



Issue / Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue status
<p>2. Is the response to question B2a of the Technical Committee Report biased? (Chandorkar)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> Staff has noted the concern and will avoid this reference in the Planning Commission Report.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> There was some concern that staff’s response to the “consistency with the goals, visions, and framework policy of the Comprehensive Plan” in the Technical Report may be subjectively commenting on “healthy lifestyle” as it relates to marijuana uses.</p> <p>The Planning Commission was satisfied that staff noted the concern and will avoid this reference in the Planning Commission Report.</p>	<p><u>Opened</u> 2/12/14</p> <p><u>Closed</u> 2/26/14</p>
<p>3. What is the rationale for allowing “processing” in Manufacturing Parks (MP), Business Parks (BP), Industrial (I), Gateway Design District (GDD), and Overlake (OV) and (OBAT) per the proposed Comprehensive</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> Per the Redmond Zoning Code, the definition of “Manufacturing and Wholesale Trade” is: “An establishment that engages in the transformation of raw materials into finished products, in the sale or distribution of those products to persons, firms, or corporations for resale, in the storage of materials or products in a warehouse or similar structure, or in the assembly or fabrication of goods. A manufacturing or wholesale trade establishment does not engage in the retail sale of products to the end consumer.”</p> <p>A marijuana processor license allows a licensee to process, package, and label usable marijuana and marijuana-infused products for sale at wholesale to a marijuana retailer. As such, a processor/processing business meets the Zoning Code’s definition of “Manufacturing and Wholesale Trade” and thus is an allowed use in the zones cited above: MP, BP, I, GDD, OV and OBAT.</p>	<p><u>Opened</u> 2/12/14</p>

Issue / Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue status
<p>Land Use Chart?  (Sanders)</p>	<p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p> <p>The question was answered to the Planning Commission’s satisfaction and the issue was closed.</p>	<p><b><u>Closed</u></b> <b>2/26/14</b></p>
<p>4. How was the proposed land use chart for marijuana related uses throughout the City, produced?  (Sanders)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> The Comprehensive Land Use Chart, RZC 21.04 “General Provisions” is a compilation of the permitted land uses throughout the City.</p> <p>First, staff determined where “general sales or service”; “manufacturing and wholesale trade” and “agriculture” are currently allowed uses.</p> <p>Next, with the exception of residential zones (WA State regulation), if a zone currently allows retail sales, then “marijuana retail sales” was added to the chart under the “general sales or service” category and designated by <u>P</u>. The same procedure was used to determine in which zones marijuana processing and marijuana production would be an allowed use.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p> <p>The question was answered to the Planning Commission’s satisfaction and the issue was closed.</p>	<p><b><u>Opened</u></b> <b>2/12/14</b></p> <p><b><u>Closed</u></b> <b>2/26/14</b></p>
<p>5. Can the Planning Commission postpone making a</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> Planning Commission could opt to table the discussion and postpone making a recommendation to Council until the State legislature votes. If HB 2322 is passed, staff would</p>	<p><b><u>Opened</u></b> <b>2/12/14</b></p>

Issue / Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue status
<p>recommendation to Council until the State Legislature votes on House Bill 2322?</p> <p>(Chandorkar)</p>	<p>need to revisit and amend the current proposed language and land use charts.</p> <p>The State is expected to vote on the HB sometime in April, which would give the Planning Commission time to make its recommendations to City Council before the current interim regulations expire on September 2, 2014.</p> <p>Staff recommends not postponing making a recommendation to City Council because the legal context for land use regulations related to marijuana processing, production and retail could continue to change. The City Council has the option to refer a topic back to Planning Commission for further discussion and recommendation as needed.</p> <p><u>2/26/14:</u> The City Attorney advised against postponement at this time. Information was also provided regarding HB 2322's failure to make it out of committee in the State Legislature. The Planning Commission did not decide whether to postpone or move forward with making a recommendation to City Council. This issue is still open and pending.</p> <p><u>Public Comments:</u></p> <p>Two citizens (who are interested in operating a marijuana related business in Redmond) spoke to the Commission at the 2/26/14 public hearing. Both parties stated their concerns regarding the postponement of any actions/recommendations. These citizens stated that applying for a marijuana license (from the State) is time sensitive, and it would be helpful for any prospective business owner to know and understand the City of Redmond's intentions moving forward.</p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p> <p><u>3/12/14:</u> The Planning Commission decided <i>not</i> to postpone making their recommendations to City Council.</p>	<p><b><u>Closed</u></b> <b><u>3/12/14</u></b></p>
<p>6. Should Planning Commission recommend adding a 1,000 ft.</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> Requiring that marijuana related businesses be separated by 1,000 ft. will prevent concentrations of marijuana related uses in any one area in the City. This would help to avoid</p>	<p><b><u>Opened</u></b> <b>2/12/14</b></p>

Issue / Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue status
<p>separation (to the I-502 buffers) between marijuana related businesses?</p> <p>(Sanders/all)</p>	<p>concentrations of these uses in specific locations within the City.</p> <p><u>Public Comments:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p> <p><u>2/26/14:</u> Commission did not complete their discussion of a 1,000-ft. separation between marijuana related businesses.</p> <p>This issue is still open and pending.</p> <p><u>3/12/14:</u> The Planning Commission voted 6-0 not to recommend a 1,000 ft. separation between marijuana-related businesses. The Commission recommended that marijuana-related uses in the City should be as broad as legally possible providing that the marijuana uses are compliant with WAC 314-55 and local zoning regulations.</p>	<p><b><u>Closed</u></b> <b><u>3/12/14</u></b></p>
<p>7. Should language be added to the proposed regulations that would require that all processing be conducted in a permanent structure?</p> <p>(Sanders)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></p> <p>WAC 314-55 requires that marijuana <i>production</i> must take place within a fully enclosed secure indoor facility, but does not appear to require the same for processing. The City Attorney will provide example language for such a requirement for processing businesses to discuss further with the Planning Commission.</p> <p><u>Public Comments:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p> <p><u>3/12/14:</u> Language requiring that all marijuana and marijuana-related uses be conducted in permanent structures that comply with the City's building codes has been added to the recommended regulations.</p>	<p><b><u>Opened</u></b> 2/26/14</p> <p><b><u>Closed</u></b> <b><u>3/12/14</u></b></p>
<p>8. Are there liquor stores that are</p>	<p><u>Staff Comments/Recommendation:</u></p>	<p><b><u>Opened</u></b></p>

