

**REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

April 21, 2010

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Hinman, Commissioners Gregory, Miller, O'Hara, Bontadelli, and Julinsey

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED: Commissioner Biethan

COMMISSIONERS CURRENTLY SERVING ON THE CODE REWRITE COMMISSION: Thom Youngblood, Vibhas Chandorkar

STAFF PRESENT: Kim Dietz, Terry Marpert, Redmond Planning Department; Carolyn Hope, Redmond Parks Department

RECORDING SECRETARY: Kathryn Kerby

CALL TO ORDER

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

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

No changes were made to the agenda.

ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE

There were no items from the audience.

PUBLIC HEARING AND STUDY SESSION, 2010 Pro Plan (PARCC) Update and Potential Park Element Updates, presented by Carolyn Hope, Senior Planner

Ms. Hope introduced the PARCC plan as a functional plan to provide staff with specific strategies, as they apply Comprehensive Plan policies to Redmond Parks and Recreation facilities. She explained that while the PARCC plan referred to a number of large City projects, those projects will each generate their own master plan when they begin development.

PARCC plan revisions would revise the existing 2004 PRO plan by:

- Better incorporating Arts & Culture, Recreation, Comprehensive Plan, and major thematic goals
- Applying policy changes
- Refining level-of-service (LOS) standards

More specifically, proposed changes include:

- Changing the plan name from PRO to PARCC to reflect how the plan's coverage and goals have changed
- Updating names and definitions for various City parks and trails
- Revising the projected needs table

The proposed General Policy revisions include:

- Modifying PR-3 language to eliminate *Parks, Recreation and Open Space* text
- Updating PR-35 regarding acquisition of the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) right-of-way (ROW)
- Modifying PR-4 regarding service radius to address areas which are simultaneously experiencing rapid growth and have inadequate recreational and cultural service
- Modifying PR-21 to acknowledge the changing, expanding demands on City athletic fields
- Updating the Level of Service table metrics for:
 - Neighborhood parks
 - Community parks
 - Resource parks
 - Trails
 - Recreation

Ms. Hope explained that five separate LOS elements guided the analysis:

- Demand
- Need
- Geographic equality
- Walkability
- Function

The proposed new policies include some new or revised LOS policies:

- Developing a more walkable and geographically equitable system of parks and trails, based on neighborhood population rather than overall City population
- Providing LOS credits for non-Redmond park facilities within walking distance of Redmond
- Creating additional active recreational programs for under-served City populations and add more health education programs
- Developing a park and trail, recreation and arts finance strategy
- Expanding the City's Joint Use Agreement with the Lake Washington School District
- Developing a Joint Use Agreement with King County
- Developing a long-term strategy with King County to transfer ownership of county parks within Redmond to the City of Redmond
- Annexing all City of Redmond parks that exist within King County

Vice-Chair Gregory asked if the numbers from this table represented the City population. Ms. Hope replied that it was a combination of City residents plus 25% of Redmond businesses to reflect that population's use of City facilities. However, the projected LOS also includes projected population growth.

Ms. Hope continued by saying that the PARCC Plan has gone through two cycles of public involvement and comment during the revision process. Future steps include the Planning Commission's review, discussion and recommendations to the City Council, with a proposed final adoption by City Council during their June 1st meeting. The final plan must be submitted to the Washington State Recreation and Conservation office by June 15, 2010 to be eligible for grant funding.

Chair Hinman asked whether Ms. Hope had any new written testimony to present. Ms. Hope replied that the City had received a letter from King County which was fairly supportive with the exception of some language in PR-38 regarding Marymoor Park. While the City would like to gain control of that park King County has no plans to relinquish control in the foreseeable future. Ms. Hope clarified that the City has a very good working relationship with King County and this letter would not constitute a reason to not move forward in general. However, some have expressed a desire for a position statement from the City regarding Marymoor Park. Commissioner Miller asked what the City's intent was for the park. Ms. Hope clarified that King County wanted to retain ownership and management of the park, while City staff would like to gain both ownership and management of the park at some point in the future.

Chair Hinman pointed out that he had previously asked Commissioner O'Hara to lead the discussion on this topic, and that he would do so after the rest of the public hearing. However, since the hearing was still open, Chair Hinman steered the conversation back towards the existing testimony. He invited members of the audience to comment. Gary Smith was signed up to speak.

Mr. Smith of 4805 - 162nd Avenue NE, Redmond asked if City staff had any plans to acquire the parcel between Bear Creek and Redmond Town Center. This parcel is roughly 25 acres and is mostly in private hands, while being categorized as Open Space. Ms. Hope replied that she was unsure what intent the Department of Natural Resources had for that particular parcel. However, the Parks Department already had an agreement with Redmond Town Center to classify that parcel as Park space. Ms. Hope is unaware of any other intent. Commissioner O'Hara asked which parcel that was. Mr. Smith clarified it was the parcel from the bank of Bear Creek going north. There were no further questions, no additional speakers, and Chair Hinman closed the oral portion of the testimony. He then invited Commissioner O'Hara to launch the study session.

Commissioner O'Hara said that overall, the plan was not changing in any fundamental way. Rather, the plan was being fine-tuned to better serve Redmond's various needs. He had not realized how much recreational programming the City provided. Given that current demand and the City's projected growth, it seemed appropriate to consider how best to improve delivery of those services. Chair Hinman added that the City's due diligence methodology was a critical part of that process.

Regarding Marymoor Park, Commissioner O'Hara said most of the City's existing statement was probably fine and did not need to be reviewed. However, he wondered if the last sentence in that statement, where the City stated its intent to seek annexation of that property, may need modification to better reflect King County's current opinion. Ms. Hope replied she would not have any objection to simply deleting that sentence. There was enough text elsewhere to adequately describe the City's goals. Commissioner Miller asked whether the Friends of Marymoor Park group discussed the policy with Ms. Hope. She indicated they had not.

Commissioner Miller replied that the park had a wide variety of activities, visitors, and costs which the City would have to really carefully examine prior to any annexation attempt. He would rather have a policy statement that defines the City's long-term goals for that park's management from the standpoint of a neighbor. Commissioner Gregory seconded that opinion, and said he had wondered why the City had any interest in taking over the facility. Marymoor is a regional facility. Commissioner Gregory was concerned that any indication the City wanted to annex the land could turn into a convenient way for King County to dump the costs if the park ever became

a liability rather than an asset. Commissioner Gregory agreed that the City's stance should be that of a concerned neighbor, and he supported removing the last sentence.

Ms. Hope clarified that the City hoped to annex Marymoor because it is one of the few remaining large tracts of land in the area which is still available for recreational purposes. If the City wanted to maintain current LOS, it would need more community parks within 20 years, and Marymoor would be a logical fit to that need. Additionally, many residents view Marymoor as a parcel that divides Redmond almost in half. The City already hoped to work with King County to make more connections through the park between the various City neighborhoods. The City and King County have very different goals for how best to manage the property, but they are discussing how to do this despite those differences. Ms. Hope added that the City's current Parks and Recreation Director used to be the King County Parks Director, which has definitely improved communications.

Chair Hinman pointed out that there were several other King County owned or managed properties within Redmond. He asked whether City staff had similar concerns about any of the rest of those properties. Ms. Hope replied that King County had opened discussions with the City for transferring the 60-Acres Park property to the City, which would give the City some appealing management options for that property.

Commissioner O'Hara asked whether it would be appropriate to suggest that staff remove the last sentence from the policy statement. Chair Hinman said they could see how the rest of the study session progressed and make the request if the Commission favored that approach. Commissioner O'Hara suggested they discuss the Bear Creek property as mentioned by Mr. Smith, since that was a similar parcel in some ways. Ms. Hope asked Mr. Smith which parcel he was referring to. Mr. Smith clarified that he meant the parcel which included the railroad ROW. Ms. Hope explained that the City was currently very happy with the existing arrangement because it seemed to work out well, without costing the City to acquire it and manage it in much the same way.

Chair Hinman suggested a conversation with staff about that particular area, the parcels involved, and the City's current intent for the property. Mr. Smith added that his main concern was the financial investment being put into lands within City boundaries which the City does not own. Chair Hinman said that raised some questions about appropriate land use that he felt should at least be addressed. Commissioner O'Hara asked how that was zoned. Chair Hinman believed it was zoned as Open Space.

Terry Marpert, Principal Planner added that he believed a majority of that parcel is privately owned but designated as public open space per the Redmond Town Center Master Plan. Ms. Hope added that the Redmond Town Center agreement encompassed approximately 40 acres. She will look into whether adjacent parcels should be included in that agreement. Chair Hinman asked if that same area would be included in the upcoming BNSF Master Plan Study. Ms. Hope replied it would likely be adjacent to it, and she will confirm that location.

Commissioner Miller asked if they could clarify some of the trail design standards. Local trails are fairly well defined, but the Commissioner would like to modify the regional and connector trails standards. For instance, regional trails are defined as *should be 12 feet wide under most conditions*. Yet King County width standards are moving to 14 feet for high-use areas, and he wondered whether the City should either match that or explain the discrepancy. Ms. Hope replied

that 12 feet is a minimum standard, which is compliant to WSDOT criteria including the City's 2009 Bicycle Facility Design Manual.

Commissioner Miller asked whether any of the trails will be paved for bicycle facilities. Ms. Hope replied that they are all classified as multiple-use trails; some will be paved and other may not. Commissioner Miller clarified that he was referring to the Bear Creek property, with trails going through that open space to connect a regional trail to Redmond Town Center. In principle, the connector trail would only need to be 6 feet wide. Commissioner Miller wanted to ensure that they would not end up channeling traffic from a heavily used trail, via a narrower connector trail, into another heavily used area. Ms. Hope replied that the way to deal with that is to designate each trail with the appropriate category which would ensure it was built or maintained to serve those types of uses. Commissioner Miller agreed with that but was uncomfortable with the specific widths since those widths may not serve all the potential uses. Ms. Hope replied that one reason the City specifies certain minimum widths is because many trails are not built by the City, but rather by developers, and the City must give them the proper criteria.

Commissioner Miller understood and would consider whether he was satisfied with the standards. He wanted to ensure consistency. Chair Hinman encouraged him to discuss that with staff as needed, but reminded him that they did not have much time left before they had to make a recommendation one way or the other.

Chair Hinman asked about the community building bullet on Page ES-1 discussed in the Executive Summary, in relation to Downtown development. He suggested that Overlake also warranted some language about such a community building. Secondly, he asked about the wording for PR-35 regarding the BNSF ROW. Chair Hinman asked whether the master planning discussions about light rail would preclude other access to that ROW. Ms. Hope said she believed the intent was to describe the current partnership so that partnership could move forward, but it did not intend to exclude other partnerships in the future. The key is that Sound Transit would have the ROW, so any other proposals that came in would have to acknowledge and work with that Sound Transit ROW.

Commissioner Miller added that during other meetings with King County officials, those officials had stated that a trail would be a definite part of that ROW. He asked if that statement was supported by the existing language. Ms. Hope replied that a trail is required by the rail banking program, so it is a City priority, along with the stated light rail and utilities, but other potential uses are permitted. There is nothing exclusionary in the language. Chair Hinman was satisfied with that explanation.

Commissioner O'Hara said with a few small changes and perhaps a clarifying conversation during the week, he felt they had what was needed for making their recommendation. Mr. Marpert clarified that the May 12th meeting would allow only a limited amount of time for further discussion, and that they would need to be ready to vote and prepare their Transmittal Summary during that meeting. Chair Hinman said that if the existing questions were answered during the week, they could get that done during the meeting. Commissioner Gregory said he would be comfortable making their recommendation during the current meeting, with the condition that their few outstanding questions or clarifications be answered during the week, such that they provide their report on May 12th.

Chair Hinman would be comfortable with that, but added he would want to be able to read the report prior to the vote. Mr. Marpert said staff could have the information ahead of time, so that they could both vote on May 12th and sign the report during that same meeting. The Commission was satisfied with that schedule. Chair Hinman closed the written portion of the testimony and closed the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING AND STUDY SESSION, Idylwood (Viewpoint) Neighborhood Plan Update, presented by Kimberly Dietz, Senior Planner, Bob DeWald and Ken Foster, CAC representative

Commissioner Julinsey began the discussion with a list of the questions and issues they still need to address, along with some of the public comments that had come in since their previous discussion. Ms. Dietz clarified that many of those issues had already been addressed and were pending revised language from staff. Ms. Dietz wanted to work through some of the other issues first, and then discuss housing afterward.

Ms. Dietz started with Question #12 regarding the vision for the WLSP. Pending language was on Page 13, to be reviewed by the Commissioners. If the new language is satisfactory, she can roll that into the neighborhood plan for their next meeting. Commissioner Julinsey asked if all the Commissioners were satisfied with the text. Everyone was satisfied and the issue was closed.

Commissioner Julinsey brought up Issue #3, regarding stewardship. Commissioner Julinsey asked if any Commissioners had questions about the revised text. The Commissioners had no additional comments and Issue #3 was closed.

Ms. Dietz said Issue #8 was regarding entryways and beautification. New language was pending Commission review and approval. The new text was accepted without change and that issue was closed.

Commissioner Julinsey brought up Request #18 regarding parking at Idylwood Park. Ms. Dietz added that one of the questions raised last time was whether other park expansions had raised similar questions. In some park expansion cases, citizens had not wanted to increase parking area size, which could increase overflow parking into surrounding neighborhoods. On the other hand, sometimes there is so much overflow parking area already available that neighbors want the parking facility expanded to make use of that overflow area. Grass Lawn Park was an example where the park expanded but the parking area stayed the same. Perrigo Park was also expanded, but land use was different and faced different parking pressures. Commissioner Gregory asked whether the overflow lot in question for Idylwood is the lot located along 178th. Ms. Dietz said that both that lot and the other park lot would potentially be restriped for additional parking.

Commissioner Gregory suggested they not pave that additional parking area because it is already serving as something of a neighborhood park. He would rather see a more efficient configuration within the existing parking areas. Furthermore, he suspected that no amount of additional parking would alleviate traffic in that area. Ms. Dietz replied that she would share that with staff and they could certainly keep that preference in mind. Commissioner Julinsey added that perhaps additional signage could help direct people to the overflow parking. Ms. Dietz said she would look into the PARCC Plan concerning proposed Idylwood improvements. In the meantime, this issue was closed.

Commissioner Julinsey brought up Issue #4 regarding trails, and pointed out that Commissioner Biethan originally raised this issue but was not present tonight. She asked if anyone had any other questions prior to moving into their discussion about housing. Ms. Dietz brought up that several Commissioners had expressed interest in how trails would be transitioned and that there are preferred methods. On March 24th, Ms. Dietz had a conversation with the City's property manager indicating that the first step in transitioning a trail involved granting an easement or making a donation. Issues of liability, maintenance costs, and current conditions all figure into the transitioning process. If a proposed or offered trail met certain criteria, then the City would roll that trail into the budgeting process to take on those costs. Chair Hinman asked Commissioners whether that background information was sufficient to close the issue. All the present Commissioners were satisfied.

BREAK

Commissioner Julinsey brought up the next two topics, Request #17 regarding housing inventory and Issue #5 regarding senior living. Commissioner Julinsey began with the housing inventory. Ms. Dietz presented a complex map showing the interrelationship between the zoning, the parcel size and the age of each home. The red areas indicate the oldest developed parcels, pink are intermediate, and gray are the youngest developments. The outlined parcels are those parcels which are quite large given their current zoning. In the long term, some of those parcels could be redeveloped. In the near term, some vacant lots could be redeveloped. The point of the map was to show the overall potential for redevelopment in that area, with the older and/or largest being generally the most likely to be redeveloped. Some of the smaller, older lots could also be joined together for a single redevelopment project, such as along NE 40th Street or 172nd Avenue NE. One of the features that neighbors want is variety, with a mix of home designs and sizes.

One of the Commission's questions from their last meeting was regarding the review process for single-family homes. In neighborhoods with a neighborhood plan, those plans would not only go through City approval but also would be submitted for approval to whatever process the neighborhood plan defined. The intent would be for an active streetscape permitting walkability by moving the living space towards the front street elevation and to avoid having the garage be the dominant architectural feature when viewed from the street. The key to meeting these design criteria is that other methods may be approved by the code administrator. Some neighborhood plans also include exemptions, such that improvements or changes to only one part of the home would minimize the number of requirements those improvements had to meet. Ms. Dietz added that one issue being discussed via the Code Rewrite Commission (CRC) process is the possibility to remove the requirement regarding garage and living space design for remodels to single-family dwellings, and have those new criteria apply only to new homes on a Citywide scale rather than a neighborhood scale.

Ms. Dietz went on to discuss accessory dwelling units. Commissioner Miller had asked what the inventory was for such units throughout the City. According to the City's permitting system, the current inventory stands at 24 units: 8 attached and 14 detached, with 2 undeclared. The average detached size was 839 square feet and the average attached size was 872 square feet. By neighborhood, eight of them were in the Viewpoint neighborhood and all of those were located along the Parkway. There were four each in Grass Lawn and Education Hill, three in North

Redmond, two in Willows/Rose Hill and one in Overlake. Fourteen of them were in R4 zoning, five were in R5 and three were in R6 zoning.

Commissioner Miller asked Mr. Ken Foster and Mr. Bob DeWald serving on the Citizen Advisory Committee, what the CAC's opinion was toward these accessory dwelling units. Mr. Foster replied that there are two related issues. First, people can already have an accessory housing unit, which is not a change the CAC introduced. The CAC discussed whether such a unit would have much of an impact on the neighborhood. Since only 20 lots would allow such a unit, the consensus was that the impact would be minimal. Mr. DeWald concurred.

Commissioner Gregory asked for more detail about the eight units along the Parkway, such as their appearance and function. Ms. Dietz replied that the City permitting process did not track that information. The units could be rentals, they could be mother-in-law homes, or even office space for the homeowners. Commissioner Miller said his original concern was whether construction and existence of these accessory dwelling units was a problem but it certainly did not seem to be. He also said some had predicted this would become a much more common housing mode in the future. Commissioner Julinsey pointed out that Redmond attracts a variety of employees from cultures where multi-generational homes are the norm. Mr. Foster echoed that sentiment. Their neighborhood features a relatively large population of Indian professionals coming in and bringing not only their children but also their parents. Chair Hinman asked if anyone else had any questions. Commissioner Julinsey asked the Commissioners to review the actual language to ensure it was acceptable. No one had further comment. Issue #17 was closed.

Commissioner Julinsey brought up Issue #5. She had asked Ms. Dietz whether the City had any particular policies or incentives to encourage developers to create senior housing. Ms. Dietz showed the retirement residence code as a reference. This housing type is allowed through a subdivision or binding site plan, or through a special use permit. The maximum number of residents cannot exceed the number of occupants per zone unless the developer implements a density bonus, one of them being affordable senior housing. This stipulation allows for increased density up to 50% higher than existing zone limits. The exemption also requires that 50% of the additional capacity meet King County affordable housing standards. Using Emerald Heights as an example, one of the impacts is increased aid-car trips, due to various senior centers offering van and shuttle services. The special use permit, if used, requires some additional steps such as notices sent to neighborhoods, as well as an appeals and review process. Finally, retirement residences would be a conditional use while an adult family home is a permitted use. Those conditional uses would not apply in R1, R2 and R3 zones. Therefore most of the zones in the Idylwood neighborhood would permit such structures. There have been some suggestions to eliminate the need for the permit process even though the building criteria would still need to be met.

Commissioner Gregory asked whether King County median income was used instead of Redmond median income. Ms. Dietz confirmed that King County median income was always used, since residents could potentially work anywhere in King County. Commissioner Julinsey asked if there were any more questions. Issue #5 was closed, and she opened discussion on Issue #6. Ms. Dietz handed out some written comments that staff had already received on this issue, as well as comments from former Commissioner Charlie McCarthy. Commissioner Julinsey asked whether the Commissioners wanted to add the notice to the utilities language. Commissioner Gregory pointed out that they did not have the authority to do that even though they would like to

improve on the 48-hours-notice criteria. It is a Washington Utilities and Transportation Commission jurisdiction.

Furthermore, they should not muddy their City code with utilities performance and service language. Chair Hinman added that he did not see the value in having a policy without regulatory enforcement to back it up. Secondly, he wondered whether any additional language on this topic would make more sense at a Citywide level rather than at a neighborhood plan level. Commissioner O'Hara seconded that statement. In this context the best they can do is recommend what notifications WUTC can provide. Chair Hinman added that many small businesses now operate out of homes and as such, residential areas are not generally considered in that notification process since they are not regarded as commercial power consumers. Perhaps this would be something to add to the Comprehensive Plan rather than in a neighborhood plan. Ms. Dietz said she could certainly take this back to staff to see if there would be a more appropriate home for this type of language. Commissioner Gregory pointed out that this should be addressed at a Citywide level, and not be decided at a Planning Commission level. While it is a borderline topic for the Planning Commission, something like this should be decided outside of the Commission.

Chair Hinman asked what specific recommendation the Commission wanted to make. Commissioner O'Hara suggested that they close the issue but move forward with Commissioner Gregory's comments. Commissioner Miller agreed that this was a Citywide economic vitality issue, not a neighborhood issue. The other Commissioners agreed and the issue was closed. Chair Hinman asked staff for feedback on how best to approach this. Ms. Dietz will take this to staff and provide Commission with some feedback prior to their next meeting. Chair Hinman reminded the Commissioners of proper Open Meeting protocols, given all the feedback and conversation they expect to get from staff. Chair Hinman closed the study session.

REPORTS

There were no reports.

SCHEDULING/TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING(S)

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

ADJOURN

Chair Hinman adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:25 p.m.

Minutes Approved On:

Planning Commission Chair