While the proposed LID Standards would allow a developer to vary the width and area of individual lots to a certain extent and the interior setbacks may be somewhat reduced, there would be greater requirements for protecting and enhancing critical areas and natural features, stormwater management and solar access. The standards would also limit the amount of impervious surface to a certain percentage of a lot and require careful protection of the trees being retained. He emphasized that the concept would not result in an overall density that is greater than allowed in the zoning district.

Mr. Owen reviewed other concepts for updating the Subdivision Code such as allowing “fee simple” unit lot design for townhomes, requiring sidewalks on both sides of street for larger subdivisions, requiring access directly from a public right-of-way, and clarifying language as needed for underground utilities, easements, dedications, etc.

Mr. Owens said that, while the application requirements are nearly the same for both short and formal plats, the review processes vary. Short plats are administratively reviewed, with appeals going before the Hearing Examiner. Formal plats are preliminarily approved by the Hearing Examiner, with a recommendation to the City Council for the final decision and appeals go to the court. No changes have been proposed for the process. However, the proposed amendments will result in clearer standards related to coverage, massing, stormwater infiltration, etc. This will result in fewer “staff interpretations” related to impacts to surrounding neighborhoods and more internal site flexibility to protect trees, natural stormwater drainage, greater buffers around the property, etc.

Mr. Owen said there have also been a lot of comments pertaining to the Sign Code, particularly about how the City calculates sign area. He explained that there are different ways to measure sign area, and Edmonds currently only counts the actual size of the letters and not the area around the letters. This encourages larger letters instead of the objectionable panel or backlit signs you see in other communities. The concept is to update the way that maximum sign area is regulated for multi-tenant commercial buildings. Currently, the maximum allowed sign area is one square foot of sign area per one lineal foot of building frontage on the main public entrance. He recommended that the language be clarified to apply the measurement to individual storefronts and not an entire multi-tenant facade.

Mr. Owen said another change that would improve the overall quality and design of signs is to make sure they are centered in proportion and shape to the architectural features of the building. In addition, signage should not two thirds of the individual storefront dimension or articulation of the building. In reviewing examples, these proposed changes will help keep the sign to a reasonable size and proportion to the rest of the building.

Mr. Owen said another thing that is unique to Edmonds is allowing signs to be on the mansard roof of a one-story building, and no changes are being proposed to this provision. However, one of the more controversial aspects of the sign code is sandwich board or A-frame signs. The proposed concept is to encourage the use of stanchion (portable post style) signs as an alternative to A-frame signs. Stanchion signs are less disruptive, yet highly visible. It is not the intent to discourage businesses from advertising. At the same time, they want to ensure there is a clear, safe pedestrian environment, as well as a sense of visual regularity and decorum in the downtown. Another option is to require a permit for stanchion or A-frame signs so they can be tracked. It is also necessary to refine the requirements for A-frame or stanchion signs in the right-of-way to make sure there is clear right-of-way, that they are close to the business, and that the numbers are limited.

Mr. Owen said the proposed amendments also encourage blade signs to advertise the additional businesses. Blade signs do not have any of the disadvantages of the stanchion signs, and they actually have very good visibility for both pedestrians and people in vehicles. They are also considering a master plan for directional signs in the downtown so that signs can be placed in key locations. These signs are particularly important for businesses that are off the main streets. Permitting would be required and some organizational effort would be needed.

Mr. Owen said many Washington Cities no longer allow new pole signs. Currently, the City only allows pole signs on Highway 99, and he recommended the City consider prohibiting new pole signs altogether and encouraging monument signs, instead. He recognized this may meet some opposition; but in the end, both businesses and other citizens tend to prefer signs that are visible but not intrusive.

Mr. Owen said there are also legal issues under review related to signs that are based on recent court decisions. General miscellaneous clean-up of the sign code language also needs to be done.

Ms. Hope noted that various items came up on the work plan that altered the City's ability to move forward with the Development Code Update. However, the current plan is to start with updates to the sign and subdivision codes. She reminded them that a related Development Code issue is the Critical Areas Ordinance, which has not yet been adopted. In addition, the fire code must be updated every three years and will be coming before the City Council for adoption before July. Also, the State implemented a change to the impact fee process, which requires that there be a different process for single-family homes; and the City needs to update its code to implement this new requirement before July. The intent is also to continue integrating stormwater LID techniques into various sections of the code, and staff is currently working with the Engineering Department to complete this task.

Mr. Chave announced that the presentation was followed by approximately 15 minutes of questions by the City Council Members, and the entire presentation is available on line.

Chair Lovell asked if the schedule was developed by the Development Services Department or the consultant. Mr. Chave answered that it was prepared by the Development Services Director, after consulting with Makers. Chair Lovell reported that he attended Ms. Hope's presentation to the City Council and recalled that a key concern was that the concept of "0" lot lines would force the housing units so close together that they could infringe on the concept of personal privacy while trying to preserve sections of a development site for natural habitat, LID, tree preservation, etc. He noted that if an area is deemed to be in a critical area, all of the requirements contained in the Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO) would apply.

Chair Lovell recalled that there has been a lot of discussion in the past about sandwich board or A-frame signs, and the issue came up again at the Council level. These signs seem to populate the sidewalks and interfere with pedestrian access. It was asked if the City has solicited feedback from retail establishments that use the signs. Obviously, they want to preserve their sign capacity as much as possible. The task is to create balanced criteria that is acceptable to everyone but also provides a clear definition as to what comprises a temporary sign. Also, at the Council meeting, it was pointed out that Mill Creek Village does not allow sandwich board signs. Instead, they use blade signs that seem to go a long way to solving the issue.

Chair Lovell advised that proposed amendments to the Sign and Subdivision Codes will come back to the Board for a\ work sessions, a public hearing, and a recommendation to the City Council later in 2016. Mr. Chave agreed and advised that a major part of the Board's extended agenda will be filled with Development Code update topics.

Board Member Crank said that, based on feedback from retailers in the City, the A-frame signs are more than just a logo. They provide valuable real estate for temporary advertising. Switching to stanchion or blade signs would eliminate a business's ability to highlight sales and specials. She presumes that this concern will come up at the public hearing regarding the proposed changes. A-frames offer critical advertising opportunities that businesses will have to pay for and provide in another way.

Chair Lovell recalled that the proposed change would not eliminate a-frame signs, but it would add additional standards to get them closer to the entrances, provide adequate ADA access on the sidewalk, etc. He expects that the updated Sign Code would continue to allow A-frame signs, but it would clarify the requirements. He also acknowledged that retailers depend on A-frame signs.

Mr. Chave commented that stanchion signs would not preclude the ability to change messages. They are simply a different type and shape of sign that takes up less footprint on the ground but still provides ample room for messaging. He noted that the sidewalks in the downtown area are typically narrow, and the intent is to figure out specific limits and regulations that will allow businesses to provide messaging without hindering pedestrian access. He commented that a variety of other stand-up sign types have been used effectively in the downtown.

Board Member Cheung asked if digital signs are allowed in Edmonds, and Mr. Chave answered that they are permitted along Highway 99, but the decision was made many years ago that digital signs were not appropriate for downtown and most other commercial areas in Edmonds. However, he acknowledged that there are a few existing digital signs that have been grandfathered and will be allowed to remain.

Board Member Robles asked if neon or LED signs would be allowed, and Mr. Chave answered that small ones that are located inside windows are allowed. It's an evolving technology, and historically, it has been tight in the downtown area because people live in very close proximity to the businesses and it is important to limit glare and light.

Board Member Cheung asked if projection lighting is allowed. Mr. Chave said the City actually encourages indirect lighting in the downtown. For example, halo signs are a new technology where there is some form of a sign face, with a light that comes from behind and illuminates outside of the sign area. The code prohibits cabinet signs in the downtown, but halo signs are indirectly lit and can produce some really attractive effects with very little light bleeding off the site. He explained that it is tricky to write sign code because the technology evolves quickly. It is necessary to look at performance standards rather than listing the specific types of signs that are and are not allowed. It is more about effect (what you are trying to prevent or encourage). For example, Mr. Owen called out the City's method for calculating sign area as unique because it only counts the area of the applied letters and not the area surrounding the letters. This is a powerful incentive for people to do block letters, which tend to be more subtle and get the message across well, without a large, bright sign background.

Board Member Stewart commented on the importance of positioning structures on the site to allow for environmental features to be utilized favorably. Cluster developments use this approach, and it has been done quite a bit in other jurisdictions. The proposed code talks about LID, which is mandated by the state and will be incorporated into the code. It is also important that the updated Subdivision Code encourage green building. Under LID, it talks about energy efficiency, locally sourced and sustainable materials, indoor environmental quality, and a host of other things. Usually, when you talk about green building, you also analyze the site; and if you have flexibility, you can position buildings to take advantage of

environmental features on the site. She noted that King County is moving forward with this evolving concept, and Snohomish County is lagging behind. Chair Lovell clarified that the idea would be to allow adjustments in the positioning of the units to enable larger areas of the site to be preserved for natural habitat, shared green space, mini parks, rain gardens, etc.

Vice Chair Rubenkonig observed that signs in the downtown should be designed to attract pedestrians, whereas signs on Highway 99 must attract vehicles passing by. She recalled previous City discussions where it was decided that signs that can attract people from more than two blocks away create too strong of a presence in the downtown, and that is where the word “garish” came into play. It is important to remember that this is the perspective that has been taken when looking at what is considered acceptable signage. She said she supports the performance based approach, which allows new technologies to be considered. Chair Lovell agreed that pedestrian-oriented signs are more appropriate for the downtown.

Chair Lovell voiced concern that, typically, when small-lot development occurs, developers put up a fence around the development and clear cut the entire site. Implementing LID concepts will require careful planning by the City staff and developers. Board Member Stewart agreed that more planning will be required, but developers can actually save time later by retaining some of the existing environmental features on the site. It’s a different way of thinking, but the concept is being used more. There are developers that take this approach, and perhaps they can attract developers from outside the City so the concept can begin to happen more.

Chair Lovell asked if there is sufficient funding to complete the Development Code update. Mr. Chave said he does not anticipate that the entire update will be finished in 2016. Right now, the consultant and staff are focusing on the most important parts (signage, subdivisions, and LID integration), and the remaining funds should be sufficient to complete these items. Staff hopes to complete the remaining work in house. He reminded the Board that another consultant is currently working with the Engineering Department to integrate LID into the engineering requirements, which will also require changes to other sections of the code. The City is also working with a consultant to prepare a Highway 99 Subarea Plan. He summarized that updating the Development Code is a very large project that involves various consultants and City departments.

Board Member Monroe requested more information about the Council’s concerns about “0” lot line development. Mr. Chave clarified that “0” lot line is not a concept that is currently being considered. Board Member Monroe asked if the changes to the short plat provisions would allow a developer to bypass some of the standards, and Mr. Chave answered no. The same standards would apply to both short and formal subdivisions. The proposed amendment relates more to the process. Short plats are administratively reviewed, but the City Council has to approve formal subdivisions. Board Member Monroe voiced concern that the proposed amendment would result in eight, small houses placed in the corner of a large lot. Mr. Chave said there are standards and limitations that would prevent this from happening. However, there needs to be some flexibility given to allow LID to be worked into the site design. The current formal subdivision provisions offer very little flexibility and no opportunity to retain trees, etc. The real question is how much and what type of flexibility should be available in both the short and formal plat standards.

Board Member Crank asked if the City Council’s decision to postpone adoption of the Critical Areas Ordinance (CAO) would impact the timeline for updating the Development Code. Mr. Chave said it could complicate the schedule, depending on how elaborate finishing off the CAO gets, since it will prevent senior staff from being able to work on the code update.

Vice Chair Rubenkonig observed that she does not anticipate a large number of subdivisions with more than eight lots, given the limited land available in Edmonds for development/redevelopment. Mr. Chave agreed and said most of the future subdivisions will be 2 or 3-lot short plats. Vice Chair Rubenkonig said that, in her experience with reviewing large subdivisions that have protected lands in the greater Seattle area, you end up with development that protects the last frontier of the resources that are left. There is not much left of the good part of nature, and the proposed LID regulations would actually protect what is left on the parcels. She also observed that people seem to like living on these properties. Protected lands are never going to be developed and they will have them to enjoy in perpetuity. There are some very fine tradeoffs. Although the houses could be smaller, there has not been a lack of interest on the part of consumers wanting to get into the developments.

Vice Chair Rubenkonig said Mr. Owen made some fine points to help the Board turn its thinking when he referred to the proposed changes to the interior side and rear setback requirements. He pointed out that only the people living in the

development would be impacted by the reductions, and they would have a clear understanding of the tradeoffs. Mr. Owen also made a point about lessening the need for staff interpretation, which is something developers continue to ask for. Developers want to know what they are working with up front so there are no surprises. Subdividing is a rather expensive process that involves a large number of experts, and it is important for the City to be very clear about what the rules are. Staff interpretations can drive up the cost for consumers.

UPDATE ON EDMONDS WATERFRONT ACCESS STUDY AT-GRADE RAILROAD CROSSING ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS

Chair Lovell explained that his presentation is not an official briefing. He is a member of the Waterfront Access Study Task Force and volunteered to update the Planning Board on the process because he believes it is important that the Board and public are kept up-to-date on how the study is progressing. The primary source of information related to the study can be found on the City's website, including task force meeting agendas and minutes. He advised that the task force meets on the 2nd and 4th Thursdays of each month at 10 a.m. in the Brackett Room at City Hall. The meetings are open to the public, although the task force does not solicit public comment at their regular meetings.

Chair Lovell reported that two public open houses have been held pertaining to the study. At the first open house, the task force outlined the purpose of the study, as well as the approach they would take towards the challenge. The second open house was a work session where members of the public were allowed to walk through all of the proposed concepts being studied.

Chair Lovell observed that the railroad has been in Edmonds for a very long time, and it is important to keep in mind that over-implementation of any access solution concept could alter the character of the City. There is a risk that solving the railroad crossing problems in Edmonds could result in turning the City into a railroad town rather than a waterfront town.

Chair Lovell advised that the task force is comprised of five citizen representatives from the Edmonds community, as well as five representatives from the primary stakeholders: Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF), Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Sound Transit (ST), Community Transit (CT), and Washington State Ferries (WSF). In addition to staff members who attend the task force meetings, the City has hired consultants from TetraTec and EnviroIssues to assist in the work.

Chair Lovell provided an overview of the study schedule, noting that the project remains on schedule and the 2nd of five stages is currently underway. He reported that the task force has completed a technical analysis by observing, quantifying and documenting existing conditions at the Main Street and Dayton Street crossings. They have also reviewed data from previous studies and community input, compiled potential concepts to improve access and developed the following screening criteria:

- Provide for continuous emergency response access.
- Reduce delays to ferry loading/unloading.
- Reduce delays and conflicts for pedestrians, bicyclists and motorists at the Dayton Street and Main Street railroad crossings.
- Provide safe and efficient intermodal passenger connectivity between ferry, commuter rail, bus transit, pedestrian, bicycle and motor vehicle modes of travel.

Chair Lovell reported that the task force has completed its Level 1 review of each of the concepts based on the initial criteria. He provided an aerial photograph to illustrate the scope of the study area and explained that the remaining concepts have been divided into the following categories: overpass solutions, underpass solutions, on-site solutions, operational solutions, railroad modifications, and ferry facility modifications. He summarized that most of the concepts focus on overpass solutions, underpass solutions and ferry facility modifications. However, some concepts suggest on-site solutions such as providing first aid training and stationing a response team on the water side of the tracks and putting in a helipad. Railroad improvements, such as running the trains only at night, relocating the trains to Kirkland, or moving the tracks to the east of downtown so the waterfront is not interrupted, were also suggested.

Chair Lovell shared a series of maps to illustrate the location of the proposed overpass, underpass and ferry facility modification solutions that are currently under consideration. He briefly described each solution and provided examples of what the solutions might look like. He explained that as the process continues, the task force will drill down more deeply into the remaining concepts to include more graphics, related work descriptions, feasibility, cost estimates, etc. The remaining concepts will be developed into potential alternatives and the following additional evaluation criteria will be applied:

- Is the concept feasible to implement?
- Does the concept avoid environmental effects/impacts?
- Does the concept avoid creating social and/or economic impacts?

Chair Lovell explained that each solution's feasibility will likely be evaluated based on factors such as project cost, implementation timeframe, City Council approval/acceptance, stakeholder agency approval/acceptance, disruption during implementation, public acceptance/approval, regulatory approval, environmental considerations, etc. In addition to the criteria, each of the stakeholders (WSDOT, BNSF, WSF, ST and CT) all have concerns that need to be considered.

Chair Lovell summarized that at its February 25th meeting, the task force will review the outcome of the Level 1 screening workshop. The Level 1 screening process will be completed at the March 10th meeting, and then the Level 2 screening process will begin. He advised that interim reports will be provided to the City Council, and updated information will be made available on the City's website. The public is invited to contribute comments and suggestions throughout the process, and an open house on the Level 2 outcomes will take place in June or July.

Board Member Monroe asked if any funding sources have been identified to implement the preferred alternative, and Chair Lovell answered no. Board Member Monroe asked if funding would be provided via WSDOT or the City of Edmonds. Chair Lovell answered that there have been some peripheral discussions that indicate if the City could put forth some funding for the project, it would help serve as an impetus to glean more funds from stakeholders, as well as county, state and federal sources. Once a preferred alternative has been adopted, the City can begin the process of securing funds for implementation.

Board Member Monroe asked if it would be safe to say that BNSF and WSDOT will not provide significant funding towards implementation. Chair Lovell said these opportunities are still on the table. Board Member Monroe cautioned that the City should not assume that WSDOT or BNSF would be reliable funding sources.

Board Member Monroe asked if scheduling or program management is also being considered as a possible solution. Chair Lovell said there has been some effort on the part of CT, ST and WSF to coordinate schedules. His understanding is that the situation has gotten better, but more improvements are needed. A major concern is that access is blocked while the ferry is loading and unloading, which can disrupt not only traffic in Edmonds, but other nearby ferry terminals will feel the impacts, as well. The intent of the study is to find a solution to decrease the number of interruptions to the ferry and provide emergency access over the tracks. Board Member Monroe suggested that if one of the goals of the study is to eliminate ferry issues, perhaps WSDOT and/or WSF should be contributing more to the planning and funding.

Board Member Robles expressed his belief that the conflict is between cars, ferries and the railroad, and calling it a safety issue is simply a diversion. If safety is the only concern, and vehicular access is not part of the equation, a simple pedestrian bridge over the railroad tracks would suffice. Chair Lovell pointed out that, in addition to ferry traffic, there are also residents who live on the water side of the tracks, as well as restaurants, retail establishments, office buildings and the marina. All of these people need regular access across the tracks.

Board Member Monroe asked if WSDOT and WSF are sympathetic to the problem or if they believe it is the City's problem to resolve. Mr. Chave explained that it is not a single-agency problem, and that is why the stakeholders have all been invited to participate in the process. All of them have a particular problem they want to solve, and there will not be a single pool of money that may resolve all of the concerns. If everyone is at the table offering solutions that will solve multiple problems, it may be possible to access more than one set of funding.

Board Member Monroe said it does not appear that BNSF has any problems to resolve. Mr. Chave said that do have periodic safety issue, and they are concerned about ferry riders interfering with their operations. He summarized that this is a huge problem and there are no simple and/or low-cost solutions.

Board Member Stewart pointed out that the Edmonds Crossing Project is still identified in City plans. She expressed her belief that Edmonds Crossing is the best location for a solution. She can't imagine spending a significant amount of money to construct an elevated crossing, only to have it removed if and when Edmonds Crossing comes to fruition at some point in the future. Chair Lovell said he suspects that Edmonds Crossing will be one of the factors that is considered as the study progresses and they begin narrowing down the options. He said he is not sure the task force will ever be able to answer the question of whether or not Edmonds Crossing will be built in the future, and he is fairly certain that WSDOT cannot, either. The Edmonds Crossing concept has been around a number of years, and a number of changes have occurred during that period of time. A new enclosed pedestrian walkway was installed for ferry riders and Sound Transit invested money to rebuild the Edmonds Station, including provisions for the second track. A few years ago, WSDOT offered a piece of land for private development. In exchange for the land, WSDOT would have required the developer to provide a pedestrian overpass at Railroad Avenue. However, no proposals were received due to the high number of requirements, and the project was abandoned. In addition, CT build a mini terminal adjacent to the WSDOT site. He summarized that a lot has been done by various agencies, investment wise, to create solutions to address their long-term needs.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Chair Lovell reported that he and Vice Chair Rubenkonig met with Mr. Chave and Ms. Hope to discuss the issues that are coming up on the Board's agenda, particularly related to the Development Code update. Ms. Hope will update the extended agenda based on that discussion.

Chair Lovell reminded the Board that their retreat is scheduled for March 9th starting at 6:00 p.m. with a potluck dinner. He advised that the City Attorney would be available to present Part II of his training related to public meeting laws. Mr. Chave agreed to furnish the Board Members with materials from the Part I training session to refresh their memories.

Chair Lovell reviewed a list of potential agenda topics that included: growth patterns and strategies; maintaining the City's character; Growth Management Act goals for jobs, housing and population growth; housing strategies; Americans with Disabilities Act requirements; mixed-use development; fringe rezoning; taller buildings; reprogramming large, single-family properties; and targeted areas of Edmonds such as Highway 99, Five Corners, Perrinville and Firdale Village. He invited the Board Members to share their thoughts on which topics they wanted to place on the agenda.

In addition to the training provided by the City Engineer, the Board concurred that the main topic of discussion at the retreat should be housing alternatives as they relate to the Growth Management Act and whether or not the City can provide housing to accommodate the projected growth.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Lovell did not make any additional comments.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

None of the Board Members made additional comments.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 9:05 p.m.