

APPROVED JULY 27TH

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

June 22, 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 Rubenkönig, Vice Chair
Todd Cloutier
Nathan Monroe
Daniel Robles
Valerie Stewart

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Brad Shipley, Planner
Jerry Bevington, Video Recorder
Karin Noyes, Recorder

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Matthew Cheung (excused)
Alicia Crank (excused)

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

VICE CHAIR RUBENKONIG MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF JUNE 8, 2016 BE APPROVED AS CORRECTED. BOARD MEMBER STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

The agenda was accepted as presented.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

No one in the audience indicated a desire to comment during this portion of the meeting.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR REPORT TO PLANNING BOARD

Chair Lovell referred the Board to the written report that was provided by the Development Services Director. There was no discussion relative to the report.

UPDATE ON HIGHWAY 99 SUBAREA PLAN PROJECT

Mr. Shipley advised that he was present to provide an overview of the presentation that was made at the May 19th open house. He reviewed that the purpose of the Highway 99 Subarea Plan Project is to create a vision for the approximately two-mile stretch of the corridor that is located within Edmonds. There are major local and regional destinations along the highway, and the Edmonds portion has been divided into three distinct sub districts:

- The **International District** is currently developed with diverse restaurants, grocers and shops.
- The **Health District** is home to Swedish Edmonds Hospital and other medical offices.
- The **Gateway District** is a new district that was identified by the community during the February public open house. The intent is that this district will provide a gateway and distinct transition point in and out of Edmonds.

Mr. Shipley explained that the corridor is already developed as a horizontal mixed-use district with retail and business uses along the highway and adjacent multi-family and single-family residential development. The goal is to integrate all of these uses in a more cohesive pattern. He provided an Urban Form Heat Map that illustrates the walkability of the corridor. He explained that there are three spots with reasonably good urban form (crossings, transit service, block size, and employment activity), but there are opportunities to enhance these nodes further. He also provided maps to show areas where there are no marked pedestrian crossings, particularly in the south. For example, there is a stretch between the International and Gateway Districts where it is a 10-minute walk between crossings. This has been helped with the new 228th Street crossing, which was not included on the map, but there are still long segments of the highway without crossings. Most people will not walk 10 minutes out of their way to get to a crossing.

Chair Lovell asked if it would be possible for the consultant (Fregonese Associates) to delineate on the maps or give some indication of the area along Highway 99 that represents Esperance as opposed to Edmonds proper. Mr. Shipley pointed out the location of the Esperance area and agreed to ask the consultant to make this distinction clearer.

Mr. Shipley advised that those in attendance at the March open house were divided into eight groups and asked to participate in instant polling and mapping exercises to identify the types of improvements they would like to see along the highway. The participants identified opportunities for new housing and business, community centers and services, and infrastructure upgrades. After the workshop the feedback was merged and digitized to reflect the participant's desires as follows:

- More housing development along the corridor, particularly in the south.
- More mixed-use development, particularly in the south and central districts.
- Greater pedestrian safety throughout the entire corridor.
- Enhancement of landscape medians.
- More mid-block pedestrian crossings throughout the corridor, particularly between 230th and 234th Streets near the Community Health Center.
- Pedestrian refuge areas at mid-block crossing locations and key destinations.
- Traffic calming on the high-speed southern area, particularly at the Highway 99/Highway 104 interchange and in the 220th Street Neighborhood.
- Enhanced transit that provides better connection mid-corridor to future regional rail and better transfers at the south end.
- Wayfinding signage to establish Edmonds' identity on Highway 99 and provide a sense of place.

Mr. Shipley reported that participants in the March open house identified the following community values: connectivity, destinations, beautification, safety, walkability, affordable housing and healthy businesses. With these community values in mind, the consultant moved forward with scenario planning to identify plausible stories about the future of the highway. He emphasized that scenario planning is not intended to represent potential master plans. The consultant started the scenario planning by summarizing the existing conditions:

- Many sites are less than 25% covered with buildings.
- Most buildings are between 25 and 60 years old and there are few new buildings or historic buildings on the corridor. Many buildings are reaching the end of their useful life.
- There are many low-to-moderate value buildings and few new, higher-value buildings, and this presents numerous opportunities for new investment and development.

Mr. Shipley said the consultant then identified potential redevelopment of parcels based on both near and long-term infrastructure improvements. The first two scenarios have a primarily residential focus, but an additional scenario is being created that identifies more of an office focus. The consultant has conducted a pro forma on the Edmonds market to determine the feasible building types that would likely work along the corridor in the near (infrastructure investment of

between \$10 and \$20 million) and long term (more extensive infrastructure investment). He pointed out that greater infrastructure improvements will result in more intense development opportunities.

Chair Lovell voiced concern that many of the statistics provided thus far by the consultant are hypothetical and not specific to Highway 99. Mr. Shipley agreed and explained that the project is in the scoping phase now, looking at different scenarios. The next phase will include actual plans with refined action items for both the near and long-term. The maps provided earlier are intended to represent what the consultant learned from the public at the first open house. Mr. Chave clarified that the intent of the presentation is to provide an overview of the process before getting into more specifics as the project moves forward.

Mr. Shipley described the scenarios as follows:

- **Scenario 1** represents near-term development opportunities, as well as a strategic, cost-effective transportation improvement package. Maps were provided to illustrate properties where redevelopment with a mixture of 4-over-1 mixed-use buildings and 2 to 3-story apartment buildings would be feasible within the next 5 to 10 years. It is anticipated that this scenario could result in additional residential capacity of between 800 and 1,600 new units. Near-term transportation improvements include enhanced street crossings, improved pedestrian infrastructure, street lighting, new bike route designations, and new Class II bicycle lanes. The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) has indicated it might be possible to provide an additional crossing somewhere between 228th and 236th Streets.
- **Scenario 2** represents long-term development opportunities and a higher-quality, costlier transportation improvement package. Maps were provided to illustrate properties where redevelopment with a mixture of 5-over-1 mixed-use buildings and 3-story apartment building would be feasible within the next 10 to 20 years. It is anticipated that this scenario would result in additional residential capacity of between 3,000 to 6,000 new units. Long-term transportation improvements include landscaped medians, pedestrian refuge areas, enhanced streetscape, and dedicated bike routes.

Board Member Robles asked if the bicycle and pedestrian improvements that are made along the corridor would tie in with the Interurban Trail, which is located nearby. Mr. Shipley answered that this connection has been part of the discussion, but it will not likely be feasible to add bicycle lanes along Highway 99. He acknowledged that there are some points where the Interurban Trail comes close to Highway 99, particularly near 220th Street. Although the plan has not progressed to this higher-level of detail, the relationship between the highway and the trail will be considered.

Vice Chair Rubenkonig asked if the discussion includes potential redevelopment in Mountlake Terrace and Lynnwood, which are located on the east side of the highway. Mr. Shipley answered that representatives from Mountlake Terrace and Lynnwood have participated in meetings with the consultant team, and they have been invited to provide feedback throughout the planning process. While there may be some coordinated design and investment, the plan has not reached this level of specificity yet.

Chair Lovell recalled that when the Board was reviewing the Port of Edmonds' proposed Master Plan for Harbor Square, they became intimately aware of the meaning of the 4-over-1 and 5-over-1 building concept, which is one level of concrete structure below four or five levels of wood-frame structure. This type of construction has proven to be a feasible and favorable design, but he reminded the Board that it does not accommodate more than five levels of wood-frame structure. He asked if there has been any discussion about more substantial and long-standing types of construction. Mr. Shipley answered that 4-over-1 and 5-over-1 is the type of construction that has generally penciled out for the corridor. The cost of construction increases significantly for buildings that exceed that height level. Although the CG and CG2 zones allow for high-rise development, it is not likely that this more substantial development would be supported in the next five to 10 years. Greater infrastructure improvements and more people living in the area will be needed before anything of that scale would pencil out for a developer.

Chair Lovell asked if 5-over-1 development would primarily accommodate residential units, and Mr. Shipley answered that both Scenario 1 and Scenario 2 indicate a mixture of residential and retail uses. However, Scenario 3 would include more office space as part of the mixture of uses, particularly in the north end within the Health District.

Board Member Monroe asked if any of the scenarios would accommodate the consolidation of lots to allow for big box stores or car dealerships. Mr. Chave said that earlier market studies indicate that there is a saturation point for big box retail along this section of Highway 99 because there are already a number of them in the area. He explained that the market area cannot go very far west because of the water, so it is mostly an east-facing market. Many of the big box retailers are moving to smaller formats so there might be some potential, but according to market studies, it does not look promising.

Board Member Monroe asked if the scenarios being created by the consultant would increase the tax base along the highway. Mr. Shipley said that is the intent of Scenario 3, which would be more office oriented. Mr. Chave added that the tax base includes two elements: property tax and sales tax. The corridor is currently developed as one-story commercial uses, and none of the proposed development types would result in the elimination of retail space. The intent is to build the local market by encouraging more intense redevelopment and infill, which would, in turn, raise property values. Board Member Monroe noted that the City receives significant tax revenue from car sales, and he felt it would be appropriate for the City to consider opportunities for properties to be aggregated for this purpose.

Mr. Shipley reviewed the scenario performance indicators, which were developed using the platform “Envision Tomorrow,” which was developed by Fregonese Associates, but is now an open source of public domain. He specifically noted the following:

- Lower investment in infrastructure improvements will result in fewer acres being redeveloped. It is estimated that about 42% of properties along the corridor would be developed and/or redeveloped based on Scenario 1 (near-term) and substantially more would be developed and/or redeveloped based on Scenario 2 (long-term) as a result of substantially more infrastructure improvements.
- Scenario 1 would result in about \$161,000 in property tax revenue per acre, and Scenario 2 would result in about \$221,000. Transit-oriented buildings would have a higher value per acre.
- The housing types in both scenarios would be primarily multi-family and there would be more opportunities for affordable housing.
- The corridor is already heavy in employment, and most of the new growth will likely be residential with some supporting retail and neighborhood commercial-type businesses. Possible exceptions are the major office users and hospital expansion. More people living in the area and more neighborhood businesses along the corridor will mean more opportunities for walking trips versus driving trips.
- Currently, the daily internal walk trips per unit is 1,918, and this number would increase to 3,479 with Scenario 1 and 6,662 with Scenario 2. With the increase of daily internal walking trips, the number of vehicle trips per household would decrease. Safety improvements, additional housing and frequent transit service would complete the corridor and greatly expand walking. As fewer people would need cars, transportation costs would also decrease. Fewer auto trips and safety improvements would also reduce the number of traffic accidents per capita.

Mr. Shipley reviewed the next steps in the process, which will start with the consultant incorporating open house and agency feedback and further refining the land use and transportation scenarios. The scenario phase will be followed by a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) and Planned Action Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) assessment. It is anticipated that a draft subarea plan will be available for the Board’s review by early fall, and that final adoption will occur before the end of 2016. He reminded the Board that more information (project updates, workshop results, upcoming events, etc.) can be found at www.EdmondsHWY99.org.

Chair Lovell recalled that when the consultant provided an initial orientation to the Board, he asked, and City Council Members have subsequently suggested, that property owners along Highway 99 be included in the process as stakeholders. Residential property owners near the highway should also be brought into the discussions. Mr. Shipley reported that he and the Development Services Director have met on several occasions with property owners along the corridor, and many have attended the open house events as active participants. The public appears to be excited about Highway 99 finally getting some attention. Many have indicated they would like to see changes, and they are optimistic about what can happen. He

summarized that there has been good engagement so far via on-line surveys and public open houses, and the opportunities for public involvement will continue throughout the process.

Chair Lovell said he was pleased to see that there is a strong desire for increased housing opportunities along the corridor, At this time, there is significant economic diversity as far as the quality of the existing residential and commercial stock. He asked if this factor has been considered, as well. Mr. Shipley said that a lot of diverse interests have emerged amongst the business and residential property owners, but they all agree that it is important to improve the safety and overall feel of the corridor.

Board Member Monroe asked if the numbers provided for property tax revenue take into account expected tax breaks that will be given to developers in coming years. Mr. Shipley said he did not prepare the information, so he is not sure what it includes in terms of affordable housing tax breaks. Board Member Monroe asked him to find out and address the issue in the next iteration. Mr. Chave pointed out that tax breaks would not be permanent. They are intended to get development in place and then the break would disappear over time.

Chair Lovell summarized that, going forward, he is primarily interested in what can realistically be done on the corridor and when. He observed that without support from the residential and commercial property owners along the corridor, nothing will happen. Mr. Shipley said the property owners he has talked to are very supportive and interested in moving forward. Mr. Chave added that, overall, the consultant and staff have been very pleased with the degree of interest. A diverse group of people are participating in the process.

RECOMMENDATION ON POTENTIAL AMENDMENTS TO THE EDMONDS COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CODE (ECDC) REGARDING TEMPORARY (E.G. A-FRAME) SIGNS AND OTHER AMENDMENTS TO ADDRESS A NUMBER OF MINOR CLARIFICATIONS AND CODE LANGUAGE UPDATES/ISSUES

Chair Lovell referred the Board to the introductory memorandum with respect to the sign code amendments, which outlines the Board's previous discussions related to the amendments. He reviewed that, at their last meeting, the Board came fairly close to agreement in terms of a recommendation to the City Council. This direction is reflected in the draft Sign Code and the Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations that were attached to the Staff Report.

Chair Lovell reviewed that, in addition to the proposed amendments relative to pedestrian signs in the downtown, the proposal also includes a number of other minor clarifications and code language updates/issues. He asked if these other proposed amendments were brought forward by the consultant. Mr. Chave answered that a few definition changes were suggested by the consultant, but most of the proposed amendments address problems staff has run into over the years with things that were not clearly defined in the code or things that get in the way of what is reasonable. For example, an applicant approached the City with a request to place a sign on the mansard roof a building, and staff agreed that it was the only logical place for the sign. However, a provision in the sign code did not technically allow staff to approve the sign, as proposed. He clarified that the changes suggested by staff are intended to be clarifications or updates rather than wholesale changes to how signs are regulated. The overall signage allowed would remain unchanged.

Mr. Chave said one issue that repeatedly came up in the public hearing was the need for businesses that are not located on the main streets to get attention to let people know they exist. These types of signs are not necessarily permanent, but mostly used during an initial period when businesses first open. If the proposed changes are forwarded to the City Council with a recommendation of approval, the Board's recommendation could call attention to this issue and recommend that the City partner with the Downtown Business Improvement District (BID) to develop a signage system that provides an avenue for these businesses to get attention in certain ways. If a program of this type were instituted, businesses may be less likely to feel a need for pedestrian signs. He summarized that the initial changes could be made now to address pedestrian signs in the downtown, and then the City could pursue other options. The Board could revisit pedestrian signs again in three to five years when the situation may be different.

Chair Lovell referred to ECDC 20.60.080(2)(a), which allows attached signs to be used for temporary signage. Mr. Chave said the intent is to allow retailers to put up temporary signs for 60 days to advertise business openings or other special events. This is allowed in the current code, and no change has been proposed. The proposed amendment clarifies where attached signs can be located. Board Member Robles observed that the means and methods by which people can

accommodate their specific interests are spread throughout the sign code. Although they may not be obvious, they are there. Mr. Chave said the intent is to provide more flexibility to respond to what people want and need to do, but not change the overall character of signage in the downtown.

Chair Lovell commented that the proposed amendment outlines how pedestrian signs would be managed in the downtown area, but it does not recognize that there are other areas in Edmonds where pedestrian signs are, in theory, prohibited. The question still exists in his mind to what degree will the sign code be enforced in other commercial zones in the City. If it is enforced in all commercial areas, will business owners in other commercial areas complain because downtown business owners are allowed to have pedestrian signs and they are not? Or if it is not enforced in all commercial areas, downtown business owners may complain that they are being discriminated against. Mr. Chave explained that code enforcement is generally complaint driven. To the extent there are more pedestrians in the downtown, it is likely that more complaints will be filed for that area.

Chair Lovell recalled that, as requested by the Board, the proposed language provides flexibility that allows property owners and business owners to work with staff or the Architectural Design Board to reach agreement on how to handle signage in difficult situations. Board Member Robles asked if the agreement would be transferrable to future occupants or owners of a building. If it is transferrable, he questioned if the City has a database to memorialize the special agreements for future reference. Mr. Chave responded that once a sign structure has been approved and placed on a building, the agreement would be valid for any future business or property owner as long as no structural changes are proposed. Any structural changes would require the property owner or business owner to obtain a new permit. If the sign does not comply with the current sign code, a new exception agreement would be required.

Mr. Chave reviewed that most of the special situations that the code previously talked about were related to site conditions. The proposed amendment expands the language to acknowledge that, in addition to site conditions, the sign code provisions may not quite fit for some buildings due to unique architectural features.

Board Member Stewart expressed her belief that incorporating additional pictures into the code would make the provisions easier for people to understand. For example, it would be helpful to provide examples of the types of pole signs that would be considered monument signs. Otherwise, the written language is a bit difficult to digest. Mr. Chave explained that the existing code considers signs that are located on one or more exposed poles to be pole signs rather than monument signs, and pole signs are not allowed. The additional sentence was added to clarify that pole signs with two poles that are not more than six feet in height would be considered monument signs and should be allowed. He agreed that pictures would be helpful in this section, as well as others, and staff plans to add them before the amendments are forwarded to the City Council for review.

Vice Chair Rubenkönig suggested, and the remainder of the Board concurred, that the last sentence in the definition of “Pole Sign” should be changed to remove the word “pole” before “signs.”

Board Member Stewart suggested that pictures would be particularly helpful to clarify the difference between a stanchion sign and a pole sign, as well as the difference between changeable message signs and reader board signs. She suggested that perhaps there should be separate categories for reader board and changeable message signs. Mr. Chave explained that it is very difficult to distinguish between reader board and changeable signs. For example, you could make the case that gas station price signs are changeable rather than reader board signs, but the City hasn't prohibited them because they are necessary. The intent was to write the language in such a way that allows a distinction to be made. The proposed language is not ideal, but it is the best staff has come up with thus far. Again, Board Member Stewart suggested it might be helpful to have separate categories for the two sign types.

Board Member Stewart referred to ECDC 20.60.020(A)(2), and requested clarification about why individual letters that are applied directly to a wall or structure are calculated individually instead of as a whole. Mr. Chave said that many sign codes calculate sign area by drawing a box around the individual letters, but the City calculates the area of the individual letters if they are applied individually to a building. This provision offers a powerful incentive for people to do this type of signage because it allows for larger letters. This type of signage is considered more aesthetically attractive because the letters are flush with the building rather than in a large cabinet sign.

Board Member Stewart said she would like the draft code to provide an illustration of a monument sign. Mr. Chave that this example has already been provided in ECDC 20.60.020.

Board Member Stewart said she was amused to read about the signs that are prohibited because she anticipates someone will come up with a clever sign that is not on the list. This will require an expensive process to get special approval to deviate from the sign code. Mr. Chave explained that staff often has to issue interpretations when these situations come up. For example, halo signs did not exist when the current code was written. Staff determined that the existing code provision related to indirect lighting would apply to this sign type, as well. He summarized that when someone proposes a sign, staff tries to identify the closest provisions that apply. Just because a sign is a different type does not mean it would be automatically ruled out. The intent is for the code to be descriptive rather than rigid in its definitions, and that is why sign codes are so difficult to write.

Chair Lovell reviewed that one of the desires expressed in the recommendation memorandum is that some exploration be done as to the feasibility of directional signage on the street corners. He asked if this is something the City's sign shop could help with. Mr. Chave agreed that is a possibility, depending on the style, design, materials, etc.

Vice Chair Rubenkönig recalled that the Board previously discussed the idea of having a GIS-imbedded mechanism that business owners could use to determine what type of sign package he/she would be allowed. However, this concept was not included in the draft recommendation that was prepared by staff. While this may be more of an administrative issue as the City becomes more technologically advanced, perhaps the Board should be more clear that they heartily support the concept. Board Member Robles commented that the matrix tells what signs can go in what areas, and the information could also be served on a map. Adding pictures would also provide helpful information. However, this approach is archaic given current technology. He asked about the timeline for reviewing the sign code again in the future. Mr. Chave explained that the current sign code amendments were put forward at the request of the City Council to specifically address pedestrian signs in the downtown. In addition, staff has included some minor amendments to clean up and clarify the existing sign code. He said he is not sure that GIS would be the best solution so he would be hesitant to include it in the Board's recommendation. However, it could be a subject that his considered as part of a future discussion of trying to make the code easier to understand. Board Member Robles suggested that if updating the sign code is an ongoing process, it should be articulated in the recommendation. He said he would support the proposed changes as long as there remains an avenue by which the sign code could be improved upon in the future.

Board Member Robles asked if all enforcement of the sign code is done on a complaint basis. Mr. Chave answered that all code enforcement is done on a complaint basis. Board Member Robles suggested that this should be noted in the sign code. Mr. Chave cautioned against adding language relative to enforcement in the sign code. Otherwise, the sign code would have to be updated every time the enforcement provisions are changed and vice versa. Board Member Robles expressed concern that citizens should have a clear understanding of how they are being judged. Mr. Chave advised that, in addition to complaint-based enforcement, there are general compliance requirements on how the overall code is administered. Staff ensures that code provisions are being met whenever someone applies for a permit.

Board Member Stewart said she understands the concerns that have been raised about the proliferation of pedestrian signs in the downtown. Because there are a lot of pedestrians in the downtown area, it is likely that more people will speak up about illegal signs. On the other hand, Highway 99 is mostly a drive-by situation so there will not be as many complaints. She said she is not sure how the fairness issue can be resolved except with additional enforcement that will require more manpower. Mr. Chave advised that the City only has one Enforcement Officer, and he does an amazing job of enforcing the Development Code provisions. It would be an entirely different thing to start patrolling the commercial areas to enforce the sign code provisions.

Vice Chair Rubenkönig suggested that another bullet point should be added to the Board's recommendation to read, "Employ technology measures, when available, to assist in sign code application."

VICE CHAIR RUBENKONIG MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD THE REVISION OF ECDC 20.60 (SIGN CODE), INCLUDING THE SCOPE OF THE SIGN CODE UPDATE, PUBLIC PROCESS AND COMMENTS, AND PLANNING BOARD RECOMMENDATIONS AS FOUND IN THE FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS PRESENTED BY THE PLANNING DIVISION STAFF ON JUNE 22, 2016, TO THE CITY

APPROVED

COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL AS WRITTEN, AND WITH ONE ADDITIONAL BULLET POINT TO READ, “EMPLOY TECHNOLOGY MEASURES, WHEN AVAILABLE, TO ASSIST IN SIGN CODE APPLICATION.” BOARD MEMBER STEWART SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Chair Lovell announced that the Board is scheduled to present a report to the City Council on June 28th. He asked that this date be incorporated into the extended agenda.

Chair Lovell asked when the Board can expect to hear from the City Council regarding a subarea plan for Five Corners. Mr. Chave answered that he is scheduled to provide an update to the City Council on July 12th. Chair Lovell suggested that the topic be added to the Board’s extended agenda for August as a placeholder.

Chair Lovell left the meeting at 8:35 p.m.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Lovell did not provide any additional comments.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Cloutier said he attended the first part of a meeting at the Senior Center regarding the Edmonds Waterfront Center Proposal, which was formerly known as the South County Senior Center Proposal. The name change is intended to ensure that the new facility is placed on the water.

Board Member Stewart announced that an open house regarding the Civic Park Master Plan is scheduled for June 23rd from 6:00 to 7:30 p.m. in the Plaza Meeting Room of the Edmonds Library Building. She said she plans to attend the meeting as a committee member, and she encouraged other Board Members to attend, as well.

Board Member Robles referred to an article in the May 31st Seattle Times regarding Airbnb regulations in the City of Seattle. He recalled that he raised this issue earlier, and some provisions were added to the City’s code to address the use. The use is quickly expanding, and he felt it would be appropriate for the Board to give further consideration to potential regulations that need to be in place.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 8:40 p.m.