

**APPROVED MAY 11<sup>TH</sup>**

**CITY OF EDMONDS  
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

**April 27, 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 – 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue North.

**BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT**

Philip Lovell, Chair  
Carreen Rubenkönig, Vice Chair  
Matthew Cheung  
Alicia Crank  
Nathan Monroe  
Daniel Robles  
Valerie Stewart

**STAFF PRESENT**

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager  
Mike Clugston, Senior Planner  
Jerry Bevington, Video Recorder  
Karin Noyes, Recorder

**BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT**

Todd Cloutier (excused)  
Samuel Kleven (Student Representative)

**READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

**BOARD MEMBER CHEUNG MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF APRIL 13, 2015 BE APPROVED AS AMENDED. BOARD MEMBER ROBLES SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.**

**ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA**

The agenda was accepted as presented.

**AUDIENCE COMMENTS**

**Natalie Shippen, Edmonds**, read a letter she previously sent to the Board, voicing her concern that the Planning Board has appeared to accept temporary commercial signs on Edmonds streets as needed, desired, and even inevitable. The only question they appear to be considering is how many and where. While it is unfortunate that a small, but well-organized downtown group feels it must soil its own nest to make a living, she does not believe that the 40,000 other people (residents) who share that nest should have to pay to solve their problems. The residents consider their homes to be a flourishing, attractive residential community, and they have spent thousands of dollars in over 50 years to make residential and commercial Edmonds look the way it does today. She said she believes their efforts deserve more consideration than they are now receiving from the Planning Board.

Ms. Shippen voiced her opinion that temporary signs are a blight. She recalled that about four years ago, the City retained consultant, Roger Brooks, to explore ways to make Edmonds more inviting. He provided a long list, and the theme of one of the items was “First Impressions Are Lasting.” Applying that old adage, he suggested that the “Entering Edmonds” sign not be placed at Westgate but further along where SR-104 enters the bowl area. It’s easy to see why. Upon entering Westgate,

one is met with a flashing carwash sign on the right, and a collection of drab, low-commercial buildings on the left. Sandwich Board signs are strung along SR-104, identifying each business. This is the perfect poor first impression. Edmonds residents don't deserve more blight and more poor impressions on Main and Fifth Streets.

Ms. Shippen concluded by stating that temporary commercial signs are a stigma. They send a far more significant message than the actual words on the signs. They convey a state of mind, crying economic distress, panic and cheap. None of these attitudes reflect the reality of a prosperous, attractive residential community. Locating temporary commercial signs in the public right-of-way creates the picture of a fine home with a seedy front yard. She questioned if that is the image the residents want their sign code to produce.

**Tracy Miller** said she is a small business owner at the Harbor Square Business Complex and was present to speak regarding proposed changes to the sign code. She asked the Board to keep in mind that many businesses would be impacted by the proposed changes, and not just the ones located on the walkable downtown streets. While she understands concerns about clutter and blocking pedestrian access, the signs are an important tool for businesses that are located off the sidewalk and in small business parks to advertise their locations. She explained that her business is not visible from the street, and the landlord (the Port of Edmonds), does not have any intent to put up signage. Temporary signage is the only method she has for customers to find her business. She said she would support some restrictions on temporary signage, but she does not support eliminating them entirely in the downtown.

**Robert Boehlke** said he owns HouseWares on Main Street in downtown Edmonds and was also present to speak regarding the sign code. He said he is a board member of the Edmonds Downtown Business Improvement District (ED), which has submitted some potential revisions they would like the Planning Board to consider. He explained that there are a number of architectural elements on the historic buildings in downtown that preclude some business owners from using standardized signage. Rather than eliminating temporary signs altogether, he suggested that there are alternative temporary sign types, other than A-frame signs, that could be used to mitigate the concerns. He asked that the Board keep in mind that there are instances where it is difficult to meet the existing code requirements.

**Debbie Rosenfelt** said she and her partner have owned Snap Fitness in downtown Edmonds for eight years, and the majority of her new members indicate they learned about her business from reading the temporary signs as they drive by. She said she has a stand-up sign that promotes classes and personal training opportunities. The sign is pivotal for them because people need to know what else they offer besides just a gym. She reminded the Board that the City helped establish the Business Improvement District (ED), which is all about promoting businesses. If the goal is to bring people into the City to shop, she questioned how people will know the businesses exist if they are not allowed to advertise. It is critical for the business owners in Edmonds to have temporary signs.

### **DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR REPORT TO PLANNING BOARD**

Chair Lovell referred the Board to the written report provided by the Development Services Director. He specifically noted the information relative to "ST3," a plan that Sound Transit is currently formulating for a vote by taxpayers in the region with respect to financing future projects, including a fairly aggressive program for transit-oriented development. Along this same subject, he pointed to a recent article in *THE SEATTLE TIMES* regarding affordable housing. Board Member Robles reviewed that the article referenced a study that says if you mix income levels in communities, the net outcome will be higher than having them separate in terms of education, progress and future net earnings of the individuals involved. From his personal experience, he agrees with the article in many ways, as a way to meet the future needs of the community. Chair Lovell explained that ST3 specifically requires that 80% of the Sound Transit Properties that are disposed of after project completion must be dedicated to development of affordable housing. This is an impressive goal.

Chair Lovell asked if any Board Members were able to attend the Snohomish County Tomorrow Meeting, and the response was no.

Chair Lovell announced that, at their last meeting, the City Council voted on the final amendment for the Critical Areas Ordinance, and the entire ordinance should come up for a vote in the near future. He also suggested that a Board Member attend the next Tree Board meeting on May 5<sup>th</sup>, where a guest speaker will discuss the "7 Myths of Sight Selection and Care of Trees." He recalled that the last work done by the Tree Board resulted in quite a large amount of public interest, which

lead to a very work-loaded public hearing process undertaken by the Planning Board last year. He said he would like to avoid a similar occurrence this year.

### **DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES UPDATE**

Mr. Chave shared the report that the Development Services Director and Building Official presented to the City Council on April 26<sup>th</sup>. He explained that staff is one of the keys to permitting success, and teamwork is required. Staff attends regular meetings with developers and residents to provide site-specific information on projects being planned, and many of the meetings are offered at no cost to the applicant. These Development Review Committee Meetings are an important part of the process, particularly for applicants who are not familiar with the permitting process.

Mr. Chave provided a graph to illustrate the Development Services Permit History from 1995 through 2015. He noted that there was a boom time in the mid 2000, but a significant decline during the recession that began in 2008. They started coming out of the decline in 2013, and 2014 and 2015 have been very strong. He noted that much of the 2014 permit activity was related to the hospital project. Without this one project, 2015 was actually well ahead of 2014. He noted that the numbers of building permits have been skyrocketing, most of which are for smaller projects. He also shared a chart to illustrate the valuation of building permits in 2014 and 2015. He noted that much of the 2014 valuation (\$74 million) was related to the hospital. Although the 2015 valuation (\$41 million) was somewhat lower, when factoring out the hospital construction, 2015 was a very strong year.

Mr. Chave explained that Land Use Permits are tracked differently. These permits are discretionary and there are State requirements that they must be completed within a certain period of time. Land Use Permits, in general, are very time intensive because there is a lot of process involved (notification, public hearings, appeals, etc.). It's very important that the City stay on top of the timelines, and the City is happy that very few projects extend beyond the 120-day timeframe. Because the City tracks how long permit review takes, they are able to advise applicants at the start of the timeframe they can expect for the process to be completed.

Mr. Chave reported that the Engineering Division issued hundreds of permits, which resulted in substantial revenue. About \$66,000 was collected in Traffic Impact Fees in 2015. A number of residents took advantage of the solarize campaigns that took place in Edmonds in 2014 and 2015. He recalled that the City recently revised its process to streamline how solar permits are issued, and the application was made available online so people can apply without having to come to City Hall.

Mr. Chave provided a graph to illustrate the history of the number of building permits issued per Development Services employee over the past 30 years. He noted that there have not been significant changes in the number of employees over the years. Rather than ramping up staffing during boom times, the City has relied more on technology, etc. to stay on top of what has to be done. The blue line on the graph illustrates the impact that efficiency has had because the number of permits completed per employee has really skyrocketed in the last couple of years.

Mr. Chave summarized that over 8,000 field inspections were performed in 2015 by the Building, Engineering and Planning Division staff. These inspections involve everything from huge projects to small remodels or renovations. He provided a map to illustrate the range of projects that have occurred in the City, many of which are on Highway 99, SR-104 and downtown. He specifically noted that in 2015:

- There were 44 active new Single-Family Residence Permits. This included subdivision projects such as Seabrook Estates (7 lots), Shaw Lane (6 lots), Woodvale (27). Individual residential projects occurred in various places throughout the City, as well. He shared examples of some of the homes that were built or are nearing completion.
- A Certificate of Occupancy was issued for the Prestige Care project on October 29, 2015. This is a 48,000 square foot skilled-nursing facility.
- Swedish Hospital expanded its emergency facility and added a new parking garage.
- Phase 1 of the Post Office/Mixed Use project is nearing completion. This project provides 43 new residential units and 4,800 square feet of commercial space. Phase 2, which includes 28 new residential units and 7,800 square feet of commercial space, will begin as soon as Phase 1 has been completed.
- The Cedar Creek Memory Care facility is currently under construction.
- A new commercial/retail building is being constructed in the Winco Shopping Center.

- Point Edwards is starting the permitting process for 68 new residential units with structured parking below.
- Salish Crossing is a significant project in terms of upgrading and updating the old Safeway Building Complex, and a variety of tenants will occupy the space.
- There were a number of tenant improvement projects, which are important to keep the commercial areas alive.
- The City is working on a number of projects, including the Frances Anderson Center Band Shell and the Edmonds Fishing Pier.

In addition to the permit activity, staff is also working on a variety of code updates (subdivisions, signs, stormwater, and low-impact development integration), the Critical Areas Ordinance, the Street Tree Plan update, the Highway 99 Subarea Plan, and the Public Works Standard Details Plan. In addition, the Permit Center on the second floor of City Hall has been substantially remodeled, and a new Green Resource Center was created. Lastly, he announced that the Permit Center, which was closed on Wednesdays in 2015, is now open from 8:30 a.m. to noon on Wednesdays. He emphasized that many resources can now be found on the City's website, [www.edmondswa.gov](http://www.edmondswa.gov). The City's web map also provides information on a number of things and can be accessed from the City's website or at [www.maps.edmondswa.gov](http://www.maps.edmondswa.gov).

Chair Lovell asked why the skilled nursing facility on 76<sup>th</sup> Avenue is still not open when a Certificate of Occupancy was issued in October of 2015. Mr. Chave could not answer the question, but assumed they are doing final touches.

Board Member Stewart said she appreciated the overview of all the projects, which shows how hard the staff works. She asked if demolitions will be worked into the equation when tallying the number of new residential units created each year. While some demolished units are replaced, others are not. Mr. Chave said this information is reported each year to the State's Office of Financial Management so it can be considered as part of the population estimate.

Board Member Stewart requested more information about the new structure that is proposed for the Salish Crossing site. Mr. Chave said this will be the new location of Top Pot Doughnuts. As currently designed the facility will include an open deck facing the ferry so that customers can enjoy the view.

Chair Lovell inquired if the information provided in the report provides the statistical information that Vice Chair Rubenkonig requested at the last meeting. Vice Chair Rubenkonig said that while she appreciated the report provided by Mr. Chave, it was actually an annual report, and her request was for a monthly count of the building permits that are being considered. She noted that other jurisdictions provide a monthly report, and she felt it would be helpful information for the Board to have.

#### **REVIEW OF SIGN CODE: TEMPORARY SIGNS**

Mr. Chave said the purpose of tonight's discussion is to prepare some options for the public to react to at a public hearing on May 25<sup>th</sup>. He reminded the Board that the City must allow for some forms of temporary signage, such as "for lease" or "for rent" signs, but it can be tricky to specifically define the signs that are allowed. While the City can regulate a sign's location and length of time it is allowed, it cannot regulate based on a sign's purpose and/or content. He referred to Supreme Court Decision Reed vs. Town of Gilbert, in which the court made it very clear that if you have to read the content of a sign to determine if it is allowed or not, you have gone too far. The City's sign regulations must be content neutral. It doesn't mean a City cannot allow these types of signs, but content cannot be the important part of the regulation.

He recalled that the Board previously discussed the idea of providing a range of options for the public to react to. For example:

1. Temporary signs within the right-of-way could be prohibited altogether.
2. The draft language in Attachment 1 of the Staff Report represents what is currently happening on the ground and recognizes the way business are choosing to use temporary signage. The draft language would still allow business to advertise special events, menus, etc., but it would be a little more specific as to how many signs would be allowed, where they could be located, and how long they could be out. While a permit could still be required, the 60-day limitation would be eliminated and replaced with limitations on location and number of signs allowed. For

example, there could be a limit of one sign per building and/or entry and the businesses in the building would have to decide how the sign would be shared.

3. The current code could be retained but more specificity could be added. Under the existing code, temporary signs are only allowed for 60 days per year. To make the current code enforceable, a permit could be required so the City could track the number of days a sign is out.

Mr. Chave requested feedback from the Board as to whether or not they want to move forward with a public hearing on May 25<sup>th</sup>. If so, the hearing needs to be advertised before the Board's next meeting. He said it would also be helpful for the Board to provide feedback on the range of options they want to consider, recognizing that they can continue their discussion on May 11<sup>th</sup> to further refine the alternatives prior to the public hearing.

Chair Lovell recalled that at the last meeting, Board Member Cloutier suggested that the Board focus on identifying exactly what they are trying to accomplish or what problems they are trying to solve with the sign code amendments. His understanding is that the Board's two main concerns were obstruction of the public right-of-way and cluttering the downtown with too many signs. The Board discussed that the concerns could be addressed by limiting the number of signs allowed per building or business and where they can be located. He reviewed that the Board has heard from business owners about the importance of temporary signs. They should recognize and respect that temporary signs are important advertising tools for businesses, and commercial property owners have a right to advertise their businesses within the rules governing Edmonds. Lastly, he recalled the Board's discussion that it would be very difficult to implement a permit system that would track each sign and how long they are out. He clarified that it is currently difficult to track signs because there is no permit requirement. Because the draft language includes a permitting structure, it would be much easier for the City to track the signs. A permitting structure could be added to the existing code, as well.

Mr. Chave clarified that off-site temporary signs are not allowed under the existing code. However, "premise" is defined as the entire lot that the building sits on, which means that the sign may not necessarily be in front of the business. The draft language would be even more restrictive to specify where the temporary signs can be located on a premise. He cautioned against allowing off-site temporary signs, which would allow signage everywhere with no restrictions. He explained that there are other ways to deal with business visibility. For example, staff had a discussion with the City Council about a partnering program with Western Washington University during the coming academic year. The City would work with a variety of classes on a number of projects, including coming up with a wayfinding system for businesses in the downtown area. This could be a mobile app linked to a website maintained by ED that provides a variety of information about the businesses. He suggested this might be a better way to provide more detailed information than would ever be possible via temporary signs. Another idea that has been discussed is a physical and unified wayfinding system, with standard signs placed throughout the downtown that point to the individual businesses.

Vice Chair Rubenkonig noted that the Board Members did not receive a copy of the letter from the Edmonds Downtown Business Improvement District that was referenced by Mr. Boehlke. Mr. Chave agreed to track down the letter and forward it to the Planning Board Members. Vice Chair Rubenkonig also noted the letter the Board received from Rick Steves, a downtown business owner, who indicated he would support a prohibition on A-frame signs.

Vice Chair Rubenkonig referred to the comments provided by Ms. Rosenfelt, the co-owner of Snap Fitness, about the importance of using A-frame signs to advertise her services. She asked if the current code would allow businesses to advertise special events in their windows. Mr. Chave answered affirmatively, but said there are some limitations. Vice Chair Rubenkonig also referred to Ms. Terry's comments about the lack of visibility at Harbor Square and suggested that is an issue the Port should address for its tenants.

Vice Chair Rubenkonig referred to the Mountlake Terrace sign code that focuses on advertising grand openings as the finest use of temporary signage. Mr. Chave said that the City's current code allows businesses to have grand opening signs, as well; but they are limited to a maximum of 60 days per year.

Vice Chair Rubenkonig asked if the current code would allow off-premise signs near the rights-of-way at Harbor Square. Mr. Chave answered that the signs would be allowed as long as they are located on private property and not in the public rights-of-way. He explained that, ideally, places like Harbor Square, with internal driveways and multiple access points that

are not visible from the street, should provide their own signage systems to identify the location of various businesses. It is unfortunate that individual businesses have to rely on their own mechanisms to get visibility. The Port could install a permanent monument sign that would serve this purpose.

Vice Chair Rubenkönig said she appreciates that the Board is leaning towards presenting three alternatives for the public hearing, and she is particularly pleased that one of the options is to prohibit temporary signs altogether in the downtown. Again, Mr. Chave reviewed the options currently being considered:

1. Prohibiting all temporary signs in the rights-of-way.
2. Maintaining the status quo but adding more specific regulations for regulating and tracking the signs.
3. Implementing the draft language provided in Attachment 1, which would replace the 60-day limitation with limits on the number and size and the locations where they are allowed. Permits would be required to help staff enforce the code provisions. This approach would most closely resemble the current situation.

Board Member Robles recalled Board Member Cloutier's earlier suggestion that the Board focus on the problems that need to be solved. He suggested that the problems could be solved quite simply by having the City paint green dots to identify where temporary signs can be located. This could take into consideration the width of the sidewalk and the need to provide Americans with Disabilities (ADA) access. The community could then decide which businesses get to place signs on the dots. He summarized that this approach would take the City entirely out of the job of regulating signs and solve the problem in a simple manner.

Board Member Crank referred back to staff's earlier request that the Board provide feedback on whether or not they were ready to schedule a public hearing on the sign code and expressed her desire to move forward with the public hearing as soon as possible. She noted that the downtown community is starting to pay attention to what is being discussed, and the City Council has provided direction, as well. The Board should "strike while the iron is hot," and schedule the public hearing for May 25<sup>th</sup>. She said she was pleased that the Chamber and ED have discussed the sign code with their members over the past week. She reported that she attended ED's annual meeting at the Edmonds Center for the Arts to inform them of what was going on. She said it is good that people are starting to pay more attention.

Board Member Crank pointed out that other communities have city-sanctioned downtown committees. While she is not suggesting that the City should form another committee, she would like the City to attempt to obtain proactive buy in from members of ED, who will be directly impacted by the changes. She asked if the City has done any outreach to invite ED to become involved in the discussion. She would like this feedback before the Board narrows down the alternatives to consider at the public hearing, and perhaps this feedback could form the discussion between now and the public hearing.

Board Member Stewart said it appears that the Board's intent is to address the quantity of signs, as well as their location. The goal is to ensure that adequate pedestrian access is maintained, particularly for people who have mobile impairments. Another goal could be to regulate the quality of signs. She noted that some signs are attractive and have character, but others do not. She said she supports Board Member Robles' idea of placing dots on the sidewalk where temporary signs could be located and businesses could decide how they are used. She voiced concern that permitting and checking the signs could become cumbersome for staff. While she does not have an opinion either way at this time, she would like to hear from the merchants and citizens who walk and shop in the downtown. She suggested that perhaps it would be helpful for ED to publish an article in the newspaper in advance of the public hearing to solicit public feedback.

Board Member Cheung asked if the current code prohibits businesses from hiring people to stand on the corner waving signs to advertise businesses. He said he would far prefer 10 A-frame signs as opposed to someone dressing like a gorilla or Statue of Liberty standing on the street corner waving a sign pointing to a business. He voiced concern that if the sign code is amended to prohibit temporary signs, businesses will come up with other ways to advertise and attract people to their stores. Unless this is specifically prohibited in the code, it is a possible outcome of the code changes. Mr. Chave said the code prohibits moving signs, but nothing would prevent someone from handing out flyers on the street corner.

Board Member Crank suggested the Board go back to the initial question of what problems the Board is trying to solve. They should focus their attention on addressing ADA accessibility and the proliferation of signs before moving to the next step of addressing the design and quality of signs. Vice Chair Rubenkönig reminded the Board of Board Member Cloutier's

caution against being too prescriptive. For example, placing the signs next to the business entrance may not be the best location. In some situations, a better location would be to lean the sign against a tree where it is out of the pedestrian area.

Chair Lovell said he was not aware that the Board had agreed to consider the option of eliminating temporary signs in the downtown altogether. He voiced concern that this would be a slap in the face to all business owners in Edmonds, regardless of the zone. The Board should keep in mind that business have invested in the signs, and they believe they are necessary to the success of their businesses. He said he believes the draft code language would address the problems identified by the Board by limiting the number of signs and where they can be located. It also describes, to a certain extent, the quality of signs that will be allowed.

Again, Vice Chair Rubenkonig pointed out that businesses are allowed to have temporary signage in the windows. She suggested that education is needed to address the issue. She would love to see what Edmonds would look like if the current sign code were enforced. In the Board's quest to come up with an approach, they should keep in mind that the City already has an approach. The issue came to the Board's attention because the City Council was asking them to consider requiring a permit for temporary signs so the code is more enforceable. For the public hearing, she supports including the option that would prohibit temporary signs.

Mr. Chave explained that, in preparation for the public hearing on May 25, staff would bring back more details on the options for the Board's continued discussion on May 8<sup>th</sup>. He would also contact the Development Services Director to discuss what has been and can be done to solicit feedback from ED.

Board Member Robles asked that the "green dot" alternative also be included as an option for public hearing purposes. He noted that the draft code language is 7 pages long and will likely get longer, and enforcement would be a nightmare. He suggested that his approach would be the simplest to enforce.

For clarification, Board Member Monroe briefly described the three options currently being considered as follows:

1. Prohibit all temporary signs.
2. Limit temporary signs to 60 days with a permit (existing code language).
3. Allow temporary signs, but require a permit and place limits on how many and where they can be located (draft code language).

#### **ZONING CODE CORRECTION AT 21805 – 98<sup>TH</sup> AVENUE WEST (PLN20160019)**

Mr. Clugston advised that the purpose of this City-sponsored project is to rezone the property located at 21805 – 98<sup>th</sup> Avenue West from Open Space (OS) to Single-Family Residential (RS-8). The rezone would bring the zoning on the site into agreement with the Comprehensive Plan. He explained that while reviewing a building permit for a nearby site, staff noticed that the subject property was zoned OS rather than RS-8 like the parcels surrounding it on the east side of 98<sup>th</sup> Avenue West north of 220<sup>th</sup> Street SW. He provided a map to illustrate the zoning of the subject property, as well as surrounding properties, and further explained that the parcel used to be the site of an old City-owned water storage facility and was zoned OS. The facility was removed in the late 1960s, and the parcel should have been rezoned to RS-8 at that time but wasn't. Despite the OS zoning, the City approved a building permit for the existing single-family residence on the lot in 1971 and later a pool in 1976. Based on the current OS zoning, the existing use is considered non-conforming.

Chair Lovell asked if the subject parcel is at least 8,000 square feet in size, and Mr. Clugston answered that it actually approximately 10,000 square feet.

Mr. Clugston advised that the proposed rezone would be scheduled for a public hearing before the Planning Board in the near future.

#### **INTRODUCTION TO THE EDMONDS SUBDIVISION CODE**

Mr. Clugston explained that the purpose of his presentation is to lay the groundwork for the Board's future discussions about subdivisions as part of the code rewrite. The intent is to review the relevant state-enabling language, discuss what

subdivisions and short subdivisions are and how the process works, provide an overview of the existing code, and outline several elements the update will focus on. He referred to the link that was provided for the MRSC's webpage about subdivisions, which provides a useful general description of subdivisions, as well as links to the relevant Revised Code of Washington (RCW) provisions.

Mr. Clugston provided a brief history of subdivisions, noting that the City was first platted in 1890, with single-family residential lots in the downtown that still exist today. The plats did not take into account such things as topography, wetlands, streams, etc. They simply created lines on a map. There were no regulations in place until 1956, when the City's first subdivision regulations were adopted. The regulations were updated in 1974 and again in 1983. Today's subdivisions are more complicated and take a lot more time to review, as they address such things as utilities, parking, critical areas, trees, street improvements, etc. He reviewed that the intent of the enabling statutes for plats, subdivisions and dedications (RCW 58.17) as follows:

- Regulate the subdivision of land and promote the public health, safety and general welfare.
- Provide for proper ingress and egress and lessen congestion.
- Promote effective use of land and provide for adequate light and air.
- Facilitate adequate provisions for water, sewer, parks and recreation areas, schools, and other public requirements.
- Require uniform monumenting of land subdivisions.

Next, Mr. Clugston reviewed the following key terms related to subdivisions and short subdivisions:

- **Subdivisions and Short Subdivisions** is the creation of lots or parcels. In the current code, a subdivision is the division of land into five or more lots, and a short subdivision is the division of land into four or fewer lots. All of the lots must comply with the underlying zoning regulations. Most land divisions in Edmonds are short subdivisions because the City is primarily built out. The intent of a subdivision is to create lots and provide for utilities and access.
- **Planned Residential Developments (PRD)** parallel the subdivision process but allow some flexibility in the underlying zoning requirements. They are particularly useful when there are environmental constraints such as steep slopes, wetlands or streams. For example, the homes can be clustered into one area, with large tracts of open space provided elsewhere, and setbacks can be adjusted to accommodate topography or other unique features of the site. The PRD process mirrors the subdivision process, but Architectural Design Board review is required.
- A **Lot Line Adjustment** is simply moving an existing parcel boundary and does not create new lots. Lots must continue to meet existing zoning requirements.
- **Plats and Short Plats** are actual paper or electronic maps that are drawn by the surveyor or engineer to illustrate the proposal. The terms are often incorrectly interchanged with "Subdivision" and "Short Subdivision."

Mr. Clugston provided an aerial photograph to illustrate some of the subdivisions, short subdivisions and planned residential developments that have been created in the City. He also provided a flow chart to illustrate the three steps of the general subdivision review process:

- The intent of a **Preliminary Plat Review** is to review the proposal against applicable codes and what is on the land to determine feasibility. No lots are created nor houses permitted at this point in the review process. The preliminary plat review for subdivisions is a Type II Decision by the Director. For short subdivisions it is a Type III- B Decision by the Hearing Examiner.
- The intent of a **Civil Review** is to review plans for improvements that will actually be constructed as part of a project, including streets, driveways, curbs, gutters, sidewalks, utilities and stormwater. A separate building permit would be required to actually construct the homes. Civil review is done by staff for both short subdivisions and subdivisions.
- The intent of a **Final Plat Review** is to ensure the improvements are constructed or bonded for, accept any dedication, and sign maps to file with the County Auditor. The final plat review for subdivisions is a Type I Decision by the Director. For short subdivisions it is a Type IV-B Decision by the City Council.

Mr. Clugston summarized that the current code works for the most part, and it is consistent with the State's enabling statutes. However, staff is proposing that it be reorganized and that several processes that are described in the RCWs (plat vacation/alteration, binding site plan, and fee simple/townhouse) be added. In addition, amendments will be proposed to clarify the provisions for creating individual lots around town home development and to implement low-impact development. He explained that the intent is to identify areas where the code can be amended to actually encourage low-impact development and green infrastructure. He concluded his presentation by advising that the City's consultant, Makers, will help guide the staff and Planning Board through the update process.

Chair Lovell asked if the PowerPoint presentations on the development activities and subdivisions are available via the city's website. Mr. Clugston agreed to provide the Board with a link to the subdivision presentation, and Mr. Chave noted that the development activities presentation is available via the City Council's packet for the April 26<sup>th</sup> meeting.

### **REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA**

There was no discussion about the extended agenda.

### **PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS**

Chair Lovell did not provide additional comments.

### **PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS**

Board Member Crank reported that she recently attended a meeting of the Chamber Board of Directors where she provided a report on what the Planning Board is doing, and specifically the sign code. She made a similar presentation to the Edmonds Downtown Business Improvement District Board. She emphasized the need to make sure these two groups are connecting with the community and not just within themselves.

Board Member Monroe reported on his attendance at the April 14<sup>th</sup> Citizens Economic Development Commission (CEDC) meeting where they had a brainstorming exercise to select goals. There is nothing concrete at this time. The CEDC meets on the third Wednesday of each month.

Vice Chair Rubenkönig said she received notice from Francis Chapin, Cultural Services Manager, concerning the interim Art April Update that included an announcement about the luminous forest, an art installation on 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The artist recently met with Public Works staff to review and finalize selection of a new LED light product. The return process for the failed lights is now complete, and the new product has been ordered. Hopefully, the new lights will arrive by mid-May, and Ms. Chapin will test them before beginning installation in June. She hopes to have a celebration of the 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue interim art project in conjunction with the Edmonds Center for the Art's 10<sup>th</sup>'s birthday bash on July 30<sup>th</sup>.

Vice Chair Rubenkönig reminded the Board that she is a Sustainable Community Steward with the Extension Service, and she started a program called the Waste Warriors. She announced that the Waste Warriors will be at the 2016 Waterfront Festival that is sponsored by the Edmonds Rotary Club on June 3<sup>rd</sup> through 5<sup>th</sup>. The event is being more centered on children and the waterfront.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

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

**APPROVED**