

APPROVED SEPTEMBER 28TH

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

September 14, 2016

Vice Chair Rubenkönig 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

Carreen Rubenkönig, Vice Chair
Alicia Crank
Nathan Monroe
Daniel Robles
Valerie Stewart

STAFF PRESENT

Rob Chave, Planning Division Manager
Carrie Hite, Parks, Recreation and Cultural Services Director
Jerry Bevington, Video Recorder
Karin Noyes, Recorder

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Philip Lovell, Chair (excused)
Matthew Cheung (excused)
Todd Cloutier (excused)

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

BOARD MEMBER ROBLES MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF AUGUST 24, 2016 BE APPROVED AS CORRECTED. BOARD MEMBER MONROE 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

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

CIVIC FIELD MASTER PLAN UPDATE

Ms. Hite reviewed the Civic Center Playfield Master Plan process to date, which started with a kick off meeting before the City Council in May. Since that time there have been two public open houses, each accompanied by a two-week online open house. The staff and consultant also held numerous stakeholder meetings, with recent engagements including teen groups and parks maintenance staff. She reminded the Board that the consultant was previously before the Board and City Council to present the results of the 1st open house and solicit feedback. This feedback, along with feedback from the community and stakeholder meetings was used to prepare two options, which were presented at the 2nd open house. Over the next three months, the design team will be working with the community to refine the two alternatives to one preferred hybrid plan. The

consultant will also host another online and in-person public open house and provided continued briefings to the City Council, Planning Board, staff, and the Project Advisory Committee (PAC). She advised that Chris Jones from Walker Macy was present to present the alternatives to the Planning Board and solicit feedback prior to presenting to the City Council on September 27th. She advised that Board Member Stewart participates on the PAC, and several of other PAC members were present in the audience, as well.

Chris Jones, Walker Macy, said he is the landscape architectural consultant for the Civic Center Playfield Master Plan and was also the consultant for the recently completed Marina Beach Master Plan. He advised that his presentation would be a summary version of the two alternatives that were presented at the 2nd open house, which started by repeating back to the community what they heard from the 1st open house. At the 1st open house, participants were asked to comment on whether they favored an active, passive or civic design for the park, and most indicated they would prefer either an active or passive design. The participants were also provided a list of potential activities/features for the park and asked to identify those that they desired most. The top 13 activities/features included restrooms, petanque courts, jogging/walking paths, soccer, shade trees, skate park, playground, tennis, Boys and Girls Club, multi-use lawn, formal track, small performance space, and gardens. In addition to ranking the listed features, participants were also invited to identify additional features/activities they would like the City to consider. He summarized that the design team has received a lot of feedback from the community, including the City Council, Planning Board, PAC, Student Conservation Association, stakeholders, and parks maintenance staff.

Mr. Jones advised that, throughout the process, numerous people have questioned where they could go for a particular type of activity if it is eliminated from the Civic Center Playfield. To answer these questions, he provided a map that identifies the location of a number of fields and courts that can be found throughout the City's park system. With the exception of petanque, there are other places to get the recreation that is currently available at the Civic Center Playfield.

Mr. Jones explained that the project site is 8 acres in size, but the City must abide by a deed restriction that applies to six acres. The deed restriction limits the design to no more than 10% impervious surface and surface parking must be pervious. In addition, the site must be preserved as open space and no synthetic turf or buildings are allowed. Both of the design alternatives accommodate the deed restrictions. He reviewed each of the design options as follows:

- **Design Option 1 (Meadow Loop).** Option 1 introduces more passive landscape features into the park perimeter, including meadows, berms, and stormwater gardens that frame a central multi-use lawn. The option features a jogging trail with exercise stations and multiple walking paths, as well as a large, central play area. The lawn would be large enough to accommodate the same level of soccer usage that occurs now. A wide promenade-style sidewalk along 6th Avenue would allow for strolling or markets and could include a plaza, restroom and shade pavilion. It could also accommodate food concessions, movable tables and chairs, and a small water feature. The option also includes a small amount of the recreational programs, such as multi-use courts and petanque. Option 1 would also maintain the current Field House for the Boys and Girls Club, with no expansion. The highest activity and noise level would be located towards the center of the site, and the north, east and south sides of the park would be a much quieter, more passive space. There would be pedestrian connections and circulation throughout the park. The proposed walking paths would provide east/west connections, as well as a connection from the north side of the park to downtown. The Field House, plaza, and shade pavilion/restroom would provide a community hub along the western boundary of the park. He provided pictures to illustrate some of the concepts proposed in Option 1 such as the meadows and gardens, flexible use promenade that could accommodate a farmer's market and/or festival booths, creative and integrated play areas, shade pavilion and plaza, passive landscape gardens and multi-use lawn. He noted that the flexible-use event space would occupy about 65% of the total park space.
- **Design Option 2 (Activity Central).** Option 2 maximizes recreational activities and facilitates spectatorship. It includes a 200-meter track, multi-use lawn for soccer and other sports, and viewing terraces that overlook the playfields. It also includes petanque courts, skate park and four multi-use courts around an expanded Field House that could potentially house the Boys and girls Club or a café and restroom. The north portion of the park is more landscaped in character, and includes a picnic or performance pavilion and multi-generational play and exercise areas. A main path runs through park at Sprague Street and offers a clear connection from the residential neighborhood to the 4th Avenue Arts Corridor. The path also offers potential for bringing markets and other events into the park. The majority of the site would be dedicated to active recreational uses and would have more of a sports feel. The higher uses would be located

in the central and southeast corners of the site, and the lower uses would be along the northern edge. There would be average activity along the west side of the park (6th Avenue). In addition to the main pathway that provides an east/west connection for Sprague Street, there would be other meandering walkways through the park. The community hubs in Option 2 would be the expanded Field House for the Boys and Girls Club and/or café and restrooms. He provided pictures to illustrate some of the concepts proposed in Option 2 such as the shade pavilion and picnic area, landscaped integrated play areas within the walkways and topographic features, lawn terraces for spectating and views to replace the popular grandstands, all-ages recreation, small plaza with an interactive water feature, and game courts within garden groves so the use can be more flexible. In Option 2, about 90% of the site would be available for flexible-use event space.

Mr. Jones reported that there were about 140 in attendance at the 1st in-person open house, and about 160 at the 2nd. The 2nd open house started with a brief presentation, followed by a question and answer period. The participants were then divided into 16 groups to review the two alternatives, using a side-by-side comparison, and provide feedback on their preferred alternative, as well as the elements they liked best in each of the alternatives. Eight groups indicated a preference for Option 1, four for Option 2, and four were split or unclear. Individual comment cards indicated a preference for Option 1 over Option 2. The most consistent comments at the in-person open house indicated support for the lawn terraces and skateboard park. While the curves are nice in Option 1, most wanted a more active program like in Option 2.

In addition to the in-person open house, Mr. Jones advised that a two-week online open house was also offered. About 360 people visited the site and 132 responses were received. Forty-two respondents indicated a preference for Option 1 and 87 for Option 2. The common reasons that respondents preferred Option 1 included the free-flowing structure, layout and path, water feature and plaza, open green spaces and lawn, and a reduced number of petanque courts. Common reasons for preferring Option 2 included the long walking and running paths, track, focus on fields and athletic facilities, expanded Boys and Girls Club, skate park, view terraces, potential for large events, and more spaces for families and children. Common elements not shown that respondents would like to see included additional restrooms, benches and/or seating areas, lighting, additional covered athletic facility and market place, water fountains, stage, ADA accessibility and a 400-meter track. He noted that restrooms were included in each option, but may not have been explicit. However, the design is not at the level of addressing items such as benches, lighting, etc.

Mr. Jones summarized that the next step is to present the two options to the City Council on September 27th, along with a summary of the open house events and feedback from the Board. The design team will present a hybrid design scheme that reflects the input that has been provided to date at a 3rd open house on October 12th.

Board Member Crank said she was unable to attend the in-person open houses, but she did participate in the on-line open house. She referred to Option 2 and asked if the school district or adjacent property owners have commented about the need for a track. Ms. Hite answered that a few people specifically requested that a track be included in the design. The PAC had an in-depth discussion about this element, and it appears that people are more interested in having a way to measure their mileage. Perhaps it would be possible to provide this opportunity on the walkway that goes around the perimeter of the park rather than providing an actual track. In her experience, tracks are not usually located at public parks. They are typically found on school properties.

Board Member Crank asked if there is infrastructure in place to accommodate the water features that are proposed in both options. Mr. Jones answered that there is water and power service available at the park site, but nothing has been stubbed out to serve this need in a particular location. Board Member Robles noted that water features can utilize a lot of water. He asked if the features would be susceptible to significant water restrictions. Ms. Hite referred to the spray pad at City Park, which does use quite a lot of water. However, rather than a direct-to-drain resource, the water actually goes into a catch system where it is treated and reused on the pad. While this option is costly, it could be implemented at Civic Center Playfield, too.

Board Member Robles asked if one option would be costlier to maintain than the other. Mr. Jones answered that Option 1 would probably require more maintenance from staff. However, they met with parks maintenance staff to discuss the maintenance needs of both options, and no concern was raised about the City's ability to accommodate the maintenance needs associated with either option. Ms. Hite added that staff can work with the consultant to incorporate elements of design that require less maintenance such as drought tolerant plants, lower maintenance gardens, and low-impact development (LID)

improvements such as rain gardens. She explained that the maintenance staff already maintains the 8-acre site. While the maintenance needs would likely increase, the change would not be significant.

Board Member Robles asked if the plan includes an on-site maintenance facility to store equipment that is used for the site. Mr. Jones said that has not been considered, but it could be built in. Ms. Hite advised that none of the City's parks have on-site maintenance facilities. The equipment is moved from park to park on a flatbed truck. Staff members go from park to park, doing the same task.

Board Member Robles asked how many different surfaces are identified in the proposed plan. Mr. Jones answered that potential surfaces include the track surface, sand volleyball court, asphalt trails, promenade of concrete or unit pavers, crushed granite petanque courts, natural turf, planted areas, and asphalt basketball courts. Ms. Hite reminded the Board that the current deed restrictions limit impervious surface to no more than 10% of the 6-acre portion of the site.

Board Member Robles commented that performance-based social gatherings are huge community-building activities. In addition to opportunities for sporting events, he would like the area to be open to the arts and social activities via the plaza, multi-use terracing, grass fields, etc. Mr. Jones said they have discussed that the southwest corner in both schemes could have moveable tables and chairs to support a variety of community uses.

Board Member Robles asked if the current skate park would be relocated or if the features would change. Ms. Hite said the current park has a cement surface, but the features are moveable. However, they are old and require frequent repairs. A better discussion would be the idea of creating a new skate park with new equipment. Board Member Robles pointed out that the current skate park is heavily used.

Board Member Monroe asked if there is a significant upfront cost difference between the two options. Mr. Jones answered that they will be exploring the rough magnitude costs of each option over the next few weeks. Option 1 would likely have a higher cost as it would require more manipulation of land forms and a more significant water feature. He commented that, from his experience, downtown parks similar to this typically cost between \$1 million and \$1.5 million per acre to develop. Therefore, \$12 million would be a ballpark cost figure based on history. Assuming the City will not foot the bill for expansion of the Boys and Girls Club, Option 1 would likely cost more to implement than Option 2. Ms. Hite emphasized that it is likely that the hybrid design will be a combination of both Option 1 and Option 2. Once the preferred hybrid option has been identified, the consultant will be asked to provide cost estimates.

Mr. Jones said that, based on feedback received to date, the hybrid alternative will likely include active park space, restroom, athletic fields, a small number of petanque courts, terraced viewing area, water feature, expanded Boys and Girls Club, basketball courts and a playground. The majority of people at the 2nd open house voiced support for the aesthetics of Option 1, as well.

Vice Chair Rubenkonig noted that only Option 2 details on-site parking for the park. Mr. Jones said the intent was to give the community two options so they can decide whether or not they want to include on-site parking as part of the park. Generally speaking, the community has indicated they do not want the 8-acre park to be taken up by parking. However, there are ways to make parking more efficient on 6th and 7th Avenues. If the Boys and Girls Club remains on the site, there will be some need for van parking and ADA parking. Vice Chair Rubenkonig noted that the ADA parking that is provided near the Boys and Girls Club could also serve the park.

Vice Chair Rubenkonig asked how tall the proposed trees would be. She noted that there have been issues in the past when trees grow tall and block views from neighboring properties. It appears that both options will have the same number of trees, but in different locations. She asked if the City has a requirement as to how many trees must be planted on the site. Mr. Jones responded that there is no City requirement as to the number of trees. The proposed trees were part of the design strategy to provide shade and divide spaces. People have expressed concern about blocking view, and the trees along 6th Avenue will likely be a low-growing species to protect the views from adjacent residential properties. Some people have actually indicated that, although they love their view of the mountains, they also love the trees that have been proposed. He noted that there was not a lot of feedback relative to trees at the 2nd open house. Vice Chair Rubenkonig asked if the City would require that the landscaping be native vegetation. Mr. Jones said that the project design has not reached a high level of specificity yet, but the intent is to use climate-adaptive plantings on the site.

Vice Chair Rubenkönig asked Mr. Jones to describe how the Sprague Street right-of-way link came about. She noted that another path would also bisect the park. Mr. Jones said the intent was to present two different options. Option 1 has a promenade and civic edge on 6th Avenue. However, if the community does not want an active civic edge, the Sprague Street right-of-way would be a great way to move people through the park and segregate the playground from the active recreational uses. Vice Chair Rubenkönig asked if the bisecting pathway between the two playfields could be eliminated from Option 2. Mr. Jones agreed it could be eliminated, but then the promenade would be the only east/west connection through the park.

Vice Chair Rubenkönig asked Ms. Hite to provide more context about the deed restrictions. Ms. Hite explained that the deed restrictions apply to 6 acres on the 8-acre site, and they are connected to the \$1 million the City received from the state and the \$520,000 it received from Snohomish County. The State's deed restriction is intended to protect open space parkland so it cannot be used for anything other than a park. With the exception of a restroom or shade structure, no other structures would be allowed within the 6-acre area. The deed restriction associated with the Snohomish County Conservation Futures Grant is more restrictive in that it limits impervious surface to no more than 10%. The County is willing to work with the City to provide structures such as a restroom and shade shelter, but they would count as part of the allowable impervious surface. Vice Chair Rubenkönig suggested that the deed restrictions should be more clearly pointed out at the next open house and explained in the master plan.

Vice Chair Rubenkönig asked if it is likely the track would be eliminated from the hybrid design. Mr. Jones answered affirmatively. Vice Chair Rubenkönig asked what purpose the track would serve. Mr. Jones said the community would like the ability to track how far they are walking or running. It would not be used for organized sporting events. In his opinion, it would be a very inflexible use of space.

Board Member Stewart said she appreciates the opportunity to participate on the PAC where there has been a lot of interesting discussion and many different perspectives. Many different ideas were considered, and she appreciates the design team's effort to reach out to the community, particularly the youth. She asked if there is another skate park in the City of Edmonds. Ms. Hite answered no, but added that the City provides support to the City of Lynnwood's skate park at Lindale Park.

Board Member Stewart said she is very interested in sustainable development. Anytime they design, they should consider the most sustainable way to not only build, but make sure it remains long term, is easy to maintain, and uses resources wisely. She said she does not recall a PAC discussion about the water feature. It would be attractive to have a water feature at the Civic Center Playfield, and still water or a fountain would be appropriate. However, she worries about the high cost of adding a spray pad. Providing a system to recirculate water would be costly and there is already a spray pad at City Park. Mr. Jones agreed that water features, particularly spray pads, are costly to maintain. Most sustainable water features have a cistern to recycle the water, and a system of this type would definitely be included as part of any water feature proposed for the site.

Board Member Stewart asked if the walking path identified in Option 1 would be pavement. She said she is hoping that at least one side of the pathway could have a forgiving surface for people with joint issues. Ms. Hite pointed out that pavement is easier to make with impervious surface that drains well. Board Member Stewart asked if rollerblades would be allowed on the walking path. She also asked if bicyclists would have a way to get through the park and if bike racks would be provided. If no parking is provided, it will be very important to make sure people can get to, from and through the park via walking, jogging, biking, and buses.

Board Member Stewart commented that Edmonds has a very active petanque group that consists primarily of older citizens. While she supports some courts for this use, she would like them to be designed to accommodate a variety of other uses, as well. She said she supports eliminating the sand volleyball court, since it would be better placed at a beach park. She hopes the sports fields will be available for drop-in play rather than used only for organized sporting events. She asked to what degree the fields would be scheduled. Ms. Hite answered that they would probably be scheduled some but will also be available for drop-in play. The SnoKing Youth Club uses the existing fields a lot, but they are transitioning more towards the new fields at Woodway. The Boys and Girls Club also uses the fields for open play. Board Member Stewart stressed the need to always ensure there is space for unprogrammed play for both children and adults. She hopes the need for regulation fields does not usurp the creative, versatile play space that is needed to serve all ages.

Board Member Stewart asked how long the path around the perimeter of the park in Option 1 would be. Mr. Jones answered that it would be about 1,600 meters or perhaps a little less. Board Member Stewart commented that the more continuous the pathway the better. The path should also be interesting, as well, and exercise stations would be a wonderful idea. She said she likes the idea of trees and felt the consultant could work with species to keep the heights where they should be.

Board Member Stewart said she loves the grandstands, but recognizes that they need to be removed. At the PAC meetings, she raised the idea of providing a viewpoint where people could climb up to have a view over the top of the trees and out to the mountains. Ms. Hite said this idea makes her think about the conservatory building at Volunteer Park in Seattle where you can climb up stairs to have a view across the park to the water. Mr. Jones pointed out that there would be a bit of a view from the south side of the park to the mountains.

Board Member Monroe asked if a covered basketball court was purposefully excluded from the options. Most of the park features can only be enjoyed during good weather, and it would be great to have a covered basketball court to accommodate winter play.

Vice Chair Rubenkonig asked if the two options would satisfy the needs of the parks and recreation programs the City sponsors. Ms. Hite answered that lacrosse and soccer are trending right now, and ultimate Frisbee, as well. All three of these uses could be accommodated on the fields identified in the two options. While Pacific Little League originally voiced a desire for more baseball fields, no other comments in support of the fields were received. She summarized that the open, grass space that can accommodate many different kinds of sports and activities will be very helpful to the City's programming needs.

Board Member Robles asked if there would be any restricted activities at the park. For example, would people be allowed to fly drones over the park or drive their remote control cars. Ms. Hite answered that there has been a lot of discussion at the national level about drones in public places and privacy rights. However, the City's current park regulations do not prohibit drones and people are allowed to recreate as they want. Board Member Robles asked if dogs would be allowed at the park. Ms. Hite said that has yet to be determined. She explained that the City has specific rules for regulating dogs in parks. She noted that the City receives comments on a daily basis, about half of which support allowing dogs in parks and the other half are opposed. Tackling the issue will involve a huge community effort, and she has not opened the conversation up.

Board Member Robles asked what other unique ideas came forward during the public open houses. Mr. Jones said the list included a zip line, heated seats, fire museum, parking below the park, and doing nothing and leaving the park as is.

Board Member Stewart referred to an email the Board received from a citizen, expressing concern that the civic edges that are proposed in both options could be monopolized by events. Ms. Hite recalled that after receiving less than favorable support for civic space at the 1st open house, she talked with the consultant about the idea of having the civic spaces be more community-oriented gathering areas with a patio, promenade, seating areas, and connections to the downtown. She expressed her belief that this type of space would be desirable in the hybrid option, as well. She reviewed that in his email, the gentleman challenged the community and the consultant to design something that would become a signature downtown park rather than designing for a particular type of community event. She said her discussions with the consultant have been consistent with this approach, and she requested the consultant provide a drawing to illustrate how each of the options would be flexible enough to accommodate desired community events. She asked Mr. Jones to answer the question of whether the designs are reflective of what the community wants or designed to accommodate large community events.

Mr. Jones said it appears that the email is suggesting that the master plan be done without community input. The community has spoken and identified the elements they want the park to include. Downtown parks are always designed by the community in which they serve, and the outgrowth of options came from the public input. To accommodate all of the activities identified as desirable would require a 20-acre parcel. While the concept put forth in the email is an interesting idea, they cannot overlook the fact that they have gone through a successful, community-led process. Special interest groups have put forward ideas and his job is to work with staff to balance the ideas. At the last open house, it appeared that people were excited about the options and there was no outcry that the design options were inconsistent with the public comments. Both options were interesting to the community, and the process was set up so that everyone had a voice. He emphasized that the Civic Center Playfield is definitely a signature downtown park. Rarely do you find eight acres of parkland in a

downtown area. The design will be a hybrid of the two schemes, but he does not anticipate changing the approach based on the email. On the contrary, you could question whether the community wants a scheme that does not include any active recreational opportunities, and this directive could change the course of how the park is designed.

Board Member Stewart asked if benches have been considered as part of the park design. Mr. Jones answered that benches will be addressed in the next layer of design along with furnishings, lighting, etc. A lot of design work is still needed.

Vice Chair Rubenkönig noted that the fence that currently exists around the field would be removed so that people can access the park from the alley, 6th Avenue and 7th Avenue. That means the park will be much more open than what people are accustomed to. Mr. Jones said that improved access to the park was brought up on a number of occasions, and it is clear that the park needs to be porous on all sides. However, it is anticipated that landscaping would be used to prevent access to the park from some locations. Landscaping would also be used near the playground to prevent children from running out into the alley.

The Board Members were invited to share their thoughts on which element they liked the best and why.

Board Member Crank: She likes Option 1, which is an open concept with clean lines. She likes the very defined civic area, as well as the idea of incorporating walking paths rather than a physical track which would lend itself more to school athletic situations that might not be appropriate for the park. She pointed out that the demographics of the audience that participated in the online open house was different than those who participated in the in-person open house, and that may be why there was a difference in the preferred option. People who live in the area and already use the park were more interested in preserving what already exists, and those who participated in the online open house were looking at what elements would attract them to the park. It is important to create a master plan that preserves what is already good about the park, as well as features that attract new people. She likes that the park would still feel like a signature downtown park, but also serve as a neighborhood park.

Board Member Monroe: He likes Option 1, as well, but he would like the water park to be eliminated since there is already a spray pad at City Park. He supports the skate park as shown in Option 1, but he would also like to include a covered basketball court that could be used during inclement weather. Option 2 seems to be more of a large playfield, which is not what a signature park should look like in his mind. He felt the design was off to a good start, and modifying Option 1 would be acceptable to him.

Board Member Robles: He felt that Option 2 is very ambitious and includes a number of great features. He envisions the hybrid being Option 2, but with a softer edge. He particularly likes the centering of the Boys and Girls Club, which is a treasure for the community that includes playfields, basketball courts, skate park, playground and a complex for artist events. The forested edge seems like a great idea for not only the visual privacy of the park, but also for noise abatement and shade. It may be possible to take 10 feet away from the perimeter of the park to provide parking space to accommodate better utilization of the park. He also likes the idea of an elevated tower with stairs for access that would provide both a view and an opportunity for additional exercise. In addition to providing more curve to the walking paths, the terraced area could also be curved to accommodate a sense of focus. He said he could support elimination of the track, and he agreed that four petanque courts would be more appropriate than eight. The water park should be eliminated, as well. He said he does not prefer one option over the other, and he is relying on the consultant to provide some good, solid thinking around the hybrid affect.

Board Member Stewart: She likes the feel of Option 1 with the softness of the edges, particularly the southwest edge. It is important to her that there be a section that offers peace and tranquility, with trees and nature and perhaps a water feature. However, she does not believe a spray pad is needed. Two smaller fields would work for the community needs and the track is not essential. However, a meandering loop that is marked for distance, with stations along the way for exercise and integrated natural elements, would be great. A few tennis courts that could double as basketball courts are standard in most parks, as are playgrounds. She supports a skate park and accommodating the Boys and Girls Club, and she would love to see a tower that allows visitors to look out. She agreed that the tower could also provide an element of exercise. She likes the idea of a terraced area with tiered seating. She believes that fewer than eight petanque courts would be appropriate. She summarized that she likes the feel of Option 1 and hopes the hybrid can maintain at least a portion of the serene feeling.

APPROVED

Vice Chair Rubenkonig: She prefers Option 1 because of the design makes more sense to her. She likes the softer edges, particularly the civic edge, which serves to green up the space along 6th Avenue, and relates the park to the Public Safety Building. The civic edge also better defines the entire area as a public center and lends to more future possibilities. For the opposite reason, the promenade in Option 2 does not provide the same affect that the Civic Edge in Option 1 can provide. She said she likes the softer edges shown in Option 1, and the design of the southwest corner appears to be more of a protected area that is more conducive to children’s play. She said she also believes that a covered basketball court is essential because of the weather. It is time for Edmonds to provide this opportunity, not only for the community at large, but for the Boys and Girls Club to use year round, as well. She said she appreciates the “all ages” recreational challenge course that is proposed along the walking path, and she agrees that a step terrace is essential to the design and will open up opportunities for the future use of the park. Electrical outlets are needed, as well. She said she welcomes the idea of a hybrid design, but she leans towards the clean design of Option 1, particularly as it allows people to go across the park from 6th Avenue to 7th Avenue without feeling like they are going through the middle of some activity.

Ms. Hite thanked the Board Members for their ideas and clear direction, which will be reflected in the presentation before the City Council on September 27th. The Board’s minutes will be included in the Council packet. The consultant will come before the Board again on November 9th to provide an update on the plan, and Board Members are invited to attend the open house on October 12th, where the hybrid option will be presented to the public for the first time.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Vice Chair Rubenkonig reviewed that the Board’s October 12th agenda will include a public hearing on the Capital Facilities and Capital Improvement Plans, as well as a discussion on Comprehensive Plan amendments. The October 26th agenda will include a presentation on the University of Washington/Forterra Plan for Five Corners, an update on the land use procedures code, and an update on the Highway 99 Subarea Plan.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Vice Chair Rubenkonig announced that the City Council will be hosting a volunteer dinner on September 16th at the Senior Center from 6:30 p.m. to 8:30 p.m.

Vice Chair Rubenkonig referred to the summary provided in the Director’s Report relative to the joint City Council/Planning Board meeting that took place on September 6th. The report states that the general conclusion was that the Board’s role relative to the issue of housing is not so much to figure out exactly how to address a specific number of housing units projected for Edmonds, but to consider the range of housing issues as local planning and code updates move forward. The Planning Board will be involved in recommending a draft housing strategy to the City Council. In the meantime, ongoing code update work may also address emerging housing needs. Board Member Crank said she particularly enjoyed the joint meeting because the City Council was able to clarify what they want the Board to do. It was good to get away from specific numbers and focus more on housing types. Board Member Robles said he spoke to a City Council Member following the meeting and learned that the Council was very pleased with the target of “aging in place,” as a problem that needs to be addressed. There are so many problems related to housing, and this is a path forward that everyone agreed on.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Crank reported that the Taste of Edmonds was more successful overall than last year due to better weather. She will receive a full report at the morning meeting of the Chamber on September 15th. Board Member Monroe observed that there were no complaints from neighboring property owners relative to noise this year.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 8:55 p.m.

APPROVED