

**REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION  
MINUTES**

February 17, 2010

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Chairman McCarthy, Commissioners Gregory, Biethan, Miller, O'Hara and Youngblood

**COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED:** Commissioner Hinman

**COMMISSIONERS CURRENTLY SERVING ON THE CODE REWRITE COMMISSION:** Passion Julinsey, Vibhas Chandorkar

**STAFF PRESENT:** Jeff Churchill, Sarah Stiteler, Planning Department; Carolyn Hope, Park & Recreation Department

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Kathryn Kerby

**CALL TO ORDER**

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

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:**

No changes to the agenda.

**ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE**

There were no items from the audience.

**PUBLIC HEARING AND STUDY SESSION, Scoping for 2010-2011 Comprehensive Plan Update,** presented by Jeff Churchill and Sarah Stiteler, Senior Planners

Ms. Stiteler presented an overview of this two-year process. Comprehensive Plans are required for all cities and counties in Washington State according to the 1990 Growth Management Act. Those Comprehensive Plans must accommodate the allocated population expansion during the next 20 years, and show how each city or county will accommodate that expansion with infrastructure and development concurrency. Public participation is required not only during the yearly update process but also the periodic update process which occurs every seven years. The current update extends the planning horizon to 2030 and must be completed by December 1, 2011. This update process will inventory and assess City needs, then determine if current Comprehensive Policies need to be reevaluated and/or modified to be consistent with the community's vision.

Required components of the Comprehensive Plan include:

- Land Use
- Housing
- Capital Facilities
- Utilities
- Transportation
- Shorelines

Optional components include:

- Economic Development
- Parks and Recreation
- Conservation/Energy
- Subarea Plans

Redmond will also consider the following as part of this process:

- Land Use
- Natural environment
- Shoreline Master Plan
- Energy
- Human Services
- Transportation Element
- Transportation Master Plan (TMP)
- Urban Centers
- Housing
- Economic Vitality
- Annexation
- Utilities
- Capital Facilities
- Parks and Recreation
- Historic Preservation and Community Character
- Neighborhoods
- Participation

The 2010-11 update will also consider:

- Recent Amendments to the Growth Management Act
- Amendments to regional planning documents
- Urban growth areas and population projects
- Other Comprehensive Plan elements

The update schedule includes:

- A public hearing on Update Scoping, as part of this Planning Commission meeting
- Another scoping meeting with the City Council March/April 2010
- Planning Commission review of proposed elements from June 2010 to June 2011
- City Council study sessions in August and September 2011
- City Council action in October 2011
- Whatever next steps are appropriate for the approved updates

Ms. Stiteler completed her presentation by giving contact information for the project. That contact information is on the home page of the City's website.

Chairman McCarthy followed by explaining that the Planning Commission would begin using the Comprehensive Plan update in 2012 after the proposed update had been approved, and staff has had a chance to determine which regulations would also need updating. He also mentioned that while the Planning Commission review period lasted a whole year, they would not spend the entire year

discussing those updates. Rather, they would review issues or proposals as they were developed. Some would require relatively little discussion but others would require more time. The Planning Commission will also have other issues to discuss during that period of time. Chairman McCarthy then opened the public hearing.

Mr. Robert Thorpe, of RW Thorpe and Associates in Seattle, wanted to present a letter to the Commission regarding three different elements of the Comprehensive Plan - Urban Centers, the Parks and Recreation element, and Utilities, particularly regarding the Overlake plan and subarea plan. His firm wanted to thank City staff for working on the plan, and that significant misunderstandings were avoided or prevented by City staff's willingness to work with his firm. Mr. Thorpe's firm specifically represents Koll Commerce Center Limited Edition property owners, which includes 19 buildings and 14 owners with 455 employees. All of the buildings are fully occupied. His clients were pleased with the Open House on January 21<sup>st</sup> where staff presented their proposal for a combined stormwater-parks facility. Alternatives A, B and C as presented at that Open House were responsive to past comments from Mr. Thorpe's clients. They were particularly pleased that the City would be satisfied with several smaller parks versus one large park, along with ideas for how trails and other features could be incorporated into existing development. Since then, his firm has continued to develop ideas for how these site improvements could successfully be phased in.

Mr. Thorpe has also looked at the Sears property redevelopment plan, and his firm believed that re-striping part of that northern parking area could add another 10' to 15' of parking. His firm is pleased with the plan's movement. Another issue is an east-west trail through the site, which his clients believe should be long-term. Mr. Thorpe's firm also thinks that the proposed route for 151<sup>st</sup> should be meandered through the properties instead of a straight line. Finally, his firm disagreed that one or two large detention ponds were the only way to solve storm water runoff issues. They prefer spreading out the storm water burden to other property owners, such that no one property owner would be required to accommodate such runoff handling. Mr. Thorpe's firm's engineers are developing plans to that effect. He hoped the City would continue to be willing to consider those alternatives.

Mr. Bill Williamson, 701 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue of Seattle, presented a letter to the Commission. He did not read the contents. He also mentioned a letter from Doug Wright, one of the KCCE owners, as well as a letter from Gary Gill, and that these letters together with Mr. Thorpe's letter should all be taken together. Chairman McCarthy assured him that all four letters would be entered into the public record.

Chairman McCarthy asked if anyone else wanted to speak. With no new speakers, he closed the verbal portion of the public hearing, but left open the written testimony until the end of the Commission's deliberations. He asked Ms. Stiteler if they had copies of all the letters. She replied that they had all four letters, as well as an email from Scott Gray, dated February 16, 2010. Ms. Stiteler would provide copies for the Commissioners' consideration during break. Ms. Stiteler introduced Mr. Sullivan as the Program Manager of ARCH, a Regional Coalition of Housing. Chairman McCarthy added that Mr. Sullivan's work with ARCH over the years has helped the City address a variety of housing issues, and that he has been a frequent speaker at past Commission meetings.

Mr. Sullivan described ARCH as a coalition of King County cities, with Redmond as a founding member. It was formed 17 years ago specifically for the purpose of being a resource to member jurisdictions to help advise them on housing issues, with primary emphasis on affordable housing. Mr. Sullivan has worked on every version of the Comprehensive Plan's Housing element over the last 18 years. He suggested that the Commissioners consider him as another form of staff support as they work through the housing-related Comprehensive Plan issues.

Mr. Sullivan is here tonight because ARCH is to assist the City of Redmond in their Housing Element. ARCH will be assisting member cities with the needs assessment component of their Housing Elements. Several issues that have come from previous efforts are:

- 1) Cities have taken a haphazard approach to putting together that information
- 2) The information gathered in such assessments was often gathered late in the overall process of Comprehensive Plan updates.

Because of that, ARCH proactively suggested that the various city governments address the housing needs assessment earlier in their various plan update projects. Towards that end, ARCH staff contacted various city planners, regional realtors and other housing groups, and asked them for feedback on a preferred format for the needs assessment. ARCH hoped that some kind of streamlined approach could be developed that all the cities could use for their individual plan updates. Since then, ARCH has developed that outline and started the research about each community's demographics and income information. The resulting report will show each individual city's information within the eastern King County region. That information will be shared with ARCH members.

ARCH is particularly interested in identifying those areas and households which are paying more than the average percentage of monthly income towards housing costs. Developing information on that particular group will help ARCH and individual cities better target affordable housing efforts. ARCH will also eventually provide various land-use data such as existing housing stock, housing zoning patterns and land capacity and rental rates for each city in the region. Additionally, ARCH research will help identify special housing populations in each community, such as persons with special needs and seniors, along with how much housing is available for those special needs groups. Finally, ARCH will also provide an assessment of how each city is meeting housing goals and needs. ARCH also hoped to determine who is commuting between communities. Mr. Sullivan hoped that he would be able to return in mid-year to present his group's findings on all these topics.

Chairman McCarthy asked Ms. Stiteler whether City staff knew how long it would take to incorporate ARCH research into the City's particular needs assessment. Ms. Stiteler replied that if the research results and assessment were both done by fall, the Planning Commission would first be able to review it this coming winter. Chairman McCarthy suggested that they schedule a briefing for the needs assessment ahead of that time. He asked if any Commissioners had questions for staff. No one had any questions. Chairman McCarthy suggested they wait to see what comes out of City Council. He closed the public hearing.

**STUDY SESSION, 2010 Pro Plan (PARCC) Update and Potential Park Element Updates,**  
presented by Carolyn Hope, Park & Recreation Planner

Ms. Hope presented an overview of the Parks and Recreation, Culture and Conservation (PARCC) plan. Currently, there is a public comment period underway, which ends on February 26, 2010.

Staff members have also met with members of the Parks and Trails Commission, the Arts Commission, the Pedestrian/Bike Advisory Committee, various citizens groups, City Council and now with the Planning Commission. Ms. Hope encouraged Commission members to talk to her about any comments or questions they may have, either in person, by email or by phone. In the meantime she wanted to give the Commissioners the PARCC update's highlights, so they can review the plan appropriately.

The general goal for the plan was to maintain the City's quality of life during future growth. The plan featured a strong City commitment to various projects through a more methodical, fact-based approach to Level of Service, and rating the City's capital improvement projects.

The Comprehensive Plan is the overall City plan for policy. The PARCC Plan, in contrast, is a functional plan that outlines strategies and specific projects to implement the Comprehensive Plan. The PARCC Plan is much more detailed than the Comprehensive Plan, but once projects are ready for implementation, a Master Plan or Feasibility Study is necessary to develop conceptual plans, cost estimates and eventually design and construction plans.

After the public comment period staff will finalize the PARCC Plan, then prepare and submit a SEPA checklist. At the end of April, staff will return to the Planning Commission to discuss policy changes. Staff also hopes to have a public hearing at that time, and hopefully adopt all the suggested policy changes when the City Council reviews the PARCC Plan in May. The alternative would be to wait for completion of the Comprehensive Plan amendment process. Some of the policy changes are listed in the attachment of Chapter 2 which Ms. Hope had previously made available to the Commissioners. It reiterated Comprehensive Plan policies in markup mode to show changes. The rest of the policies are related to the Level of Service approach. In April, Ms. Hope will provide a detailed memo with all the policy changes. The PARCC Plan is due to the State on June 15<sup>th</sup>, 2010.

Some of the changes in the PARCC Plan include:

- 1) Make the plan more of a strategic tool for staff
- 2) Level of Service standards
- 3) Policy Changes
  - a. Community Walkability
  - b. Geographic equity in parks and trails
  - c. Healthy community improvements
- 4) Other Policy priorities:
  - a. Incorporate Arts & Culture more thoroughly in the document
  - b. Incorporate Recreation more thoroughly throughout the document
  - c. Reiterate major Comprehensive Plan policies for each chapter, to minimize having to refer back to the Comprehensive Plan
  - d. Provide one new chapter for each neighborhood
  - e. Include major thematic goals, namely, create great parks for the community, through a combination of:
    - i. Sustainable construction
    - ii. Providing cultural and economic benefits
    - iii. Creating healthy community programs
    - iv. Providing equitable distribution of parks and trails
    - v. Addressing the diverse community needs via diverse parks and facilities

Major challenges for the PARCC plan include the City's projected population growth. City staff needed to account for not only residential growth but also employment growth, which is much higher. Staff recommends the LOS target population to include 100% of the residential population and 25% of the employment population to align better with how park impact fees are collected. In the next 20 years, City staff expects to see a 36% growth rate in the target population, which is a significant jump.

This plan is required by the state Recreation and Conservation Office. Some of the elements they require in this plan include:

- 1) Goals and Objectives
- 2) A Needs/Demands Assessment
- 3) Inventory of current Parks, Trails and Recreation system
- 4) Public involvement
- 5) Capital Improvement plan
- 6) City Council adoption

Public priorities for the City's parks and trails system included:

- 1) More parks and trails
- 2) More drop-in types of programs, for instance at the Teen Center and Senior Center, but the City could offer more programs for children and adults outside those age ranges already provided
- 3) A top priority was an indoor aquatic center. Plans are in place for transfer of ownership of the Redmond Pool from the County to the City in 2010, but that facility is currently in poor repair. Other cities with such aquatic centers with fitness centers enjoy very strong usage rates, not only with daily recreational activity but also with parties, classes and special events.
- 4) A public arts performance center

The City's Level of Service policies are guided by simplistic averages, such as a certain amount of parkland per thousand residents, or certain length of trail per thousand residents historically. If those averages were met on a City-wide basis, that was sufficient. However, that concept has been replaced by a five-pronged approach to providing diversified City-wide Level of Service, which included:

- 1) Demand - community's requests for service
- 2) Need - service necessary to meet underlying community goals
- 3) Geographical equity and Walkability - distribute parks and trails evenly, and provide more connections between parks. One major change is to implement new assessments and projects on a neighborhood basis, rather than a City basis, to provide for both of these aspects.
- 4) Functionality of existing facilities - use a cost-benefit analysis, and evaluation of each site's conditions, amenities and features.

As a result of this new evaluation method, the City's PARCC Plan will attempt to create Level of Service policies based on a process that:

- 1) Modify the distribution of parks:
  - a. Current LOS criteria is 6.5 acres/1000 people, for neighborhood, community and resource parks, City-wide

- b. The proposed change is to apply the neighborhood park LOS to neighborhood populations, rather than City-wide populations

2) Increase the Trail Level of Service

- a. Trails were a very high priority for the community
- b. Current trail LOS is .25 mile/1000 people
- c. The proposed change would occur in two phases:
  - i. A revised LOS of .35 mile/1000 people until 2016
  - ii. After 2016, provide .45 mile/1000 people
- d. Apply trail LOS to neighborhood population populations, rather than City-wide populations
- e. That would build another 26 miles of trail over the next 20 years, but the City still would not yet have completed its entire proposed trails system

3) Create a Recreation Level of Service

- a. The City does not have a formalized Recreation Level of Service standard
- b. Staff felt it was important to more accurately predict when recreation facilities are needed such as sports fields, gymnasiums, picnic shelters, or performance stages
- c. Staff tried to determine how many hours of annual programming is already offered within existing City facilities, then applied expected population growth figures, and estimated the anticipated growth of existing facility types
- d. Some City facilities are already near their capacity, and population growth will require additional such facilities if Level of Service is to be maintained.
- e. If and when analysis predicted the need for new facilities, the City could then conduct a feasibility study to determine the details of facility size, demand, and design
- f. The City's resulting Recreational Level of Service would end up being a function of Annual Hours of Recreation/Person, based on the City's anticipated target population.
  - i. By that measure, the City's current LOS is roughly 7 hrs/person
  - ii. The target LOS would go up to nearly 9 hrs/person by 2030

A summary of other proposed Level of Service policy changes included:

- 1) Refine the Park definitions:
  - a. Neighborhood parks
  - b. Community parks
  - c. Resource parks
- 2) Redefine the target population to include residential plus 25% of employment population
- 3) Give credit to non-City-owned parks, either within or adjacent to City boundaries, which already serve some City demand
- 4) Improve Walkability of City parks and trails per new equitable geography distribution

The revised PARCC Plan now includes a strategies chapter for each neighborhood that include the following:

- a. LOS needs
- b. Neighborhood policies
- c. Visioning Results
- d. Strategies to achieve those needs, policies and visions

Staff developed a methodology to prioritize CIP projects:

- a. Each project was assigned a completion date based on the LOS analysis
- b. Each project was rated on a number of questions with weighted scores
- c. Parks, Recreation, Trails and Maintenance each have a list of projects and the top projects on each list should be completed during each budget cycle
- d. The Capital Improvements List is sorted first by the completion date and second by the rating criteria score

Cost for all of these projects is approximately \$253 million, which is less than what the City originally estimated. Much of the reduction was created by relying on partnerships. The CIP projects list, dates and costs are available in Chapter 11 of the plan.

The City actually has a variety of funding options:

- a. General fund
- b. REET
- c. Impact fees
- d. Grants
- e. Private funds
- f. Partnerships
- g. Bond measures
- h. Park districts
- i. Volunteers
- j. Optimize existing resources

In closing, Redmond has the opportunity to create a legacy park system which will serve the community extremely well. Even with the recession, Redmond has a great deal of private, public and commercial sector resources to draw from to create that legacy.

## **BREAK**

Chairman McCarthy opened the discussion and asked Commissioners if they had any questions. Commissioner Youngblood asked why the City only received 25% credit for Marymoor Park. Ms. Hope replied that Marymoor Park did receive 25% credit primarily because King County, not the City, controlled the park's programming. Non-Redmond neighborhood and resource parks received 50% credit, because public has full access to these parks, they are not programmed. The City is also negotiating with the County about how to be included in future programming decisions for Marymoor.

Commissioner Youngblood asked about the disparity between budgets for Maintenance and Small Works versus the Parks, Trails and Recreation categories, even after considering the new ranking system. Ms. Hope replied that many maintenance and small works projects are paid from the operating fund. Nevertheless, they were also added to the CIP list because combining those items with other projects would allow the City to receive grant money to cover both. Commissioner Youngblood suggested that the report break out those specific numbers to reflect that.

Commissioner McCarthy asked if the City's eventual goal was to have all of these projects paid for from the CIP. Ms. Hope replied not necessarily. One other issue is that the funding listed is simply a

list of past funding sources which may or may not be representative of what is available in the future. The City would like to pay for maintenance projects out of the operations fund as much as possible, but when an alternative funding source presents itself the City will act on it.

Commissioner Biethan asked how the current \$250 million compared to previous PARCC plans, and how much of that could reasonably come from grants. He also asked if the PARCC plan included a lot of items to qualify for as much funding as possible. Ms. Hope replied that the numbers were completely driven by Levels of Service goals, rather than the hope to maximize funding decisions. The City does not get the same amount of funding every year from each source, and she did not have information with her on how much the City has recently spent on past projects. I later emailed the Planning Commission and told them we spent about \$25 million in the past ten years. Our past ten-year Park Improvement Plan had a budget of \$140 million. Commissioner Biethan clarified that he was just looking for an estimated amount of CIP expenditures rather than an exact figure. Chairman McCarthy asked Ms. Hope to find out how much the City had spent on past CIP projects. Commissioner Biethan added a request for how much grant money has been used in past projects. Ms. Hope will try to get that information sent via email.

Commissioner O'Hara pointed out that park and trail growth can only increase to a certain level, since the City's population increase implies increased density and less buildable land. He asked if the City had already considered this issue. Ms. Hope replied that yes, the City has begun consideration of this issue with the new Recreation LOS, which is based on hours of recreation/pp year or capacity of a facility rather than population acres or miles. Staff is working to collect more detail in order to apply a similar LOS standard to parks and trails, but to date we don't have sufficient data on unprogrammed use of parks and trails.

Chairman McCarthy added that the City had not even yet caught up with its existing trail building goals, let alone the revised LOS goals it is proposing. He was curious whether staff had determined how long it would take to reach existing goals at the current rate of construction. Commissioner O'Hara said seeing that measure was perhaps a more accurate reflection of what the City can do versus where the City would like to be in terms of LOS. Also, he would be interested to know what other urban areas use as their metric. Commissioner Miller added that trails not only serve a recreational function but also a transportation function. He would be interested to see those two functions truly joined synergistically not only in planning and budgeting but also in execution.

Commissioner Miller asked what other City officials have said about the PARCC plan and he asked if those comments would be included. (Sent via email and copied Planning Commission on a City Council memo.) Ms. Hope replied that she had not yet received official comment but those comments would be added. He then asked, of the 26 miles of new trail, how many qualified as multi-use. Ms. Hope replied that all of them could qualify as multi-use but she did not have the specific amount of trail which had officially been designated multi-use. Commissioner Miller asked how much credit county and state trails received in the City's crediting system. Ms. Hope replied that all trails within City boundaries are at 100% regardless of ownership, because they are always open to being used by anyone. Commissioner Miller asked about special events and how that figures into Level of Service, such as Derby Days. Ms. Hope replied that the Recreation chapter covered those events, but event data such as Derby Days, Redmond Lights, and Eggstravaganza are not included in the Recreation LOS, since they don't use the facilities that all are currently trying to measure capacity of. Commissioner Miller would like to see those types of non-facility events encouraged and included in more formal project planning Ms. Hope will include a discussion of

that cross-over functionality in the PARCC Plan as a result of public comments. Commissioner Miller strongly encouraged any pursuit of crossover cooperation and partnership. Ms. Hope replied that there are already several discussions about those types of projects with other agencies.

Commissioner Gregory complimented Ms. Hope on the PARCC report's detail and organization. He asked whether bond issues and park districts would require voter approval. Ms. Hope confirmed that would be required. He then asked whether the City's public outreach had also determined the public's willingness to pay for such items. Ms. Hope replied that staff did ask that question in the online survey, and those survey results are included in the report. She added that such survey results are only a preliminary step. If those particular projects came closer to being carried out, the City would conduct a much more robust poll to determine how much financial support such projects really had.

Chairman McCarthy added that the Planning Commission has seen many instances where community-supported projects have subsequently died when the public realized how much it would cost them to foot the bill. He hoped these other funding possibilities are fully explored.

Chairman McCarthy asked if a performing arts center could potentially compete with existing Redmond arts activities, rather than strengthening those existing activities. Ms. Hope replied that the performing arts center is still a very general concept as part of the City's ongoing Economic Development Study. Given that, the Arts Commission and Arts Administrator's goals encourage cooperation amongst the different arts groups, rather than competition. A market analysis would be necessary and would consist of an inventory of what the arts community would like to have in such a facility, and staff would need to develop a plan that met as many of those priorities as is feasible, as well as looking at which neighboring performance centers could possibly be incorporated into those goals.

Chairman McCarthy was curious about the staff's hopes for the new Recreation LOS. He asked whether staff had considered not only the increased population but also the trend towards that population becoming progressively older. For instance, adding nine new ball fields may not make much sense if the average age is climbing into the middle-age range. Ms. Hope replied that demographics were definitely considered as part of their analysis. Those figures are available in the report, and helped shape not only how much service was provided, but what types of service.

Commissioner Youngblood asked how valid the polls are when they sample such a small percentage of the population. Ms. Hope replied that there are statistical methods to determine how big a poll must be to gather accurate, representative data from any given population. The web survey was only intended as an introductory-level data gathering device, but two other statistically valid surveys were used in the development of the PARCC Plan, as provided in Chapter 3.

Chairman McCarthy asked if there were any other questions, and there were none. He noted that the public comment period is open until Friday, February 26<sup>th</sup>, 2010. He said another chance for public input would be via a public hearing scheduled for April 2010.

### **STUDY SESSION: Planning Commission Rules, presented by Sarah Stiteler, Senior Planner**

Chairman McCarthy began the discussion by asking Ms. Stiteler if she had a copy of the updated Section F. She replied that each Commissioner should have received a copy. Chairman McCarthy

pointed out that in the revised Rule 20.F.4, there were some minor language corrections which had already been made. One previous concern from the last meeting had been the roles of the Chairperson, the Commissioners, the speakers and the audience during quasi-judicial meetings. Ms. Stiteler took those concerns to City Attorney Jim Haney for review. Rule 20.F.4 provides clarifications to that process, particularly to the rights and responsibilities of the chair to control the direction of the discussion during such meetings. Chairman McCarthy asked the Commissioners to read through that new language and provide their feedback.

There were no questions, and Commissioner Gregory moved to adopt the rules as amended. Chairman McCarthy made a friendly amendment to include the amended Community Development Guide section 20.50.40 Planning Commission Purpose, Authority and Duties. The amended motion was seconded. Chairman McCarthy commented that the sunset wording did not need to be included because when it does move into the municipal code, the Code Rewrite Commission will no longer exist. However the language about the size of the Commission will remain to cover the transition back to seven members. The motion passed 6-0.

### **REPORTS**

Ms. Stiteler reported that the City Council meeting included both a regular business meeting and a study session. The business meeting portion covered Council committee work plans and items on the Consent Calendar. The study session covered the MP/BP Phase II scoping. The Council was in favor of the Planning Commission's recommendation to postpone that phase. Instead, they favored proceeding with the privately initiated Development Guide amendments individually, and to reassess how or in what capacity they should resume consideration of Phase II after the Code Rewrite Commission and City Council's review of the Commercial, Manufacturing and Industrial regulations. The City also had an Open House on the Code Rewrite Commission's residential regulations rewrite. That event was attended by roughly 50 people.

### **SCHEDULING/TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING(S)**

The Commission discussed the issues to be addressed in upcoming meetings.

### **ADJOURN**

Chairman McCarthy adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:30p.m.

Minutes Approved On:

Planning Commission Chair

---