REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

February 16, 2011

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chairman Hinman, Commissioners O'Hara, Julinsey, Gregory,

Miller and Flynn

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED: Commissioner Biethan

STAFF PRESENT: Pete Sullivan, Sarah Stiteler, Eric McConaghy, Kim Dietz, Jeff

Churchill, Gary Lee, and Terry Marpert, Redmond Planning Department; Don Cairns, Redmond Public Works Department

RECORDING SECRETARY: Kathryn Kerby, Lady of Letters, Inc.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Hinman in the Council Chambers at City Hall.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

No changes to the agenda. Pete Sullivan clarified that Ms. Stiteler would first present a summary of the four elements to be discussed:

- 1) Goals, Vision, Framework Policies
- 2) Land Use
- 3) Urban Centers and related regulations
- 4) Transportation

Then the public hearing would be opened for comment on any of the elements. Once all the oral testimony had been heard, the Commission would begin review of each specific element. City Planning Department staff were in attendance for details about each of those elements.

APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY:

Chairman Hinman asked if anyone had any questions or concerns about the meeting summary for February 9, 2011. No one had questions. The Commission voted unanimously to accept the meeting summary.

ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

There were no questions or comments from the audience.

PUBLIC HEARING AND STUDY SESSION, 2010/2011 Comprehensive Plan Update, various elements, presented by Redmond City Planning staff (Sarah Stiteler; Pete Sullivan; Terry Marpert; Eric McConaghy; Kim Dietz; Jeff Churchill; Gary Lee)

Ms. Stiteler opened by providing an overview of the 2010-2011 Comprehensive Plan Update similar to that which was presented at the February 9, 2011 Study Session. The following elements will be considered this evening:

- 1) Goals, Vision, Framework Policies
- 2) Land Use
- 3) Urban Centers and related regulations
- 4) Transportation

The purpose of the current meeting is to hear public comment on these four elements, identify any outstanding issues, and begin resolution of those issues.

The last Comprehensive Plan review and update was completed in 2004. That update set the planning horizon to 2022. The current revisions include an extension of the planning horizon to 2030. The work being done with this latest round of changes consist of an update, a fine-tuning of the current plan, rather than an overhaul. It also maintains the City's current vision of two urban centers, Downtown and Overlake, as well as the integrity of other land uses.

The document also needs to be updated regarding project changes or work completed since the last Comprehensive Plan update. Finally, the state's Growth Management Act, updates to regional plans and other mandates must be integrated into the City's Comprehensive Plan. This has resulted in updated growth targets, including revised counts for anticipated residents, dwelling units and jobs in the City.

One general change that's being reflected throughout the Comprehensive Plan is the concept of sustainability, including environmental quality, economic vitality and social equity. Changes include goals to reduce stormwater runoff through revised development criteria, and to provide opportunities for access to local healthy food sources by encouraging community gardens. Economic vitality includes increased opportunities for a healthy business environment, including business creation and retention. Equitable access to basic human needs includes access to food, human services, and public services.

Examples of proposed policy updates in response to changes since the last Comprehensive Plan update include policies regarding:

- 1) The Redmond Central Connector
- 2) Downtown Central Park
- 3) Light rail

Additionally staff propose revising Comprehensive Plan language promoting a *small town feel* with language supporting a *comfortable and connected feel*.

Changes in response to the Growth Management Act and related plans include policy updates to address climate change and reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to support opportunities for improved human health.

Next steps in this process include:

- 1) Additional Planning Commission study sessions on February 23, 1011 and March 2, 2011
- 2) Planning Commission completion is anticipated on March 9 or March 16, 2011
- 3) Review by City Council is scheduled to begin in April 2011
- 4) City Council approval of a resolution of intent to adopt these amendments is targeted for the first week of May, 2011

Ms. Stiteler concluded by thanking the Commission for all of their hard work during this latest review cycle. She offered to answer any questions they might have. Commissioner Miller asked Ms. Stiteler to clarify how this latest set of Comprehensive Plan changes would qualify as mere adjustments, when they were actually introducing the new concept of sustainability. Ms. Stiteler explained that yes, the sustainability concept was new, and the City's desire to incorporate that concept throughout the

Comprehensive Plan actually drove this latest cycle of Comprehensive Plan revisions. However, since that large-scale addition was to be made, planners felt it was a good opportunity to also tweak other sections of Comprehensive Plan to reflect these smaller-scale adjustments. Chairman Hinman added that when City Council decided to add the sustainability concept to the Comprehensive Plan, they felt it made more sense to add it consistently throughout the Comprehensive Plan, rather than trying to tack on sustainability requirements to each small section of plan.

Commissioner Miller asked Ms. Stiteler to clarify the difference between public access and public equity, since both terms seem to be used interchangeably within the sustainability language. Ms. Stiteler replied that the City wanted to ensure equitable access to public services. She added that the question of small animal husbandry had been raised very recently, specifically regarding urban chickens. Planning staff will add that topic to the issues being considered.

With no additional questions or comments, Chairman Hinman opened the public hearing. Ms. Cindy Jayne of 5524 161st Place NE, Redmond, was speaking on behalf of Sustainable Redmond. That group is very supportive of the City's efforts to add the sustainability concept to the Comprehensive Plan. They would like to see additional language added to strengthen that concept in the City's Comprehensive Plan:

1) Framework policies

- a. The group would like to see the City of Redmond prepare for climate change by following a model similar to that outlined in the Preparing for Climate Change Guidebook for Local, Regional and State Governments published by King County and the University of Washington's Climate Impacts group and ICLEI the International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives. That guide would help the City understand and mitigate potential climate change impacts, such as additional flooding and snow pack reduction. The document would also tie in well with the City's efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, which Sustainable Redmond also supported.
- b. The addition of a bullet to Framework Item #8, related to gray water. Ms. Jayne read off the suggested bullet's additional language, and said she had a hard copy of the language that she would present as part of the record.
- c. Finally, she asked whether the new population numbers were supported by an analysis of what the City's natural resources can sustainably support. She provided Las Vegas as an example of a city that would have to consider water in its consideration of sustainability.

2) Land Use

- a. Sustainable Redmond liked seeing the City's emphasis on increased p-patches and community gardens. The group would like to enhance that by adding language that every citizen has easy biking or walking access to a nearby community garden.
- b. The group wanted to encourage the creation and preservation of farmlands. Ms. Jayne submitted more specific written language for all items.

3) Transportation

a. The group would like to add a goal to the Goals, Vision and Framework policies. The new goal would be to have all residences and businesses within City limits have access to mass transit within a half mile of their residence or business. That would feed the Overlake and Downtown hubs, allowing all residents and businesses access to the larger regional transit.

That concluded Ms. Jayne's comments. Chairman Hinman asked if any of the Commissioners had questions for her. There were none. Chairman Hinman asked if there were any other members of the audience wishing to address the Commission.

Mr. Donald Marcy of 524 - 2nd Avenue, Seattle, spoke on behalf of Microsoft Corporation. They have reviewed the drafts of the element revisions, and he wanted to make a few comments. Before doing so, he also wanted to inform the Commission that Microsoft was still reviewing the proposed changes, and would continue submitting written testimony about those changes. He asked that the Commission extend the time for written comment so that they had time to complete the review. Chairman Hinman asked if there were specific revisions that Microsoft was particularly interested in reviewing. Mr. Marcy replied that he would like to review the Land Use and Transportation Elements, and particularly the Urban Center Element provisions regarding Overlake. He reviewed the comments they have put together so far:

- 1) Land Use Element: table LU-1 provided for an increase in commercial space of 11 million square feet, between 2010 and 2030. He did not know whether that included both office and/or research/development space, as opposed to just retail space. Microsoft was not sure whether that additional space would be sufficient, considering the estimated population growth within that 20-year timeframe. It worked out to be only 500,000 additional square feet per year.
- 2) Land Use Element: Mr. Marcy questioned whether the City should expand the Overlake Urban Center area as shown on map LU-3, to include both the former Safeco campus as well as the area on the west side of SR-520, between 148th Avenue NE and SR-520. Much of that property is owned by Microsoft and Nintendo, and both companies plan to grow in the future. However, those particular areas are not included in the Overlake Urban Center even though they are zoned within the Overlake Business and Technology area.
- 3) Transportation Element: in the parking portion of that element, policy TR-38 included revisions to the maximum and minimum parking ratios. Those ratios would be reduced with the development of enhanced transit facilities or as mode-split goals are achieved. Microsoft has worked hard to achieve better mode-split categories between single-occupancy vehicles and other means of transportation. They have done a good job of achieving the goals that the City has set. However, the company felt penalized for meeting those goals, only to subsequently see the ratios reduced. The parking ratios are already too low to meet their existing uses. Microsoft has had to go out and buy Transfer of Development Rights to acquire additional parking spaces because Redmond's parking ratios are insufficient. Mr. Marcy suggested they delete that sentence.
- 4) Transportation Element: Concurrency and Level of Service: Policy TR-X provided for establishing separate mode-splits for biking, walking and transit. Microsoft wondered why the City needed separate mode-splits for those types of activities which do not involve single-occupancy vehicles. Microsoft certainly understands the need to get people out of cars and into alternate travel modes, yet Microsoft does not understand the need for mode-splits for those alternatives. Chairman Hinman pointed out that he seemed to be referencing TR-41. Mr. Marcy replied that he might not have the most current draft showing the final numbering.
- 5) Transportation Element: Maintaining Community Character, TR-8, included the statement: ensure that no transportation project conflicts with or detracts from the desired character of the community. Microsoft was concerned because that language was apparently to be applied to

urban centers with the most density. There may be future transportation projects which would violate this requirement. Redmond is no longer the small urban town. It is a major suburb of Seattle, with one of the best employment bases in the whole Puget Sound region, which attracts a lot of new residents. The City will need to build transportation hubs that will not look consistent with the small town feel listed in the Comprehensive Plan.

- 6) Urban Centers Element: N-OV-5.5 was confusing. It looked like the City anticipated fewer employees in 2030 than in 2010. Mr. Marcy may have an earlier draft but he did not understand why the City expected fewer employees in the future. In that same policy, the City established a new floor area ratio of 5.35, both for 2010 and 2030. That is one of the elements that they were still reviewing.
- 7) Urban Centers Element: N-OV-14 included a statement to *ensure that building heights respect views of the tree line*. This is a difficult requirement for Microsoft to maintain. If Microsoft is going to continue to have a presence in Overlake, and expand its headquarters facility, buildings will have to be taller, and would definitely interfere with views of the tree line. Again, Mr. Marcy pointed out this policy applied to an urban center, with higher densities and buildings that are taller than trees. Chairman Hinman pointed out that he may be looking in the residential sections rather than the employment areas. Mr. Marcy said that could be, and if that's the case, he apologized for the comments.
- 8) Urban Centers Element: Policy N-OV-37 included minimized parking facilities at the two light rail stations that are envisioned for Overlake. That may be acceptable, depending on how Sound Transit lined up funding for the East Link system. However, if they do not extend East Link past Overlake, then providing minimal parking facilities at Overlake Transit Center would be a terrible mistake. The Commission may want to include something in the Comprehensive Plan to allow for that possibility.
- 9) Urban Centers Element: Policy N-OV-72 included maintaining the employment area as a moderately intensity district. Again, Microsoft felt that a significant number of companies would be looking to relocate or open operations in Redmond during the 20- year timeframe covered by this policy. To limit Overlake to moderate intensity might unnecessarily limit the City's growth in the future.
- 10) Urban Centers Element: Between policies N-OV-75 and N-OV-77 is a paragraph that reads *the campus-like environment of the employment area can best be achieved by development of mid-rise buildings*. That would be a real problem for Microsoft. The company cannot continue to build new buildings at the same height as current buildings. They need the additional height to provide the needed square footage. The company hoped that taller buildings would be permitted. Chairman Hinman said that since that was not a current policy, the conversation was outside the scope of the current conversation. However, that could be a future conversation.

In summary, Mr. Marcy again requested that the comment period be held open for a few more weeks so that they would have time to go through all the remaining policy revisions. He had been trying to coordinate with Jim Stanton due to travel conflicts and the extra time would be very helpful. Chairman Hinman asked him to be sure to provide his contact information so that staff could get back to him about his request for the comment period extension. Ms. Stiteler said that a two-week comment period would be fine. Chairman Hinman asked that staff also ensure that Mr. Marcy had access to the latest

drafts. He asked if any other members of the audience wanted to comment. There were no further comments. Chairman Hinman closed the oral portion of the public hearing, and held open the written portion of the testimony for up to two weeks.

Goals, Vision and Framework Policies Element

Chairman Hinman opened the study session for the Goals, Vision and Framework Policies Element. He asked the Commissioners to review the updated issues matrix to see if their questions had been adequately answered and issues described. He pointed out several crossover issues which touched on the topic of organizational improvements to streamline format and standardize terminology. He did not want to discuss those yet. He merely wanted to make sure nothing in the issues table had been omitted or needed to be clarified. If so, he wanted to add those issues before they proceeded. There were no additional comments or requests for clarification.

Chairman Hinman brought up the new topic of animal husbandry. He suggested that new topic belonged in Land Use. Ms. Stiteler replied that there were actually several areas that could include language for animal husbandry, but probably not within the Goals, Visions and Framework section. Moving on, he pointed out that new sustainability language would be coming into the Introduction portion of this section. Chairman Hinman also mentioned some style questions raised by Commissioner Julinsey. He asked if Ms. Stiteler had had a chance to discuss those questions with Commissioner Julinsey. Ms. Stiteler replied that she had been in communication with her, and they could continue to talk off-line to resolve those questions.

Chairman Hinman said several new issues had come to light from the public testimony from Ms. Jayne. He said that climate change was an over-arching topic which would probably need to be mentioned in a variety of places throughout the Comprehensive Plan. Specifically it should be mentioned in the Goals, Visions and Framekwork section, as well as in subsequent sections. Ms. Stiteler asked if he was suggesting that they add Ms. Jayne's comments to the issues matrix. Chairman Hinman confirmed the three issues raised by Ms. Jayne should be added, and Ms. Stiteler said she would add them. Mr. Sullivan clarified that their current task is to acknowledge what they heard during oral testimony, and discuss whether those items have already been addressed within existing issues on the matrix, or need to be added as new issues. Chairman Hinman recommended they add those to the issues matrix. Ms. Stiteler added that staff can research to see if those concerns may have already been addressed elsewhere. Chairman Hinman asked if there were any other new issues for this element. No one provided new issues, so he moved the conversation to the Land Use element and issues matrix. He invited Commissioner Flynn to facilitate that conversation.

Land Use Element

Commissioner Flynn asked the Commissioners to review the Land Use Element issues matrix and see if staff had adequately described the issues, or if additional comments, questions had come up. There were no comments or further questions. He asked whether Ms. Jayne's concerns and requests regarding p-patches and community gardens were possibly already included in the Land Use Element. He felt that perhaps the issue of farmland preservation could be woven into the issue about the relationship between agriculture and rural land use and recreation. He believed they should add the issue of access to p-patches. He asked if anyone else had any comments or questions about the Land Use Element issues matrix. Vice-Chair Gregory asked whether perhaps they had not yet adequately matched up the proposed policies with the realities, the needs and expectations of the marketplace in the next 20 years. He felt that Mr. Marcy's comments and concerns merited a closer look at the City's land use assumptions. Given that, he asked whether either the Commission and/or staff should do some

basic vetting on these land use numbers, and whether City goals really reflect City business needs. Perhaps the goals would not need to change, but more room for variation could be warranted.

Commissioner Miller replied that this was a double-edged sword. In relation to Mr. Marcy's comments, he would like more information about the development agreements that have been made between the City and Microsoft and other major employers regarding their growth, capacity, and style of development within the City's urban centers. He felt that Mr. Marcy's comments painted a new vision of what development would be. That vision might work well for Microsoft but not necessarily for Microsoft's neighbors. He lived close to the Microsoft campus and each year when the tree leaves fall, he has to look at the Microsoft building lights which stay on all night. So things like tree line and views should matter. He agreed with Commissioner Gregory about reviewing the City's long-term business goals, but he wanted to look at it in terms of long-term relationships between businesses, neighborhoods and urban centers. Commissioner Flynn asked if staff had a clear enough understanding of the two Commissioners' questions and concerns to define a new issue. Mr. McConaghy replied that yes he did. Chairman Hinman added that the comments were made in the Overlake section of the Comprehensive Plan, and the Economic Vitality Element should also be reviewed. This would not make the comments any less valid, but the Economic Vitality Element may provide some of the details they're looking for.

Commissioner Flynn asked what the zoning was for the Safeco campus and buildings west of there. Chairman Hinman believed that the areas on the other side of SR-520, over to 148th, are outside the urban center zone. Commissioner Flynn asked if that would be addressed in another section of the Comprehensive Plan. Chairman Hinman replied that the referenced map may not be current. Staff had provided copies of the Comprehensive. Plan Map in question and the Urban Centers Map. Mr. McConaghy added that the Comprehensive Land Use Plan Map does not explicitly show the boundaries of the Overlake Urban Center. However, there are commercial areas in Overlake which are not included in the Urban Center. He believed that was the heart of the issue raised by Mr. Marcy. They can add that to the issues matrix for discussion. Commissioner Flynn suggested that they wait for staff comments on that point before discussing the topic further. Chairman Hinman suggested that they also see if there are any other related comments to add to this particular issue. Mr. McConaghy added that they may want to add the zoning issue to the Urban Centers element discussion. It could qualify as a crossover element, and staff could consider it as such.

Commissioner Flynn asked if there were any other issues to add. Commissioner Julinsey said that Ms. Jayne was trying to point out that p-patches should be accessible by hiking and biking trails, which went beyond what was in the proposed language. Chairman Hinman clarified that Ms. Jayne wanted the Comprehensive Plan to support both the agricultural component as well as the accessibility component. That, along with her comments about access to public transit, could be addressed when they get to the Transportation Element.

Ms. Dietz added that the Transportation element could certainly address those issues in a way that would reinforce the Land Use element policies. Mr. McConaghy added that Policy 17.1's second bullet encouraged walking and bicycling access to public facilities, and supported creation of community gardens such as p-patches in public open space. He felt that those two paired statements got to the heart of the matter, providing both presence and access. Staff can clarify that if needed. Mr. McConaghy asked whether the Commissioners had questions about any of the ten existing issues for this element. There were no questions or comments. Commissioner Flynn confirmed that he believed all the staff responses had been adequate. Mr. McConaghy asked if there were any new topics to be

added to the matrix. Chairman Hinman replied that he believed staff would be receiving written questions, given the public testimony. Some of those questions would cross over into other elements such as Transportation. Mr. McConaghy added that any written comments will be added into the issues matrix as needed and brought to the Planning Commission during the next meeting. There were no further questions.

Urban Centers Element

Chairman Hinman opened discussion on the Urban Centers element. This element had the most issues associated with it (31 in total). Jeff Churchill asked if any of the Commissioners had questions about the staff responses. Chairman Hinman replied that Issue #9 covered a wide range of topics. He said he had spent some time with staff trying to understand the issues, or a set of common urban center policies which would help focus issues not unique to either Downtown or Overlake. His hope was to tackle those common items first, then move into issues related specifically to one or the other urban centers. Chairman Hinman said that staff would also get back to the Commission on Issue #9 in particular and that issues consolidation in general. However, he still wanted to know if any Commissioners had questions about particular issues. Mr. Churchill replied that staff would probably not be able to return the reorganized element in time for the next scheduled meeting, but rather the meeting after that. The additional time would allow staff to fully flesh out all the various issues. Commissioner Flynn asked if any other issues needed discussion. Chairman Hinman replied that some of the issues are semantic in nature only, while others seem to be semantic but overlie deeper philosophical issues.

Commissioner Miller commented that on Issue #10, page 5, bullet #1, regarding timing, he explained that he wanted to know more about the time intervals. He could put off talking about Issue #11 until another meeting. He appreciated staff response to Issue #13, regarding the south side of the rail corridor, and he thanked staff for the changes they made regarding Issue #15. Chairman Hinman asked if he was willing to close any of the issues he's named so far. Commissioner Miller replied he was willing to close #15, but he was not yet comfortable closing #13. He also wanted to discuss #17, but would be willing to close #18. He would like to discuss #20 a bit more, regarding the terms *gateway* versus *view shed*. Mr. Churchill pointed out that it would be a good time to discuss that if needed to close it.

Commissioner Miller said his main question at this point was whether gateways should be pedestrian-friendly. His original question had apparently not been adequately captured in the issues table, so it was not adequately answered. Chairman Hinman suggested they pick up conversation on that point a little later since it was already getting more in depth than they really had time for at this point. Commissioner O'Hara asked Commissioner Miller to please go ahead and clarify his original question. Commissioner Miller replied that a gateway which happened to provide a good view of the Cascades was merely coincidence; it was not a public place which warranted special view shed protection. So he was concerned about how those locations were defined and how they were supposed to function.

Chairman Hinman asked whether now would be a good time to raise new issues regarding regulatory issues they have not yet covered. Mr. Churchill confirmed that yes, this would be a good time, and asked if there were any new issues to be listed. Commissioner Flynn listed one new issue regarding Mr. Marcy's statement that the City was expecting lower employment in 2030 than in 2010. Mr. Churchill suggested they incorporate that into an existing issue about the growth target table in the Urban Centers element.

Chairman Hinman said he would like to add the issue of parking concerns with East Link light rail interim termination at NE 40th. He also wanted to add an issue asking how the term *moderate density* was or could be defined. Mr. Churchill pointed out that all of Mr. Marcy's comments were related to each other, being different aspects of the intensity of development in any one area, so they should be treated as one issue. Chairman Hinman added that he had some question about whether those questions belonged in the Urban Center or Land Use element, or possibly both. He asked if another geographic area, the Growth and Transportation Efficiency Center, had concurrent boundaries with designations such as the urban centers. Chairman Hinman said it would be helpful to see maps of all those areas, and how they relate to each other. These issues clearly have aspects of both Land Use and Urban Centers so will have to be considered as crossover issues.

Mr. Churchill asked if anyone had any more new issues. No one had new issues. Chairman Hinman pointed out that they could also close Issue #5. Commissioner Flynn confirmed that Issues #15 and #18 were also closed. Mr. Sullivan suggested they move on to the next topic.

Transportation Element

Commissioner O'Hara stated the issues matrix had 17 issues, and Mr. Marcy's testimony brought up two more: parking ratios and parking concerns with light rail interim termination at NE 40th. He asked if anyone had any additional issues. Commissioner Flynn brought up Ms. Jayne's request that every resident have access to mass transit within a half mile of home and asked that it be added to the issues list.

Commissioner Miller asked whether his previous question about the Complete Streets ordinance had made it into the issues list. He did not see it listed. If it had not been added it should be. Mr. Churchill asked Commissioner Miller whether he supported a Complete Streets ordinance that was stronger than what is currently defined. Commissioner Miller replied that he would like the Transportation policy to be aligned more closely with the intent and language of that ordinance. The ordinance itself was fine. Commissioner O'Hara asked if anyone else had comments on existing issues. Chairman Hinman said he had meant to give staff some contact information for individuals who could explain Issue #3, but he had not yet done so. He would get that information to staff during the break.

Commissioner Miller suggested that they add all of Mr. Marcy's issues to the issues list to make sure all of his points were addressed. Mr. Churchill said staff would need time to work through all those items and supply comment. There were no further additions from the Commission to the issues table. The Commissioners agreed to delay further discussion of the Transportation element until the next study session in order to provide sufficient time.

BREAK

Goals. Visions and Framework Issues Matrix

Chairman Hinman opened discussion of the Goals, Visions and Frameworks issues table. Chairman Hinman asked Commissioners to take a moment to review an older matrix of key concepts dated from July, that he wanted to review with Commissioners to ensure all those concepts had been woven into their most current set of revisions. The document title was *Exhibit E: Summary of Identified Concepts*. It identified plan elements versus new concepts and how they might be dealt with during the update process. Most of the concepts had indeed been incorporated, except for the following:

1) An economic vitality concept was listed in relation to the Urban Centers element, yet was only mentioned in passing within the current revisions for that element.

- 2) The document listed an on-site renewable energy and net zero energy initiative program in the Land Use element, which did not seem to be included in the current revisions for that element.
- 3) Green infrastructure was discussed extensively under the Land Use element. He believed they had included that sufficiently but asked staff to review it.

Mr. Sullivan asked if these should all constitute new issues. Chairman Hinman said no, he just wanted to ensure all these concepts had been incorporated into the existing revisions. He asked if staff could review all the listed concepts and ensure they had been included in some way in the relevant element's revisions. He then returned to the Goals, Vision and Frameworks issues matrix.

Issue #1 regarded public parking facilities. Staff had suggested they move that over to the Transportation issues matrix. Chairman Hinman asked if anyone had any objections to closing that issue in this element and adding it to the Transportation element. None objected so the issue was closed, and added to the Transportation issues matrix.

Issue #2 regarded the costs of capital improvement being matched to benefits received. Chairman Hinman said he was satisfied with staff response and asked if any other Commissioners had questions or comments. None did, but Chairman Hinman wanted to give Commissioner Biethan a chance to comment. Chairman Hinman closed the issue subject to Commissioner Biethan's acceptance of the response.

Issue #3 regarded whether having two urban centers would marginalize or diminish other City neighborhoods. Commissioner Miller said he was satisfied with the response, but he still wanted to know how this issue would specifically be addressed. Ms. Stiteler replied that staff would keep this issue in mind while reviewing other language during normal business. If they discovered sections of the Comprehensive Plan where this concern was needed, staff could add it. The Commission could also add appropriate language if/as needed in the future. Commissioner Miller was satisfied with that clarification, and closed the issue.

Issue #4 regarded whether Old Town was given more prominence than justified. He had raised this issue and was satisfied with the response. Commissioner O'Hara suggested that they simply remove the bolding from the first sentence to reduce the implied importance of that sentence. Ms. Stiteler would make that change. Otherwise the issue was closed.

Issue #5 regarding the readability of the Comprehensive Plan would probably require additional work between the Commission and Planning Department staff, but Chairman Hinman was generally satisfied with the response. He did wonder if maps and other reference materials could be made more available. He understood that some of the reference materials used by the Planning staff were not actually maintained by that department. Yet access needed to be improved if at all possible. He was comfortable closing Issue #5 with those comments.

Issue #6 involved clarifying the language on pages 10-11, regarding the vision of Redmond as a having a green character versus preserving elements of the natural environment. Chairman Hinman was satisfied with staff response, but asked the Commission if anyone else had questions. No one did and the issue was closed.

The Commission had already agreed to close Issue #7, regarding mode-split, and address it within the context of another element. Chairman Hinman and Commissioner Miller both felt it would likely come

up in several elements as a crossover issue. This particular issue was closed, to be discussed under other elements.

Issue #8 asked whether agricultural land use was compatible with the Urban Recreational land use classification. Chairman Hinman suggested that they consider this issue under the Land Use element instead. Commissioner Miller had originally raised this question and was comfortable considering it as a Land Use issue instead. The issue was closed.

Chairman Hinman summarized that all the issues had been closed and/or moved to other elements, some with pending language changes and/or approval from absent Commissioners. He asked what the next step was for this element. Ms. Stiteler proposed that all the documents for this element would be presented to the Commissioners on Friday February 25th, complete with all necessary changes and comments. Mr. Sullivan added that staff hoped all the issues would be closed within one week. The following week the drafts could be modified accordingly, and those changes confirmed with the Commission. That closed the conversation about the Goals, Visions and Framework element.

Land Use Issues Matrix

Commissioner Flynn opened with Issue #1, regarding examples of redeveloping underutilized properties. It was originally Commissioner Biethan's issue and he was not present to comment. Commissioner Miller had also requested additional information as part of this issue. He read through staff response and was unsure what that response actually recommended. Ms. Dietz clarified by saying that this policy reflected a summary of the Goals, Vision and Framework element. Staff suggested that this issue instead be considered under the Goals, Visions and Framework element. The parent language belonged there, and any associated language in the Land Use element would be a copy to reflect that policy. Commissioner Miller asked if that meant they needed to add an issue to the Goals, Visions and Framework element that they just finished. Ms. Stiteler replied that this was the only policy she was aware of that occurred in one element and was copied in its entirety to another element. It was added to the Land Use element because it helped clarify the Land Use element. Commissioner Miller said Commissioner Biethan's questions still had not been answered. Ms. Stiteler suggested that they open a new issue in the Goals, Visions and Framework element for this issue, and close it within the Land Use element. Any comment from Commissioner Biethan could be incorporated within that element.

Vice-Chair Gregory pointed out that Commissioner Biethan had not suggested changes, but rather was asking for examples. The current language seems to be a circular definition - each element is referencing another element for that definition, but the definition itself has not yet been provided. If the Framework element is the best place to resolve this issue, then so be it. However, he suggested that they make sure to provide those requested examples in the Goals, Visions and Framework element since that is what Commissioner Biethan originally requested.

Mr. McConaghy brought up Issue #3 which was similar, in that it asked for examples of a Land Use infill policy, to help illustrate that policy. He suggested that the examples provided in that Issue #3 staff response could also answer most of the questions from Issue #1. He would want Commissioner Biethan to verify that was the case, but he suggested they leave Issue #3 open, and use those examples to provide the new Goals, Visions and Framework issue with its requested examples. That might answer all concerns for both issues. Vice-Chair Gregory suggested they simply combine Issues #1 and #3. The Commission agreed with that suggestion. Commissioner Flynn suggested that the staff response to Issue #3 could be the entire answer for Issue #1, thus removing the need to create a new issue. Issue #1 was closed.

Issue #2 referred again to the distinction between agricultural and recreational land use which they had just discussed under Goals, Visions and Framework. Since they had agreed the issue was more appropriate to the Land Use element, further discussion was warranted. Chairman Hinman pointed out that the agricultural land use issue may not refer to farming per se, but rather to backyard livestock and gardening. Commissioner Miller clarified that he felt the City had de facto written off in-town commercial agriculture, so the conversation did necessarily only consider p-patches, community gardens and backyard production. He thought the heart of this issue's question then became whether commercial agriculture, which is permitted alongside recreational land use, may be incompatible with recreational land use so lumping the two together was inappropriate. The City could either say that commercial agriculture simply has no place within City limits, or that commercial agriculture still has a place in the City's future, and the City would take measures to protect it like protecting any other desirable land use. His concern was that it was still undefined.

Mr. McConaghy had several points on this topic:

- 1) The City has established several policies to treat agricultural land usage differently. One example is a policy regarding protection for agricultural uses against lawsuits due to such activities. For instance, if a parcel was being used in an agricultural capacity and a nearby property was slated for development or redevelopment, the development permits would include notice of the nearby agricultural activities to prevent future nuisance charges from being filed.
- 2) The City is carrying out the Growth Management Act which in part seeks to protect rural agricultural land use even within very close proximity of City limits.
- 3) The Urban Recreation Zone does allow for agriculture uses. Mr. McConaghy thought it was an interesting testimony that times are changing, to say that the City's agricultural future might rest with p-patches, backyard livestock and community gardens.
- 4) The City has also worked hard to provide sales outlets for locally produced foods from nearby rural farms. So support for agriculture extends beyond mere land use but also economic opportunities.

Chairman Hinman said that LU-20 would probably be the most appropriate location for any new language on this topic. Ms. Dietz added that LU-60 might also be a good location for such language, which is the Urban Recreation/Open Space Designation policy. The second paragraph within that policy list allowed uses, including agricultural uses. Commissioner Miller requested that this issue be held open, because he wanted to work with staff to reaffirm the intent to protect existing resource-based agriculture. Access to fresh food is a different topic.

Commissioner Flynn asked staff to move comments from the Goals, Visions and Framework Issue #8 over to this Issue #2. That Issue #8 was closed with the assumption it would be discussed further under Land Use. He wanted to make sure those concerns were included in Issue #2. Chairman Hinman added a request that Land Use Issue #5 be moved to Transportation, so they can close that issue in the Land Use element.

The conversation about Land Use issues was closed for this meeting because they were out of time. They moved on to the next element's issues matrix.

Urban Centers Issues Matrix

Commissioner Flynn said that the first several issues all originated with Commissioner Biethan. Mr. Churchill noted that Mr. Don Cairns (Public Works) was in attendance, in place of Tricia Thompson.

He could speak to Issues #28 through Issues #31. Mr. Churchill asked that they address those issues first since Mr. Cairns was in attendance.

Commissioner Flynn started with Issue #28, regarding the cross-section for 152nd. Commissioner Miller had raised this issue and he appreciated their response. He did not necessarily agree with it, but it was a satisfactory answer and they could close the issue.

Issue #29 had previously been closed. Issue #30 regarded the BRT stops on 152nd. Mr. Cairns replied that the BRT line would be opening in October 2011, and the stop will initially be close to the existing Park & Ride. The light rail will not be completed until 2021. There will be only one stop in that area, and the location for that stop could be changed when the light-rail station opens, but it will be somewhere on 152nd. Chairman Hinman asked if there was any other mass transit slated for 151st. Mr. Cairns indicated there were no planned routes along151st. Chairman Hinman was satisfied with that information and the issue was closed.

Issue #31 regarded rain gardens in the in-street cross-sections. Chairman Hinman was familiar with the concept but could not find an example in the cross-sections. Mr. Churchill said a note on page 51 might provide the information he wanted. The urban pathway would have pipes underneath where the rainwater is collected and infiltrated. There would also be rain gardens on the access streets, incorporated into planting strips. Mr. Cairns added that the LID treatments along the street would actually be for water quality purposes. For the north/south streets such as 152nd and 151st, because they are more pedestrian and bicyclist in nature, those facilities would not be on those streets. Instead, they would be on the access streets, typically the east/west streets. Chairman Hinman asked if they needed to define *urban pathway* somewhere in the text. Mr. Churchill said it was defined in the Overlake Master Plan Implementation Strategy, as well as in the zoning code. Chairman Hinman asked if this was the only place the City planned to have an urban pathway or if more were planned elsewhere. Mr. Churchill replied Overlake Village is where that concept is being pioneered. Chairman Hinman was satisfied with that response and the issue was closed.

Chairman Hinman thanked Mr. Cairns and asked him to thank Ms. Thompson as well for all their hard work on the issue. He felt that their involvement had really improved the project and its integration into related projects in nearby areas.

Commissioner Flynn asked if Commissioner Biethan would be in attendance next week. Chairman Hinman believed he would. Commissioner Flynn suggested they sort out those issues which could be closed during the current meeting then resume their discussions when Commissioner Biethan returned. So they started with Issue #9, regarding the overall element structure. Before they started with that, Chairman Hinman suggested they move Issues #7 and #8 to the Transportation element. Commissioner Flynn suggested that Issue #7 was simply a typo issue, and could be closed without discussion, pending the required edits. Issue #8 could be moved over to the Transportation element. So they closed that issue pending conversation under the Transportation element.

Vice-Chair Gregory asked to discuss Issue #2, regarding small and independently owned businesses. He believed that the distinction *independently owned* put an arbitrary limit on the types of businesses which could be opened. It was entirely possible that a franchise could not only fit perfectly with a particular area ambience, but franchises are also sometimes the only way small business owners can afford to launch such businesses. The rest of that policy is fine but he would like to remove the *independently owned* phrase. Chairman Hinman asked if the staff response had come from some pre-

existing source. He suggested that perhaps *locally owned* would be a better term than *independently owned*. Mr. Lee pointed out that DT-3 did not prohibit franchises. Vice-Chair Gregory replied that the staff response in a public record would indicate a strong preference against franchises, even if the actual policy did not explicitly prohibit them. He would prefer to stay with the policy as-is, or possibly better defined *small and independently owned*. Mr. Lee asked if the inclusion of small franchises within that term definition would be sufficient. Vice-Chair Gregory said yes that would be sufficient. He simply did not want to exclude businesses that might be a natural fit otherwise. Commissioner O'Hara suggested that they remove the words *and independently owned* from the sentence. Vice-Chair Gregory said that would work too. Chairman Hinman suggested they check out NOV-54, where that phrase also crops up. Whatever changes they make here may need to be made there as well. The Commission and staff collectively decided to remove those three words and close the issue.

Issue #9 may be too big to tackle in the current session. Chairman Hinman suggested they study that issue and be ready to discuss it at the next meeting.

Issue #10 regarded the phrase 18 hours in the context of how long businesses would be open. Commissioner Miller had asked about this because he felt that term was almost jargon. He felt the City should spell out its intent more specifically, instead of relying on a term that not everyone would automatically understand. Commissioner O'Hara suggested they simply end the sentence after the dash. Mr. Lee said that would be acceptable. Planners wanted to ensure that the policy reflected a vibrant night life, rather than a sleepy town ambience. The issue was closed pending the removal of that text.

Issue #11 would probably require a lengthy conversation, so it was deferred. Chairman Hinman asked staff if any of the remaining issues seemed more straightforward so they could work through them quickly. Mr. Lee suggested Issue #17, regarding how best to connect Redmond Town Center and Marymoor Park. The work *under* was used to specify going under SR-520 where it rises above grade. Staff recommendation was to use the word *across* instead of *under*. Commissioner Miller said there was more to this issue than mere semantics and it would not be fixed simply with a word switch.

Chairman Hinman reminded the Commission that they still had a lot of the Planning staff available and perhaps it would be best to address as many easy issues as possible, then save the more involved issues for later. Commissioner Flynn suggested they look at Issue #22. Commissioner Miller was satisfied with the staff response and the issue was closed.

Issue #19 regarded the purpose of policy OV-13. Commissioner Miller preferred the alternative language offered in the staff response. So that issue was closed.

Issue #23 addressed a lack of consistency between policies, with some being very specific and some being very general. Chairman Hinman suggested that reviewing every policy in the Comprehensive Plan may be prohibitively time-consuming, considering this is simply an update cycle rather than an overhaul cycle. Some inconsistency was inevitable given that policies are written by different authors at different times. Commissioner Julinsey said they could close the issue, but she asked that Commissioners and staff keep in mind the consistency of each policy and how to make them more consistent over time. The issue was closed.

Chairman Hinman said Issue #27 may have already been covered previously in the meeting. He would prefer that each map referenced in Comprehensive Plan be available in that section of the plan, instead of referenced from some other source which may not be available to everyone, but he understood

staff's response. He wondered if there was a cross-reference method possible to provide those map references without duplicating them. He was willing to close the issue but asked staff to keep that request in mind.

Issue #26 regarded using consistent terminology. Chairman Hinman said he would be comfortable closing that issue. Commissioner Flynn said they were waiting on more information for Issues #24 and #25, so those were not ready for discussion. He asked if Issue #13 was suitable for discussion. Commissioner Miller said that he wanted the code to address both the south side as well as the north side of the rail corridor. He was willing to close the issue.

Chairman Hinman suspended further discussion until their next meeting.

REPORTS

There were no reports.

SCHEDULING/TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING(S)

ADJOURN

Chairman Hinman adjourned the meeting at approximately 10:00 p.m.

Minutes Approved On: Planning Commission Chair