

2013 Redmond Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Miscellaneous Amendments (LAND-2013-01274)

Attachment B: Final Planning Commission Issues Matrix

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>1. Unit lot subdivision: when was it adopted? How many times has it been extended? How many projects have been completed? (Sanders)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 8/21: Commissioner Sanders was satisfied with staff’s response, and expressed some hesitation about going ahead with an indefinite extension of the unit lot subdivision provisions, preferring a time-limited extension to allow more projects to be built. The Commission ultimately decided to recommend approval of this amendment given the number of times these provisions have been utilized in recent years and given that it provides a mechanism for subdividing multi-family projects.</p> <p>8/14: Commissioners expressed interest in learning more about the length of time that the unit lot subdivisions had been in effect since its initial adoption and the number of projects that had made use of the provisions.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 8/21: In reviewing the adopting ordinances, staff found that it was initially adopted on October 29, 2005 with an original sunset date of October 29, 2008. The ordinance was then extended for an additional five years, and so expires in October 2013. During the eight year timeframe when the unit lot subdivision provisions have been in effect, there have been approximately five projects that have utilized this code, with the majority of applications occurring in the last two years.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u> 8/21: No public comment on this issue.</p>	<p>Opened 8/14 Closed 8/21</p>
<p>2. Public input generally (Multiple)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 8/21: Commissioners described to staff the topics they would like to cover as part of an agenda item devoted to public outreach. The Commission’s interests lie particularly in engagement that the Planning Department undertakes in the context of neighborhood plan updates, other long range plan updates, and development projects. The Commission asked that staff summarize what the City does now, and what the City is required to do, by process type. Additionally, the Commission expressed interest in learning how the notice/engagement activities the Planning Department undertakes fit with the City’s overall communication strategy and what kind of assistance Planning staff receive from Communications staff. Commissioners suggested that a study session on this topic could also be a brainstorming session, with flip charts or other means of recording ideas.</p>	<p>Opened 8/14 Closed 8/21</p>

2013 Redmond Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Miscellaneous Amendments (LAND-2013-01274)

Attachment B: Final Planning Commission Issues Matrix

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>8/14: Commissioners expressed interest in learning more about the Planning Department’s current outreach practices and strategies, and about the strategies and activities of the City’s Communications office. There was particular interest in pursuing more proactive outreach approaches.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 9/11: Staff is coordinating schedules and anticipates bringing this item to the Planning Commission in October.</p> <p>8/21: Staff appreciates and understands the Commission’s interest in outreach, and shares the desire to reach a broader audience both for specific land use applications and for other initiatives. To that end, staff has experimented with a number of new approaches recently. These include: visiting neighborhood parks, leading neighborhood walks, sending more communication directly to email inboxes, hanging posters in local businesses and apartment mailrooms, incentivizing online questionnaire completion, partnering with other City departments on outreach activities as part of Derby Days, and partnering with the library system and a local artist.</p> <p>We recognize that the outreach landscape is changing and so we continue to seek and apply new ideas and tools. For example, the City is evaluating more active forms of community engagement that could supplement the biennial citizen survey (the traditional source of citizen satisfaction data); this effort includes researching best practices and the use of technology to enhance community engagement. Also, we are researching the availability and use nationally of interactive digital tools for a variety of civic engagement purposes. We will work with Communications staff to follow-up on the Commission’s request to learn more about citywide communication and outreach efforts and provide an update following that discussion.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> 8/21: Tom Hinman testified in general support of addressing this issue broadly on behalf of Sustainable Redmond.</p>	
<p>3. Master Planned Development neighborhood meetings: are there</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 8/21: Commissioner Biethan reiterated his concern about information coming to light late in the process, though recognized that it is impossible to completely eliminate that possibility. The Commission was satisfied with staff’s response.</p>	<p>Opened 8/14 Closed 8/21</p>

2013 Redmond Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Miscellaneous Amendments (LAND-2013-01274)

Attachment B: Final Planning Commission Issues Matrix

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
ways to further reduce the chances of last-minute surprises? (Biethan)	<p>8/14: Planning Commissioners requested additional discussion relating to ways to address issues that may arise from a neighborhood meeting during the final stages of a project, or ways to increase the odds that those issues are surfaced earlier in the process. Commissioner Biethan noted that those issues can sometimes result in significant changes to a project, such as infrastructure modifications.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 8/21: Staff understands the Commission’s concerns relating to ensuring predictability during the design and planning of a project. There are informal ways to resolve issues that arise as a result of a neighborhood meeting, between the developer and concerned citizens. Typically, developers attempt to resolve issues that arise prior to a scheduled public hearing. Staff’s recommendation includes providing an additional opportunity to gather early public input and thereby reduce the chances that new issues will surface in the last days before a decision is to be made.</p> <p>This issues is also related to issue #2 regarding public outreach more generally. The better the City’s outreach is in general, the less likely it is that surprises will emerge late in the development review process.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> 8/21: Tom Hinman testified in support of this amendment on behalf of Sustainable Redmond.</p>	
4. Community advisory group for trees (“tree board”) (from public testimony)	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 8/21: Commissioners discussed the idea of a community tree board in response to the issue being raised in public testimony. Commissioners identified the following questions about a tree board: 1) What would the role of such a board be, and how would its role be different from the role played by Sustainable Redmond today? 2) Is it appropriate to have a narrowly-focused board like this? In other words, what happens when someone requests a salmon commission or something similarly narrow? 3) What are other cities doing and why? 4) What are the City’s obligations in order to remain a Tree City USA?</p> <p>Although it is not making a recommendation to the Council, the Commission asked staff to conduct basic research into the above questions so as to provide the Council with background information for Sustainable Redmond’s request.</p>	Opened 8/21 Closed 9/11

2013 Redmond Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Miscellaneous Amendments (LAND-2013-01274)

Attachment B: Final Planning Commission Issues Matrix

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 9/11: Staff determined that Redmond has been a Tree City USA for the last 14 years. There are four requirements: a tree board or department, a tree care ordinance, a community forestry program with an annual budget of at least \$2 per capita per year, and an Arbor Day observance and proclamation.</p> <p>In Redmond the City’s Park Operations division functions as the managing body and oversees annual recertification under this program. Park Operations cares for and manages the City’s trees, as required by the Tree City USA program.</p> <p>The City of Poulsbo has a volunteer tree board that advises the City on tree issues. Here is a summary from the City of Poulsbo:</p> <p><i>The Poulsbo Tree Board was established in 1997 to advise and educate the Mayor, City Council and citizens on issues pertaining to trees in the city. This includes the promoting of responsible planting of trees on public and private property; promoting public education and proper tree maintenance of trees; advocating trees within the city; providing for aesthetics within the city through the formulation and implementation of tree programs; developing innovative and joint funding for tree projects from a variety of sources; and providing the Mayor and the City Council with a yearly report regarding Tree Board activities.</i></p> <p>City of Poulsbo staff confirms that Poulsbo has a productive tree board that focuses on outreach and education. For example it organizes ivy clean ups, appears at the local farmers market, and makes site visits to other places to investigate tree best practices. The Poulsbo board is not involved in private development.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> Tom Hinman testified in support of creating a community advisory group for trees (“tree board”) on behalf of Sustainable Redmond. This was in the context of revising zoning code language related to the selection of street trees.</p>	
5. Increasing notice radius for projects	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 8/21: Commissioners were initially supportive of the idea of expanding the mailed notice radius for</p>	Opened 8/21 Closed 8/21

2013 Redmond Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Miscellaneous Amendments (LAND-2013-01274)

Attachment B: Final Planning Commission Issues Matrix

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
in urban centers (from public testimony)	<p>development projects in urban centers to 800 feet. However, before recommending such a change the Commission believed it would be better to consider that request in the context of public notice and outreach more broadly (see issue 2). Therefore, the Commission decided not to support a change at this time.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 8/21: Staff recommended against changing the notice radius at this time. Staff cited consistency (all required mailed notice radii are 500 feet) and questioned the effectiveness of such a change. In staff's view, the mailed notice radius has little influence on how many people become engaged in the development review process; rather, it seems to be driven by the particular issues in a given project. In the past Redmond used a 300-foot notice and some time ago expanded that to 500 feet. Staff has not seen a concurrent increase in engagement on development projects as a result of that increase.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> Tom Hinman testified in support of expanding the required mailed notice radius for development projects in urban centers given their potentially greater impact. He suggested an 800-foot radius, though was not set on that particular number.</p>	