

APPROVED JULY 22

**CITY OF EDMONDS
PLANNING BOARD MINUTES**

June 10, 2015

Chair Tibbott 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

Neil Tibbott, Chair
Philip Lovell, Vice Chair
Matthew Cheung
Todd Cloutier
Carreen Rubenkönig
Daniel Robles
Valerie Stewart
Nathan Monroe

STAFF PRESENT

Shane Hope, Development Services Director
Kernen Lien, Senior Planner
Bertrand Hauss, Transportation Engineer
Karin Noyes, Recorder

READING/APPROVAL OF MINUTES

VICE CHAIR LOVELL MOVED THAT THE MINUTES OF MAY 27, 2015 BE APPROVED AS SUBMITTED. BOARD MEMBER RUBENKONIG SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY, WITH BOARD MEMBERS CLOUTIER AND STEWART ABSTAINING.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA

The agenda was rearranged to place the Introduction to Irreconcilable Applications Code Amendments to Title 20 (Item 8a) before the Continued Review of the Draft Code for the Critical Areas Ordinance Update (Item 7a). The remainder of the agenda was accepted as presented.

AUDIENCE COMMENTS

Scott Blomenkamp, Edmonds, said he recently closed on a home in Edmonds at 23227 – 97th Avenue West, and was immensely happy to move in on May 23. He had spent several years searching for the property and specifically chose it for its approximately 14 old growth trees, as well as what he believed to be a great Edmonds community. He thought Edmonds had a reasonable balance between development and environmental concerns, which was reinforced by the large, beautiful apartment complex that is next to his property and extends several blocks. This is an example of responsible development that is balanced and abides to the Edmonds Community Development Code. However, the week he moved in, he was surprised when a developer next to his lot clear cut approximately 13 old growth trees, one over 32 inches in diameter, to build 10 duplexes. In doing so, he severely damaged the health of four of his trees, one approximately 40 inches in diameter, by excavating within two feet of the trees and severely injuring roots. He was grossly amazed and completely astonished at the fact that there are clear codes that address the situation, but the City administration does not seem to know or understand the code. He has a 7-year-old child and specifically purchased his property for the trees and the backyard. He is not anti-development, but he is anti-destroying his property, excavating needlessly and doing something completely out of character when the code clearly talks about fitting within the character of the local area. It also talks about retaining trees that

are over 6 inches in diameter if at all possible for the development. These are things that are reasonable and not extreme and something the administration should be talking about. He said he will continue to come to meetings to talk about his situation on and on. Again, he said he is concerned with the administration's attitude of not following or even understanding the code and implementing it in an unfair and unequal way.

Roger Hertrich, Edmonds, commented that trees are a big issue in Edmonds, as evidenced by the large turnout at the Board's last public hearing where the draft Tree Code was the subject of discussion. He suggested that excess by developers caused the City to take emergency action that resulted in the draft Tree Code proposed by the Tree Board. It was a radical reaction to the simple problem of how to deal with developers who cheat. Rather than the draft Tree Code, he suggested the City implement greater penalties for developers who "cheat" and cut down more trees than permitted for development. For example, the City could shut down development, and require developers to wait one or two years before resuming a project. He felt this penalty would be greater than any fine the City could impose, and developers would not likely take a chance by cutting trees illegally. He asked the Board to consider this option as a way to solve the problem of excess clearing. He summarized that, at their last public hearing, the Board got a lesson in how people react when they are informed about an issue that impacts them. The Board should keep in mind that the citizens will come out if they are upset about something that is being proposed.

DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DIRECTOR REPORT TO PLANNING BOARD

Ms. Hope referred the Board to her written report and specifically reported that an open house for the Comprehensive Plan was held just prior to the Planning Board meeting. Although the event was sparsely attended, there were a number of display boards available to provide information to the public in attendance.

Vice Chair Lovell referred to the list of development projects in Edmonds (Pages 1 and 2), particularly the Woodway Fields Project. He requested an update on the status on using crumb rubber material for the fields and asked if the City Council has the ability to deny the material in response to public concern. Ms. Hope explained that the Edmonds School District (ESD) owns the fields and made the decision to move forward with the crumb rubber material. Although citizens raised concerns before the City Council, it was the City Attorney's legal perspective that the particular type of synthetic material is not regulated by City code. As a principle of law, the City cannot add new regulations once a project comes forward. It must deal with the regulations in place at the time of application. The City Council decided not to take action relative to the proposed materials. It is up to the ESD, who owns the property, to make that call. Mr. Lien reported that a Land Use Petition Act appeal of the City Council's decision was filed and will go to Superior Court. The appeal was filed by the proponent of the project and names both the City and the ESD.

Board Member Stewart said she heard that Verdant Health was researching other surface materials. Ms. Hope reported that Verdant Health did complete a study and the results were forwarded to the Planning Board previously. The study indicated that there is no known evidence of a problem with the crumb rubber material. However, Verdant Health has indicated that it would continue to study the issue. Board Member Stewart noted that the material has been banned from sports fields in Europe. Board Member Robles asked if it would be possible to remove and replace the material at some point in the future, and Vice Chair Lovell answered affirmatively.

PUBLIC HEARING AND RECOMMENDATION ON 2015 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE

Ms. Hope recalled that the Board has been reviewing elements of the Comprehensive Plan Update for the past year. She advised that comprehensive plans are intended to be the framework for planning in each community. Under State Law, cities must complete a major review and update of their comprehensive plans at least every eight years. The deadline for the City's update is mid 2015. She advised that no wholesale changes are being proposed as part of the current update. The proposed amendments are primarily intended to provide consistency between the Comprehensive Plan and the Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC), improve clarity, and update data.

Ms. Hope advised that State Law provided direction for the City's Comprehensive Plan update, along with the multi-county planning policies that are part of the Puget Sound Regional Council's (PSRC) Vision 2040 document, and the county-wide planning policies. She emphasized that the City's Comprehensive Plan must be consistent with these three documents, but the City also has some discretion to add additional goals and policies. She reviewed that, to date, there have been 31 public

meetings related to the Comprehensive Plan update, including 9 public hearings before the City Council and 2 open houses. In addition, the City has issued press releases and articles have been published in local media. Notices of meetings have been broadcast on EdTV and posted in the newspaper and other official locations throughout the City.

Ms. Hope reviewed that the Comprehensive Plan update has moved forward on an element-by-element basis. Draft elements were presented to the Planning Board for review and comment, followed by a public hearing and additional comments from the City Council. The purpose of the Board's final review and public hearing is to make sure all the elements reconcile with each other and provide any last comments before making a recommendation to the City Council, who will take final action. She emphasized that public comment has been and will continue to be important.

Ms. Hope reminded the Board that one meaningful performance measure was added to each of the elements and some elements include action items, as well. She reviewed each of the elements of the Comprehensive Plan as follows:

- **Community Sustainability Element.** Because this element is not data heavy, few substantive changes have been proposed. The minor changes center on adding text to goals and policies for energy efficiency and wastewater reduction at City facilities. A performance measure and key implementation action was added, as well.
- **Land Use Element.** Updates to this element focused on new data, including population data for the next planning period. With the addition of new data, rewriting of some narrative sections and replacement of outdated figures was required. Other changes include reformatting and streamlining of text. For example, the goals and policies related to urban design were moved to the Urban Design Element. Staff recognizes that the element could be streamlined further, but it would have required even more work. The goal was to focus on eliminating text that was clearly not needed.
- **Housing Element.** City staff worked with the Alliance for Housing Affordability (AHA) to update the element and incorporate new census data and updated housing targets consistent with the countywide planning policies. The AHA, a countywide organization of which Edmonds is a member, completed a housing profile for the City, and data from this document was used to update the housing element. References to the County's Housing Affordability Strategy (no longer applicable) were removed, and the new partnership with the AHA was noted. The goals and policies were reformatted and minor changes were made to the text. A performance measure was added relative to the number of housing units added over a period of time compared with the City's goal. A key implementation action step was added, as well, which calls for the City completing a detailed housing strategy by 2019 to identify different options, tools and information by which the long and mid-term decisions could be considered.
- **Economic Development Element.** Much of the background narrative in this element was rewritten to account for outdated information. For example, the policies were modestly revised to address tourism and to provide more information about the Strategic Action Plan (SAP) which was adopted after the original Economic Development Element was written. A performance measure was added to report the number of new jobs within the City each year compared with the City's target over the next 20 years.
- **Community Culture and Urban Design Element.** In this element the urban design goals and objectives were simplified, and the urban design goals and objectives contained in the Land Use Element were moved to the Community Culture and Urban Design Element. Text was added to the narrative to recognize the importance of trees and the significance of arts and historic preservation. In addition, the data was updated and housekeeping and formatting changes were made. Rather than a performance measure, two implementation action steps were added. First, is developing an updated Street Tree Plan in 2016; and second, is developing an Urban Forest Management Plan (UFMP) by 2017. Although some minor revisions have been made to the Street Tree Plan as part of the Comprehensive Plan update, a more significant update is needed in the future. In addition, the Planning Board has expressed support for an UFMP, as it would provide a lot more policy and oversight with regard to tree management.
- **Utilities Element.** Few changes have been proposed for this element because detailed information is included in separate functional plans for each utility. However, a new performance standard was added relative to the amount of lineal feet of old water, sewer and stormwater mains replaced or rehabilitated both annually and program-to-date.

- **Capital Facilities Element.** More detailed inventory maps and a list of capital facilities was added to this element, consistent with State Law that requires an inventory of major facilities. Text was added relative to concurrency management, and several minor changes were made to the project list in the Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) based on the capital needs of the City and available funding. The project list also includes a list of projects that would be nice to do if funding becomes available, but there is no reasonable funding source at this time. Data, housekeeping and formatting updates were also made. A performance measure is project delivery based on a comparison of expected results from the approved CFP to the actual results. She recalled that the Board asked that this performance measure be clarified, and she suggested possible rewording could read: *“Project delivery results—based on comparing projects in the Capital Facilities Plan to what was actually done on the projects.”*
- **Transportation Element.** This element would be reviewed in greater detail by Mr. Hauss, Transportation Engineer.

Mr. Hauss recalled that he and the consultant came before the Planning Board in February to discuss the goals and policies in the Transportation Element of the Comprehensive Plan, and in May to review the project list and Level of Service (LOS) standards. He provided a matrix outlining the staff and consultant’s response to each of the questions raised previously by the Board and reviewed each question and response as follows:

- **Revise the Introductory Statement.** The statement was rewritten to read, *“Goals are generalized statements which broadly relate the physical environment to values. Under each goal, policies are listed that provide specific direction for meeting the goals.”*
- **Add additional references to maintenance.** This was addressed in Goal 7 of the policies.
- **Add reference to pedestrian connections and protection of the natural environment.** This was addressed in Policy 3.18.
- **Add a reference to “walkway path” instead of “sidewalk.”** This was addressed in revised Goal 4.
- **Add a reference to Complete Streets.** This was added in Policy 5.1.
- **Add a reference to electric vehicles and charging stations.** This was addressed in Policy 6.22.
- **Add a reference to transit connections.** This was addressed throughout Goal 6.
- **Add Level of Service (LOS) criteria.** This specific criteria was included in Table 3-3.
- **Add an in-depth definition for “non-motorized transportation.”** Definitions for motorized and non-motorized transportation were provided in the Definition Section found at the beginning of the Transportation Plan.
- **Provide alternative solutions to certain projects such as Main and 9th and Puget Drive at 88th.** These alternative solutions are identified as footnotes in Table 4-1.
- **Identify a future parking lot at the proposed light rail station on the 220th Corridor.** This was added to Figure 3-18.
- **Add a project preliminary cost estimate and prioritization.** A detailed cost estimate and prioritization was completed for each of the projects, and the information is included in Tables 3-12 and 4-1.
- **Identify whether any projects in Lynnwood (such as the Highway 99 intersection improvement projects) would have any impact on projected intersection delay and LOS at Edmonds intersections?** Since most improvements are located more than one mile away from the Edmonds’ intersections, the impact on intersection delay would be very limited.
- **Identify the sharrows along Sunset Avenue as temporary.** A footnote would be added below the figure to make it clear that the current system on Sunset Avenue is temporary on a trial basis.
- **Explain why there is a priority for walkway paths along collector streets.** This will be addressed by removing “according to the priority list” to eliminate confusion.

Board Member Robles asked if Mr. Hauss received the written comments he submitted a few weeks ago. Mr. Hauss answered that he forwarded the comments directly to the consultant, and they were considered and addressed in the updated version where appropriate. Board Member Robles said he particularly asked that the terms be defined consistent with the definitions found in the Washington Administrative Code (WAC). He also noted some glitches between what is considered a walkway and what is considered a bike path. These inconsistencies can drive someone to an illegal condition or endanger them.

Board Member Stewart voiced appreciation for the handout that outlines the staff and consultant's response to each of the Board's questions and comments. However, she noted that some of the comments she submitted were not addressed. For example, she asked that **Policy 3.18** be modified by replacing the word "preserve" with "encourage." She explained that, not only is it important to protect existing easements, but it is also important to encourage even more easements. Changing this one word would facilitate this goal. Mr. Hauss said this change was made in the latest version from the consultant. Board Member Stewart said she also recommended that **Policy 3.2** be modified by adding "and sustainable" after "innovative" and before "materials." Mr. Hauss agreed to add this change. Board Member Stewart also recalled her request that the map be updated to identify the bike locker storage facility that is currently available at the train station. Mr. Hauss advised that the storage facility was added to the most recent version of the map.

Vice Chair Lovell observed that, although there have been numerous discussions in the City about the need to provide some type of crossing over the railroad tracks, the main body of the Comprehensive Plan does not identify either an overpass or underpass at Dayton and Main Streets to solve the issue. He noted that the language in the last two paragraphs on Page 3-82 of the Transportation Plan specifically addresses the need for an Edmonds waterfront at-grade crossing, and he wants to make sure it is incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. Mr. Hauss clarified that the Transportation Plan would be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan as the Transportation Element, including the statement referenced by Vice Chair Lovell regarding the need for an at-grade crossing. However, there is nothing in the Transportation Plan that specifies that either an overpass or an underpass would be the preferable solution. The City Council has allocated funding for a study in 2016 to determine the best approach for addressing the problem.

Chair Tibbott noted that the performance measure uses the term "sidewalk" rather than "walkway path." Mr. Hauss said the term has been changed to sidewalk throughout the latest version of the document.

Ms. Hope explained that the current Comprehensive Plan includes a lot of documents that were adopted by reference, and most would be removed in an effort to streamline. However, some (i.e. Shoreline Master Program, Edmonds Swedish Hospital Master Plan, Community Cultural Plan, and the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan) would be retained. She noted that the latter two were recently updated in 2014. The proposed appendices include the Streetscape Plan and the Street Tree Plan, which was recently updated to replace the poor performing species with other species as recommended by the Tree Board.

Ms. Hope invited the Board Members to conduct the public hearing, ask questions and identify additional changes, and then forward a recommendation to the City Council. A public hearing before the City Council is scheduled for June 16th, followed by a study session and discussion on June 23rd and final adoption on July 7th. This schedule allows the City to meet the State's deadline of mid 2015. A copy of the draft Comprehensive Plan has been forwarded to the State as required, and they may provide comments in the interim period.

Chair Tibbott reviewed the rules and procedures for the public hearing and then opened the hearing.

Natalie Shippen, Edmonds, said she already submitted written comments outlining the heavy editing she believes is required in the Downtown Waterfront Activity Center in regards to Edmonds Crossing. However, she also asked that the section related to the Downtown Waterfront Activity Center be modified by removing the reference to taller buildings. She said the language is vague and suggests that the City Council has approved taller heights in the bowl, which the Harbor Square discussion indicated they have not. Including this reference is misleading to the public.

In addition to the changes outlined in her written comment letter, Ms. Shippen asked the Board to consider adding a major project to the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element and give it top priority over all other measures. The goal would be to complete the project in two years and it would be financed by a bond issue. This approach would be unlike the City's usually cumbersome planning process. The Planning Board would initiate action and fast track the project. Rather than waiting for 10 years for the project to be funded, the Board could ask Edmonds residents to invest in their community. The project she has in mind is improvements on Main Street from 3rd or 4th Avenues to Sunset Avenue, similar to the work that was done on Main Street between 5th and 6th Avenues, which is attractive and successful. She questioned why Main Street has yet to be finished in a City that will be 125 years old next August. She also questioned why any self-respecting town with the resources Edmonds has would accept 10 years as the minimum wait time for the completion of any project. She noted that it

did not take 10 years for the underground utilities along 4th Avenue to be completed, even considering the delay caused by a court case. It didn't take 10 years for the decorative lighting on Main Street to be installed or the first corner parks to be developed. The Planning Board is in a position to bypass the planning inertia that now plaques Edmonds, and she suggested that they try.

Stan Piha, Seattle, said he has served as a member of the Highway 99 Task Force since its inception, and he owns property within the Highway 99 district. He noted that he submitted written recommendations to the Planning Board. He said the Highway 99 Task Force has discussed the concept of creating mixed-use nodes around the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) stations along the Highway 99. This concept has been utilized by both the City of Everett and the City of Lynnwood relative to their Highway 99 districts. The BRT stations are one thing the City of Edmonds has in common with jurisdictions to the north, and the mixed-use nodes within ¼ miles distance of the BRT stations could easily accomplish many of the elements that are being discussed in the Comprehensive Plan (Economic Development, Transportation, Housing and Sustainability). Creating the nodes can also benefit the corridor, itself. The other cities have created ordinances with much greater detail than what is ready to be adopted by the City of Edmonds, but taking a bite out the apple by providing the mixed use nodes around the BRT stations could provide stimulus to start some very positive activity along the corridor. He encouraged the Board to include the concept in the Comprehensive Plan.

Roger Hertrich, Edmonds, observed that the temporary pathway on Sunset Avenue is non-standard and does not meet the requirements of the American's with Disabilities Act (ADA). It should be a walkway only and bicycles should be prohibited. Allowing both pedestrians and bicyclists to use the walkway could result in liability issues for the City. The pathway should either be made wide enough to accommodate both uses safely, or it should be limited to pedestrians only.

Mr. Hertrich noted that the project description for the aquatic facility (Page 7 of the Capital Facilities Element Project List) indicates that a feasibility study was done. However, it is important to note that the study did address the opportunity to locate the facility at the old Edmonds Woodway High School site. Although the ESD has been resistant to the idea in the past, they may be more open to the idea in light of major changes that are occurring at the school site. He suggested the City meet again with representatives from the ESD to explore this option further.

Mr. Hertrich referred to the third paragraph on Page 54 of the Land Use Element, which contains the statement referenced earlier by Ms. Shippen regarding taller buildings on the waterfront. The fact that there are existing taller buildings on the waterfront is not a reason to develop new taller buildings in that area. He suggested that this sentence be deleted from the Comprehensive Plan.

Mr. Hertrich recalled that at the recent hearing related to the draft Tree Code, view blockage was a significant concern of the citizens. Property owners are interested in maintaining their property values, which can be significantly impacted by the loss of view. He suggested that public views should be considered in every discussion the Board has regarding land use. For example, although the Street Tree Plan identifies a number of appropriate species for the downtown area, it does not specify how tall they will grow at their maximum height.

Mr. Hertrich referred to Vice Chair Lovell's earlier comments about the need to provide safe pedestrian and emergency access over the railroad tracks. He noted that a Sunset Avenue to the waterfront over-the-track connection, providing emergency access for pedestrians and vehicle, would be possible to do at grade level using the street and bluff for height over the tracks. This option could meet all of the City's safety needs and provide a wonderful overlook for pedestrians and tourists who look out over the waterfront. He asked that a study of this option be added to the priority list.

The public portion of the hearing was closed. The Board indicated that they received the written comments from Mr. Piha, but some did not receive the written comments submitted by Ms. Shippen. Mr. Lien provided hard copies of Ms. Shippen's comments.

Vice Chair Lovell referred to Mr. Piha's earlier suggestion that the City create mixed-use nodes along Highway 99, within proximity of the BRT stops. Mr. Piha suggested that the City follow the concept used by the City of Lynnwood. Vice Chair Lovell suggested that the Edmonds portion of Highway 99 is not large enough to create separate mixed-use nodes. As far as he is concerned, anywhere along Highway 99 in Edmonds is ripe for mixed-use development, and there is no need to limit it to the BRT nodes.

Board Member Cloutier asked staff to elaborate on why they continue to include the Edmonds Crossing Project in the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Hope said that, although many people feel the project will never move forward, the State is considering the project again and it would be reasonable to keep some reference to it in the plan. A lot of work has been done to date. If the project does not move forward, there is no harm in having it in the Comprehensive Plan, but the plan provides important information on how to deal with this important subject. Mr. Lien added that some of the State's responses to the City's Shoreline Master Program (SMP) related to how the SMP would impact the Edmonds Crossing Project. This leads him to conclude that the Edmonds Crossing Project is still very much on the Washington State Department of Transportation's mind.

Board Member Cloutier indicated support for Mr. Hertrich and Ms. Shippen's request that the 3rd sentence in the last paragraph on Page 54 of the Land Use Element be eliminated. It does not guide public policy or provide a vision for the City that anyone has elaborated on or asked for. In fact, it implies that only the view corridors should be protected when the City's vision is to maximize everyone's view, as well as maximize the use of the land. It is not intended to allow taller buildings outside of the view corridors. **The Board agreed to eliminate the 3rd sentence in the last paragraph on Page 54 of the Land Use Element which reads, "The location of existing taller buildings on the waterfront, and the site's situation at the bottom of "the Bowl," could enable a design that provides for higher buildings outside current view corridors."**

Board Member Cloutier agreed with Vice Chair Lovell that rather than creating separate BRT nodes on Edmonds' portion of Highway 99, the entire corridor is appropriate for mixed-use development. As written, the proposed language would encourage mixed-use development along the entire corridor, and no additional language is needed. The remainder of the Board concurred that rather than creating specific nodes for BRT stops, the goal is to have mixed-use development all along the corridor. However, they acknowledged that, from a development standpoint, mixed-use development will likely occur first near the transit stops because the BRT service is successful and highly used.

Board Member Robles asked if zoning changes have been implemented for Highway 99. Ms. Hope said the City Council did recently adopt some changes that were recommended by the Board that allowed for more residential uses and eliminated the requirement that the first two floors of a development be commercial use. The City Council also allocated funding for a Highway 99 Subarea Plan that will provide more details, and this work will start later in 2015. Chair Tibbott asked if adoption of a Highway 99 Subarea Plan would require amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. Ms. Hope said the subarea plan could be adopted as an element of the Comprehensive Plan or it could be adopted as a supplement to the Comprehensive Plan. While it must be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, it would provide much greater detail and involve a lengthy public process, as well.

Board Member Stewart suggested that the concept of sustainability should be inserted where appropriate throughout the document. For example, Policy B.1 on Page 57 of the Land Use Element, could be changed to read, "*New development should be high quality and varied and encouraged to use sustainable building practices.*" Also, Policy B.2 on Page 64 of the Land Use Element could be changed to read, "*The City's development policies encourage high-quality and sustainable site and building design to promote coordinated development and to preserve the trees, topography and other natural features of the site.*" Adding the concept throughout the document, where appropriate, would provide consistency with other policies and goals, such as Policy C.3 on Page 67 of the Land Use Element, which states, "*Allow a variety of architectural styles while encouraging public art and sustainable development practices that support pedestrian activity and provide for appealing gathering places.*"

Board Member Stewart suggested that the word "native" be inserted in place of "natural" throughout the entire document. For example, the second paragraph on Page 73 of the Land Use Element could be changed to read, "*The beauty of then native growth provides pleasing vistas and helps to buffer one development from another. Areas where native vegetation exists provide good sites for nature trails and for other recreational and education opportunities.*" She pointed out that the term "natural" would cover the whole gammit of species, and "native" would be specific to the region.

Board Member Stewart recommended that Policy B.2 at the top of Page 74 of the Land Use Element be changed to read, "*Erect and maintain educational displays that identify some of the more common plants and animal ecosystems and habitat.*" She also suggested that the examples of major habitat should be changed by eliminating those that are not natural, such as

pilings. She explained that habitat is where organisms live in their native environments. Rocks and sand are places where animals can live, but pilings are man-made structures that should not be included on the list.

Board Member Robles recalled that the Board spoke early on about sustainability being defined as natural sustainability, as well as resilience (the community's ability to withstand an externality). There is a lot of good language in the Comprehensive Plan that makes this distinction, but the word "resilience" isn't resident at least in the beginning. The terms should be able to be used interchangeably. Including the word resilience is important because the measurement is different. Resilience could actually encompass the earlier suggestions related to access over the tracks to the water. Having the ability to evacuate people quickly in the event of a disaster is a form of resiliency.

Board Member Robles noted that the Housing Element does not mention short-term housing or at least short-term rentals. While it is not necessary to specifically name the platform by which those transactions are conducted, it could be part of the housing component and part of the resilience component. If something were to happen, why should someone have to live outside of Edmonds while their home is being rebuilt?

Board Member Robles expressed support for the Comprehensive Plan policies and goals for Highway 99, particularly the buffer areas. This was important to the adjacent residential property owners, and he assumes it will also include the back of commercial buildings. While it may be seen as an infringement on the commercial property owners' rights, it is something that must be included in the plan to protect residential property owners.

Board Member Robles observed that the plan talks a lot about having a pedestrian atmosphere and there is a lot of information about how communities are forming intellectual atmosphere as well. Maybe there's an opportunity to suggest this concept. For example, an engineering company wanted to locate in downtown Edmonds but the zoning restricted the use in certain parts of downtown. The City's Economic Development Director was very flexible and helped the company define what they are in order to fit within the code. Perhaps this approach could be codified to allow for some exceptions under certain conditions. It is important to have the ability to accept new ideas that come up. He also said he likes the removal of the term "economic growth" and the emphasis on economic development, which will pay dividends into the future.

Board Member Rubenkonig asked staff to respond to Mr. Hertrich's concern about Sunset Avenue and whether or not the temporary walkway is ADA compliant and sufficient in width to be used by both pedestrians and bicyclists. Ms. Hope said it is important to understand that there are differing opinions about what the appropriate width should be, and the Comprehensive Plan is not the appropriate place to address the issue. Width would be more appropriately addressed in the Development Code. Mr. Hauss explained that the Sunset Avenue Project is a trial, but it does meet the ADA's requirement for both bicycle and pedestrian activity. Board Member Rubenkonig commented that any permanent solution on Sunset Avenue would have to be ADA compliant, as well. Ms. Hope explained that after the trial period, the Public Works Department and Transportation Engineer will review the data collected and report back before a final decision is made. A permanent solution will also require a public process.

Board Member Rubenkonig invited staff to respond to Mr. Hertrich's recommendation that the old Woodway High School site be studied as a possible location for a new aquatic center. Vice Chair Lovell said he participated on the task force for the aquatic study, and the Woodway High School site was considered. In fact, he said he met personally with a representative from the ESD to discuss the possibility. The Edmonds School District Board has jurisdictions of the site, and they have indicated they do not want a pool in this location. Therefore, the study focused on the Yost and Harbor Square Athletic Club sites and not the Woodinville High School site. He summarized that the aquatic study is a well-researched plan that has sat on the shelf for a number of years. The school facility is still being used by students, and the ESD has made it clear that they do not want a pool or related activities on the school grounds. He does not believe it would be appropriate to further consider this location.

Board Member Rubenkonig pointed out that view protection is addressed in broad terms in the Comprehensive Plan, and more specifically in the Development Code. However, perhaps it is not covered as broadly as some members of the public would like. She asked how the City would go about considering future changes to the Development Code to address view. Ms. Hope said language related to view protection was added into the Urban Design Element, particularly regarding trees. Perhaps future code updates will be needed to address the issue more specifically. Vice Chair Lovell pointed out that views are also addressed in the framework goals included in the introduction to the Activity Centers Section on Page 41 of the Land

Use Element. Specifically, the third bulleted item states, *“Build on historical character and natural relationships, such as historic buildings, slopes with views and the waterfront.”*

Board Member Rubenkönig referred to Ms. Shippen’s recommendation that the Board initiate a project for Main Street Improvements that would follow a fast track and require funding via a bond. She said she understands the City must follow a certain process for prioritizing capital improvement projects and obtaining funds. She asked if there is also a specific process the City must follow for emergency projects that may take precedent over other projects on the list. Ms. Hope answered that emergency projects may take precedent over other projects on the list. She explained that a lot of work goes into identifying the capital projects, and prioritization is based on the perceived needs of the community as well as grant funding opportunities.

Board Member Rubenkönig said it is important for the process to be transparent so the public understands where the funding comes from and how viable a project is. She recognized that this is all difficult for the staff to predict. Ms. Hope agreed that funding sources for each of the projects is something the City does not always know in advance. Board Member Rubenkönig asked if the Planning Board has ever dealt with the financing side of projects. Ms. Hope said funding issues are typically addressed by the City Council and not the Planning Board. While the Planning Board can make recommendations to the City Council on issues related funding, they should be sensitive about making recommendations without know a lot of the other associated facts.

Board Member Rubenkönig said she understands there are limits on what the Planning Board can and cannot do as far as project prioritization and funding. She asked if the State has any discretion over the City Council’s decisions. Ms. Hope answered that the State reviews the City’s CFP and project list, but they seldom take action unless it is something that affects a State project or goes below the minimum amount of safety required.

Board Member Rubenkönig said she believes Ms. Shippen’s intent was to help citizens understand where the money for projects comes from and what is taking place with the City’s bonding ability to support projects. It is not a matter of it being a lake of transparency, but it is a difficult subject to track. The intent of the Comprehensive Plan update is to include performance measures that will allow the City to be more transparent, but the issue will always come back to money. Ms. Hope explained that the CFP indicates where the funding is expected to come from in each year for a variety of projects. It is based on the best understanding that City staff has about where the money is likely to come from and can be adjusted each year as new information comes available.

Board Member Rubenkönig commented that it is up to the City Council to ask the Chief Financial Officer to identify funding opportunities and provide reports relative to funding. Ms. Hope said that, in her experience, Planning Board’s do not get into the level of detail that involves funding.

Vice Chair Lovell expressed his belief that a bond level at the magnitude recommended by Ms. Shippen (\$7 to \$8 million) would require a public vote. If the mechanisms of City government select the project they could perhaps obtain some grant funding, but a bond levy would be required to make the project happen quickly, and the public would have to vote in support of the levy. Unless they request a special ballot, which is costly, it will take several months to put the idea out for public vote. In order to request a bond measure, the City would have to have to complete a significant amount of design work, including costs estimates that are within 5% to 10% of the total cost of the project. This will require considerable expenditure, as well. He summarized that the process will be long and not something that can be done on an emergency basis. He reminded the Board the City Council just authorized the City staff to make an offer of \$300,000 for the Conference Center, with the idea that they will come up with money from somewhere. He does not anticipate the City will have any funding to move a Main Street project forward in the near future.

Board Member Rubenkönig expressed her belief that the Comprehensive Plan Update process was close to exhaustive in terms of the number of times the Board was able to review and discuss the changes with the City staff and consultants. It represents the best product the Board can come up with at this time. While the update includes a lot of reformatting, she felt it could be further streamlined in the future to help it be more readable. However, it does provide clear guidance for the City’s future and sufficient information to update the Development Code as needed.

Chair Tibbott said he particularly focused on the performance measures identified at the end of each element. He feels the measures provide additional transparency and accountability to the process and allows the city to review its performance on an annual basis. He asked staff to provide more information about the performance measure for the Housing Element. Ms. Hope referenced the countywide planning policies, which are required by State Law to deal with future growth over the next 20 years. She explained that the State Office of Financial Management identifies the projected growth for the Counties and there is some discretion for each county to allocate the growth among the jurisdictions in a way that is still consistent with the Growth Management Act (GMA). The cities and counties work together to decide how to take on the population over the next 20 years. This effort is further guided by the PSRC's Vision 2040. The preferred location for growth over the next 20 years is within cities rather than in the rural areas. Even within cities, the growth will be focused where there is already infrastructure in place. The idea is to focus most of the growth in the medium and large cities.

Chair Tibbott noted that the Housing Element's performance measure calls for tracking the number of units that are created in the City each year. He asked if this would include accessory dwelling units in addition to single-family and multi-family residential units. Ms. Hope answered affirmatively.

Chair Tibbott said the performance measure identified for the Economic Development Element would count the number of new jobs added in the City each year. He asked if the City could also count jobs based on type. Ms. Hope said this would be challenging because there would not be sufficient data available on a yearly basis. When data is available, staff could report on both the number and type of jobs created.

Chair Tibbott noted that in the performance measures identified for the Community Culture and Urban Design Element, updating the Street Tree Plan would come before adopting an Urban Forest Management Plan (UFMP). He suggested that the UFMP be adopted first, as it might provide guidance relative to the Street Tree Plan. Ms. Hope said the City Council is very aware of the need to move forward with the UFMP, but it requires that budget dollars be set aside. Staff has committed to coming back to the City Council with a funding request to begin the UFMP in 2016. Just because the performance measure indicates a deadline of 2017, does not mean the City could not choose to move the UFMP forward in 2016. Chair Tibbott strongly suggested that the UFMP should be adopted prior to updating the Street Tree Plan. Ms. Hope explained that the Street Tree Plan was identified to be first because the changes will be easier, and the UFMP will require a significant public process and require significant funding. While the work could start in 2016, it may not be completed until 2017.

Chair Tibbott asked if there is a reason why the Street Tree Plan must be updated prior to adoption of an UFMP. Ms. Hope said staff has received comments that the minor tweaks that have been made to the Street Tree Plan are not enough and additional work is needed. Mr. Lien explained that the Street Tree Plan is applied to new development and requires that trees be planted within the right-of-way in front of the building. One concern is that the trees currently identified in the Street Tree Plan are not the appropriate species for the location. The Tree Board recommended some changes to the Street Tree Plan on an interim basis, but the larger update would not only address species, but the mix and proportion of the different species, as well. This can be more easily addressed outside of the UFMP, but he acknowledged that adoption of an UFMP could inform the Street Tree Plan, as well. He suggested that perhaps the two plans could be done simultaneously.

Chair Tibbott said the performance measure for the Capital Facilities Plan is based on project delivery. He said he likes the idea of being able to track the status of each project, but he is not clear how the City would track this information. Ms. Hope said staff discussed this with the Public Works Director who is a proponent of the measure. Without having the exact methodology worked out, the idea is to look at what the CFP says each year and then report back with what has been done on each project. Chair Tibbott summarized that the intent is to provide a broad overview of the status of each project in the CFP. Vice Chair Lovell pointed out that many projects take more than one year to complete, but it is important to know the progress that is made each year. He said the Economic Development Commission is working hard to create a performance matrix for the action items identified in the Strategic Action Plan (SAP), as well. They intend to use a similar approach and provide a status report to the public regarding each of the action items.

Chair Tibbott said he appreciates that the Comprehensive Plan will adopt, by reference, the Shoreline Master Program, Edmonds Swedish Hospital Master Plan, Community Cultural Plan, and Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan, but he questioned how the City would measure the progress of these plans. Ms. Hope said these plans are related to specific elements within the Comprehensive Plan and will be adopted by reference because they provide critical information, but it is not staff's intent to measure their progress. Vice Chair Lovell said it is likely that the performance matrix that is created for

tracking the action items in the SAP will also measure many of the goals and policies contained in the fore mentioned plans. He noted that there are currently 82 action items identified in the SAP, and all have been assigned leads. Again, he said the EDC is working to create a tracking mechanism that is available to the public on line to find out the status of each of the action items.

Chair Tibbott said it is his understanding that most, if not all, of the Main Street Project east of 4th Avenue was funded via a grant, and the City paid for the utilities to be undergrounded. Ms. Hope said a large portion of the project was grant funded. Chair Tibbott asked if there are any grant opportunities that might be applicable to a project that improves Main Street towards the water. Ms. Hope said there are no known funding sources at this time, but staff will continue to look for opportunities.

Chair Tibbott asked to what extent the Comprehensive Plan could address aesthetic issues, particularly on Highway 99. Ms. Hope answered that the Comprehensive Plan could contain broad statements, but specific codes and regulations would come as part of the Highway 99 Subarea Plan that is planned for the near future. The Development Codes would have to be updated to implement the goals and policies contained in the subarea plan once it is adopted.

Board Member Stewart suggested that Policy B.2 on Page 74 of the Land Use Element should be expanded to address more than just the beach and near-shore environments. She recalled that, as a leader in the Discovery Program, she also took children into the forested areas to teach them to leave elements in place for animals to use. She suggested the language be changed to read, "*Prevent unnecessary disturbances of native species in their respective habitats.*"

Ms. Hope referred to Board Member Stewart's earlier suggestion that the term "natural" should be changed to "native" throughout the document. She reported that Mr. Chave reviewed the document and tried to identify when "natural" and "native" would be the appropriate. She asked for additional direction from the Board about whether or not they want to change "natural" to "native" in all cases throughout the document. She pointed out that native habitat and plants are important, but there are times when non-native plants are also very useful in the environment. Chair Tibbott asked if it would be possible to identify specific areas in the City where native plants would be required, and the term "natural" could be applied to all remaining areas. Ms. Hope explained that the language in the Comprehensive Plan goals and policies will help inform what the Development Code should be. If the Comprehensive Plan says "native" but the intent is really to allow some other "natural" species, it may be difficult to adopt or amend the code while taking this policy into account. Chair Tibbott asked if it would be possible to articulate natural landscaping, with a preference for native. Ms. Hope agreed that this approach would put the focus on native species, but it would not be exclusive. Board Member Stewart reminded the Board that the City has been identified as a National Wildlife Habitat Community, which means it should encourage property owners to plant species that benefit and support wildlife. However, she agreed that perhaps it would not be appropriate to require native species in all situations, and she encouraged the staff to use their best judgment.

Chair Tibbott inquired how staff would address the comments and recommendations put forth by the Board. Ms. Hope commented that the input and suggestions provided by the Board would not be considered substantive changes in policy direction. The Board could simple make a recommendation on the Comprehensive Plan Update, including the changes the have been discussed. Chair Tibbott noted that the City Council would also have the benefit of the meeting minutes, which will become part of the public record.

BOARD MEMBER LOVELL MOVED THAT THE BOARD FORWARD THE DRAFT 2015 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE TO THE CITY COUNCIL WITH A RECOMMENDATION OF APPROVAL AS PROPOSED AND INCLUDING THE INPUT AND COMMENTS DISCUSSED AND AGREED TO BY THE PLANNING BOARD DURING AND FOLLOWING THE PUBLIC HEARING ON JUNE 10, 2015. BOARD MEMBER CLOUTIER SECONDED THE MOTION, WHICH CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY.

INTRODUCTION TO IRRECONCILABLE APPLICATIONS CODE AMENDMENTS TO TITLE 20

Mr. Lien reviewed that the City Council adopted Ordinance 3992 as an emergency interim zoning ordinance on March 17th. As the interim ordinance expires in six months, the Planning Board must review the language and forward a recommendation for a permanent ordinance to the City Council by September. A public hearing before the Planning Board is tentatively set for July 8th. He explained that the intent of the interim ordinance is to address irreconcilable applications on the same

property. As per the interim ordinance, if a second application is made on the same property as a previous application and the two projects have locations or features that could be irreconcilable, the first application would be deemed withdrawn and will not be processed further. To clarify the interim ordinance as it relates to irreconcilable applications that result in withdrawal, he provided the following examples:

1. An applicant submits an application for a four-lot short plat on a particularly property. Subsequently, another application is submitted for a three-lot short plat on the same property. Assuming there is not enough land area for seven lots, the two applications would be considered irreconcilable because one could not construct both short plats. Hence the four-lot short plat application would be deemed withdrawn.
2. An applicant submits an application for design review of a 20-unit, multi-family development and subsequently, another design review is submitted for a 30-unit development whose footprint would substantially overlap with the footprint of the structure shown for the 20-unit application. Because both structures would occupy the same space, they would be considered irreconcilable and the 20-unit application would be deemed withdrawn.

To clarify the ordinance as it relates to applications that may be inconsistent but are not irreconcilable resulting in withdrawal, Mr. Lien provided the following examples.

1. An applicant submits a four-lot short plat on a particular property. Subsequently, a building permit application is submitted for a single-family home, the footprint of which would encroach into the setbacks as measured from the proposed short plat lot lines. Because the building permit application could be corrected to properly locate the footprint, the applications are reconcilable and do not effect a withdrawal of the short plat application.
2. An applicant submits a landscaping plan that is inconsistent in an insignificant way with civil site-improvement plans that are submitted for the same property. If the two sets of plans can be reconciled by submitting a correct version of at least one of the two plans, City staff would seek corrections and withdrawal would not be deemed to occur.

Mr. Lien said a second part of the interim ordinance relocated a section that had to do with the resubmission of an application after denial from Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC) 20.07 (Closed Record Appeals) to ECDC 20.02 (Development Project Permit Applications). As per the language in this provision, an applicant could not be able to resubmit an application within a 12-month period of denial unless there has been a significant change.

Vice Chair Lovell requested clarification of the provision that would be in ECDC 20.02.006. Mr. Lien said this provision is already in the code, and the proposed change would simply relocate it from its current location in 20.07.007. The title to the section would be changed, as well.

Board Member Rubenkönig asked who would be responsible for determining whether or not there has been significant change. Mr. Lien answered that the decision would be made by the Planning Director. Board Member Rubenkönig also asked why the first application, rather than the second application would be deemed withdrawn. Mr. Lien pointed out that applications can only be submitted by property owners, and it is assumed that the most recent application would be the one the property owner wants to put forward.

Mr. Lien reminded the Board that the draft ordinance would be scheduled for a public hearing on July 8th.

The Board took a break from 9:15 to 9:25.

CONTINUED REVIEW OF DRAFT CODE FOR THE CRITICAL AREAS ORDINANCE (CAO) UPDATE

Chair Tibbott explained that Mr. Lien would present the Staff Report relative to the CAO Update. However, due to the lateness of the hour, the Board Members would not be invited to comment and discuss the proposed changes following the presentation. Instead, the Board Members can email their comments and recommendations directly to staff so they can be incorporated into the final version that is scheduled for a public hearing in July.

Mr. Lien reviewed that he introduced the CAO update to the Board on March 25th and presented modifications to the CAO on April 22nd. At this meeting, staff will discuss proposed changes related to Frequently Flooded Areas (FFA), which are, by definition, considered critical areas. They will also discuss the existing native vegetation requirement contained in Edmonds Community Development Code (ECDC) 23.90.040.C, as well as a proposed new section in ECDC 23.40.215, which pertains to Critical Area Restoration Projects.

Frequently Flooded Areas

Mr. Lien reported that the consultant is recommending the City require compensatory storage for development around Lake Ballinger. He explained that because of existing geology, particularly the 25 feet of peat on the south side, it is not feasible to do compensatory storage mitigation around Lake Ballinger. As such, staff is not proposing a compensatory storage requirement at this time.

Mr. Lien said the consultant is also recommending that the City require that new residential structures within the floodplains be elevated to provide a minimum of 1 foot of freeboard above the Base Flood Elevation (BFE), which is the elevation of the 100-year flood event). He pointed out that the City's floodplains are largely contained in two areas: the downtown waterfront area and around the shores of Lake Ballinger. He provided maps to illustrate the floodplains around the shores of Lake Ballinger, as well as along the waterfront. He advised that the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) completed a Coastal Flood Risk Review for Snohomish County in 2014. Although the map provided in the review is not currently effective, it does illustrate the likely location of the floodplains along the waterfront. He noted that the floodplain area was significantly expanded in the draft map, which also establishes the BSA at about 12 feet above sea level. There are a few other floodplains identified in the City, including Shell Creek downstream of Caspers and a few more along the shoreline to the north.

Mr. Lien noted that Lake Ballinger is a highly-controlled environment with the level of the lake controlled by a structure at the McAleer Creek outlet of the lake, and it is not likely that the flood events that happened in 1997 and 2007 will occur in the future around the lake. At this time, staff is not proposing any changes regarding construction being elevated above BFE around Lake Ballinger.

Mr. Lien said sea level rise should be considered when allowing development within the FFA near waterfront area. He provided a graph to illustrate the results of recent studies from the Mote Marine Laboratory and the National Research Council (NRC) relative to sea level rise. As per the NRC study, the mean projection for sea level rise by 2050 is 6.5 inches, and the mean project by 2100 is 24.3 inches. By the end of the century, there is likely to be a sea level change of two feet. When considering development along the waterfront, the City should consider the life of the buildings and whether or not the City should plan for potential sea level rise.

Mr. Lien explained that flood plain areas are largely regulated by the Building Code (ECDC 19.00.025), the International Residential Code (IRC) for residential development, and the International Building Code (IBC) for commercial development. He noted that the IRC does not require single-family residences to be elevated above BSE, but the IBC does require structures to be constructed at or up to two feet above BFE, depending on the category of the structure. Staff is recommending that the building code be amended (ECDC 19.00.025) to include a Design Flood Elevation (DFE) of 2 feet above the BFE for all new structures within the Coastal High Hazard Areas and Coastal A Flood Zones. However, he acknowledged that requiring structures to be constructed above the BFE would impact the overall height allowed. The maximum allowable height is currently measured from an average level of the undisturbed soil as defined by ECDC 24.40.030. Where existing grade along the waterfront is at or below the BFE, requiring structures to be built 2 feet above BFE would effectively eliminate 2 feet of the allowable height for a structure. In order to maintain existing height allowances, the Planning Board should consider whether to modify the development code to establish a new base elevation from which the maximum height of the structures within the Coastal High Hazard Areas and Coastal A Flood Zones are measured. This could be accomplished through a modification to the definition of height in ECDC 2r.40.030 or through specific allowances within the zoning code (ECDC 16).

Native Vegetation on RS-12 and RS-20 Zones

Mr. Lien said staff is proposing to change ECDC 23.90.040, which requires retention or establishment of a minimum of 30% native vegetation on undeveloped or redeveloped property within the RS-12 and RS-20 zones. He explained that the provision has characteristics of a provision in King County's CAO that was struck down by Washington Court of Appeals. Currently, the requirement is tied to the zone rather than to habitat. For example, he is working on an application for a 7-lot subdivision at the corner of 9th Avenue and Caspers Street. It is currently a grass field that has no habitat, and the current provision requires the applicant to provide a native landscaping plan to show how they will provide a 30% native vegetation area. He reviewed that, initially, staff and the consultants drafted provisions that would replace this section with new requirements for biodiversity areas and corridors. However, it is clear that more study is needed to fully develop standards for retention and connection of biodiversity areas and corridors. Based on the current budget and time constraints, it is not possible to fully flesh out new biodiversity areas and corridors code provisions. However, it could be addressed at a later time with information developed in association with an Urban Forest Management Plan.

Mr. Lien said staff is now proposing changes to provide more definition to specific habitat features to be retained by the provision such as indigenous species, native significant trees and snags. Additionally, a section would be added to allow the Director to waive the provisions of ECDC 23.90.040.C where the habitat is nonexistent on a particular property. He explained that the proposed revisions will provide continued protection for naturally vegetated areas of the City that are important for wildlife habitat while also providing a more defensible code in line with the findings of the court case mentioned previously.

Restoration Projects

Mr. Lien explained that the City does not wish to discourage restoration projects that would provide a net benefit to the City's critical areas. Therefore, staff is proposing a new section (ECDC 23.40.215) that would grant relief for restoration projects not required as mitigation for a development proposal. The proposed relief would be a reduction to the standard buffer otherwise required by the critical area regulations. He further explained that two types of projects would be eligible for relief under ECDC 23.40.215:

- Daylighting of a stream, or
- Creation or expansion of a wetland that would cause a landward expansion of the wetland and/or its buffer.

Mr. Lien advised that a restoration project may apply a buffer equal to 75% of the standard buffer. A restoration project proponent may request a buffer be reduced to a minimum of 50% of the standard buffer if:

- A 75% buffer would significantly limit use of the property.
- It is the minimum necessary to achieve the restoration project.
- There would be a net environmental benefit.
- Granting relief is consistent with the purposes of the critical area regulations.

Mr. Lien reminded the Board that a public hearing on the draft CAO has been scheduled for July 8th. He recalled that the Board was scheduled to discuss the CAO at their May 27th meeting, but the discussion was postponed due to time constraints. He invited Board Members to forward their comments and suggestions to him for consideration as he prepares a draft code for the public hearing. He anticipates the Board will have an additional meeting after the public hearing to discuss the more complicated provisions contained in the draft CAO further.

Vice Chair Lovell expressed his belief that it will be important for the draft CAO to provide specific language and methodology for implementing the various provisions in the CAO prior to the hearing. He said this is particularly important for the issue related to height of structures in Coastal Flood Hazard Zones given the currently proposed provision that would require new residential structures to be elevated. Mr. Lien invited the Board Members to email him their thoughts on the issue and said the draft CAO that is presented for public hearing will provide specific language to address this issue. He reminded them that he previously presented two options for addressing height: through a modification to the definition of height in ECDC 24.40.030 or through specific allowances within the zoning code (ECDC 16).

Board Member Robles questioned if the City really wants to legislate the elevation of buildings in the Coastal Flood Hazard Zones. Another option would be a “build at your own risk” approach. Developers know that sea level is rising. Mr. Lien pointed out that the IBD already requires some structure to be built above the BFE.

Chair Tibbott reminded the Board Members to submit their comments and recommendations to Mr. Lien as soon as possible.

REVIEW OF EXTENDED AGENDA

Chair Tibbott announced that the Planning Board’s retreat is scheduled for June 24th in the Edmonds Swedish Hospital Board Room, starting at 6:00 p.m. At least a portion of the meeting would involve a conversation with representatives from Verdant Health regarding their future plans for the hospital property. He agreed to provide more detailed information about the location soon. It was noted that the retreat would be open to the public, and staff would notice the meeting details as appropriate.

PLANNING BOARD CHAIR COMMENTS

Chair Tibbott did not have any additional items to report.

PLANNING BOARD MEMBER COMMENTS

Board Member Cloutier observed that a public comment earlier in the meeting appeared to suggest that the Planning Board prepared and endorsed the draft Tree Code, which was the subject of a public hearing before the Board on May 27th. He clarified that the Board reviewed the Tree Code in a public meeting, but it was not something the Board wrote. The fact that people came to the hearing does not mean the Board is not doing its job correctly. The Planning Board fulfilled its responsibilities by publicizing a public hearing and encouraging the public to participate.

Board Member Stewart thanked staff for their hard work on the heavy documents the Board has received in past months. She also thanked the Board Members for taking time to review the documents and participate in the discussions. She asked that staff date each draft that is prepared so the Board Members can easily identify the most recent version. She also suggested it would be helpful for the Board to reach a consensus on whether they will work from the clean or marked up copies.

Board Member Rubenkönig said she is a Waste Warrior for the Snohomish County Extension’s Sustainable Community Stewards Program. Her group recently worked at the Rotary Club’s Edmonds Waterfront Festival, diverting over 900 pounds of organic waste from the landfill, and they are waiting for numbers for the amount of recyclable materials that was diverted, as well. She concluded that they were able to improve over last year’s, and they plan to work at the Taste of Edmond, as well.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board meeting was adjourned at 9:58 p.m.