

**REDMOND CODE REWRITE COMMISSION  
MINUTES**

January 4, 2010

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Steve Nolen, Chair, Sue Stewart, Vice Chair,  
Robert Fitzmaurice, Nancy McCormick

**COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED:** Robert Pantley, Vibhas Chandorkar

**STAFF PRESENT:** Lynda Aparicio, Jeff Churchill, Steve Fischer, Kurt  
Seemann

**RECORDING SECRETARY:**

**CALL TO ORDER:**

The meeting was called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Nolen in the Council Chambers at City Hall.

**APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA and MEETING MINUTES:**

No issues with tonight's agenda.

MOTION by Ms. Stewart to approve meeting minutes from the December 7<sup>th</sup>, 2009 meeting and the December 14<sup>th</sup>, 2009 meeting. Motion seconded by Mr. Fitzmaurice Motion passes unanimously (4-0).

**ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE:**

Mr. Nolen noted there was no one from the public in the audience, but that if someone did show up later, that person would be given time to speak, as needed.

**STUDY SESSION, AND DRAFT RECOMMENDATION, MISCELLANEOUS USES:**

Mr. Fischer asked the members of the CRC to look at the last-minute items that were changed at the Commission meeting December 7<sup>th</sup>. At that meeting, the CRC requested that the City Attorney review a number of code issues. Mr. Fischer presented the CRC with a memo from the City Attorney, as well as proposed changes by staff as directed by that memo. In at least one case, in the definition for abandonment, the Attorney proposed new draft language, but recommended taking no action.

Mr. Nolen asked about the definition of abandonment, and Ms. Stewart was curious as to why the City Attorney would not want a definition for that term. She wants to make sure city planners and laypersons are on the same page with that concept. Mr. Nolen confirmed with Mr. Fischer that the Attorney recommended defaulting to the court's definition of abandonment. Mr. Fischer noted that case law can evolve, and that is the primary reason why the Attorney has recommended a definition should not be added. However, the Attorney gave the CRC an option to put a definition in the Code if the CRC members want to.

Mr. Fitzmaurice saw this issue as a question of use, perhaps as a *stoppage of use* rather than *abandonment*. He believes the CRC is saying if a person stops using the property, whether rights to that property are given up or not, the clock starts ticking. Ms. Stewart asked Mr. Fischer if this definition would handicap staff at all. Mr. Fischer said no. Mr. Nolen asked if citizens need a definition like this, in order to know when the concept of abandonment comes into play. He says it is a challenge for the public to rely on case law because few people are familiar with it. Ms. Stewart noted there could be gray area with this definition, as in the case of an old bank taken over by an espresso stand. During the interim time, which could have been considered abandonment, the property owner was in active pursuit to get that building occupied. There is an issue, also, over bringing in another non-conforming use in a building that has not been used for some time. Ms. McCormick said, for the citizens, a definition should be in the Code. Mr. Nolen agreed, and believes the definition is based on court decisions. He believes the Code could be amended if new court decisions are made.

Mr. Fitzmaurice is still concerned about when the clock starts for property owners. Mr. Fischer admitted the definition merely expresses state law, and does not note how time is counted or when the clock starts. In the case of the bank that turned into an espresso stand, the new definition would not have changed that situation. Mr. Fitzmaurice asked if a property owner did not actively pursue a new tenant, for example, but only stated there was no intent to abandon, that would be allowed under this section of code. Thus, non-confirming uses could not be removed. Mr. Nolen would like to see a time limit, but Ms. McCormick does not want to counter the City Attorney. Mr. Fitzmaurice does not believe the Code, as stated, will make much difference. Mr. Nolen suggested if there were more direction before the final draft of the Code, changes could still be made. The CRC agreed to end the discussion on this issue. Mr. Fischer will bring this issue before the City Council as a transmittal report on the 25<sup>th</sup> of January. Mr. Nolen asked if the CRC could entertain a motion on this issue.

MOTION to approve the Draft Recommendation for Miscellaneous Uses made by Ms. McCormick. Motion seconded by Mr. Fitzmaurice. Motion passes unanimously (4-0).

### **STUDY SESSION, DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS 1:**

Mr. Churchill noted there were about five issues open in this section of the Code. The first issue is C-1 on page 6 of 23 the issues matrix, about sight distance triangles at intersections. The latest response from Ms. Jonas indicates that measurement of that triangle will begin in a face of curb that would not affect on-street parking spaces. Ms. Stewart noted that because the sight distance triangle deals with the curb face, the triangle deals with items only on sidewalks or side yards. Other sight distance triangles deal with parked cars, stopping distance, or approaching vehicles. Mr. Fitzmaurice asked if the new sight distance triangle will impact parking, and if it does not, his concerns would be satisfied. He asked when the triangle would be impacted, as when vans or large vehicles block off sight lines as they exit driveways, for example. Staff members are trying to balance between allowing parking downtown and having safe entrance onto streets. The

sight distance triangle discussed in issue C-1 does not address the sight issues at some downtown areas, like the library.

Ms. Stewart noted that changes in the sight distance triangle could have a big impact on bus capacity, as well. She wanted to figure out which triangle applied in what situations. Mr. Churchill says the triangle inside the curb is in the zoning code because it impacts structure placement. The triangle on the public side of the curb deals with issues outside of private property.. Mr. Fitzmaurice would like to add a note to the Code in this section to show that the sight distance triangle would not apply in certain areas. An illustration would be added; the CRC wants to make sure a note is put along with that illustration to note the discrepancies in the sight line triangles.

Ms. McCormick brought up Mr. Pantley's previous concern about the impact of street trees and the legs of the bus shelters at the transit center on the sight line triangles. Mr. Churchill pointed out the new language in the Code, Section 25.030, that says traffic control devices, trees, and utility poles are allowed in the sight distance triangle when placed at an adequate distance, so as not to obstruct the triangle.

Ms. Stewart asked if some performance criteria should be involved in this discussion, to show if an object in the triangle does indeed force a car to enter a roadway to be able to see. 20' x 50' is the general triangle area, but that is not always possible downtown. Mr. Churchill noted that in certain unusual cases, the Public Works Department has the authority to manipulate the dimensions of the triangle, as needed. Mr. Nolen asked about the *parked vehicle* phrase of the Code, and how it impacts the area behind the curb face. Mr. Nolen says there is some confusion on this issue, when you consider that cars can park on median areas, for example. Mr. Fitzmaurice says the Code's handling of bus shelters needs some changes, as well.

Ms. Stewart asked if a new developer would have to go through two reviews for sight distance triangles in front of the curb and/or behind the curb. Mr. Seemann said yes, both of those triangles will be addressed through civil plan review. Ms. Stewart asked if some reference to the TMP should be included in this section of Code. Mr. Seemann pointed out that the TMP is part of the Comprehensive Plan, as the guiding document for the City. The Code is how development is regulated. There is a standard details document that shows the different sight distance triangles, so that new buildings are not built out into those triangles. Ms. Stewart noted that above-ground utility vault boxes could block off sight distance triangles, as well. Mr. Nolen asked if there should be a reference to the standard details within this section of Code.

Staff members agreed there is some confusion on this issue, specifically regarding parked cars, but the site distance triangle provision proposed is relatively clear. In conveying that on street parking is not included in the site distance triangle provision that is proposed, according to Mr. Seemann. Ms. Stewart noted, however, that a developer could create a sight distance problem by adding more traffic, from an underground garage for example, to a certain street. Staff members noted that a developer would have to deal with issues on his or her side of the curb, but did admit there could be a problem regarding parked

cars on the other side of the curb. Mr. Fitzmaurice asked again if the bus shelters at the transit center would be allowed. Staff members say the intent of the sight distance triangle would not include bus shelters. Mr. Fitzmaurice suggested striking the phrase *parked vehicles* and putting *bus shelter* in its place in that section of Code, and also recommended using language such as the phrase, *an adequate distance not to significantly obstruct the sight distance triangle*. That would indicate parking is not part of this issue. Mr. Nolen asked about a bus shelter with glass sides that would not obstruct vision. Staff reiterated the idea that the intent of sight distance triangles is to create clear sight lines, and possibly work on a case-by-case basis with different bus shelters. Mr. Churchill does not want to add bus shelters, but Mr. Fitzmaurice wants to make sure that issue is clear. Ms. Stewart reintroduced the idea of making sure there was a performance-based phrase to allow for certain objects in the sight distance triangle. Mr. Nolen suggested using the word *opaque* in the Code, and removing *bus shelters* specifically, to allow larger items in the triangle area, if people can see through them. The word *significantly* will be placed before *obstruct* to help clear up that section of Code. The CRC decided to move past this issue at this point.

Mr. Churchill next spoke to item C-6, on page 12, dealing with concurrency and when the counting should begin. Staff is recommending extending this limit to 180 days, and would be far more comfortable with a set time period rather than a set of development milestones. Those milestones would be difficult to determine and to measure. Mr. Nolen says he appreciated the staff's flexibility on this issue; the CRC members decided to end their discussion on this issue.

The third issue open is D-3, on page 18, dealing with traffic cabinets. Staff is recommending that traffic signal cabinets be exempt from the menu listed. These items can then go in the sight distance triangle. Ms. McCormick brought up the idea of bringing these cabinets inside buildings, which has been working in Bellevue. She sees staff putting up roadblocks to this idea in Redmond. Staff members believe that from a safety and accessibility standpoint, in an emergency, for example, instant access would be needed. Staff members are unclear as to how Bellevue and Seattle are able to accomplish this.

Ms. Stewart noted that the CRC did not want to close the door on this concept, in that some developer in the future could provide the safety features and access to the City with these boxes, as required. She would like to create a performance standard to allow these boxes inside buildings rather than a rigid code that would limit that possibility. The Operations staff is still concerned about accessibility, and having control over that utility space. Mr. Fitzmaurice asked why these boxes could not be located further away from a corner. Staff explained that the signal controller would need to be close to the signal in order to see how the signal changes when adjustments are made from the cabinet. Ms. McCormick recommended staff to reach out to Bellevue to get more information. Mr. Nolen anticipated that staff had already done that. Mr. Churchill, in the interest of moving this issue forward, would like to draft language for the CRC's recommendation about this concept while simultaneously reaching out to Bellevue. Mr. Churchill

proposed adding a phrase about *other locations* to the cabinet location criteria, to allow for the possibilities Ms. Stewart was discussing.

Mr. Nolen noted that there would soon come a day when remote access would obviate the need to even open the box. The CRC ended discussion on this issue in agreement.

Mr. Churchill next spoke about issue E-3 on page 21, which has to do, generally, with the transportation appendix. The CRC most recently discussed making a change to the table that has the right-of-way widths, and where center lanes are *optional*. The *optional* phrase has been changed to *where required*, to answer a concern of Commissioner Fitzmaurice. Mr. Fitzmaurice voiced his approval, and the CRC members closed their discussion on this issue.

### **CONTINUED PUBLIC HEARING, DRAFT RECOMMENDATION, DEVELOPMENT STANDARDS 1:**

No one in the audience asked to speak on this issue.

MOTION by Ms. McCormick to close the public hearing, seconded by Mr. Fitzmaurice. Motion passes unanimously (4-0).

Mr. Churchill asked the CRC if the members were ready to make a draft recommendation to the City Council pending the changes Ms. Jonas will bring back to the CRC. The CRC could make that motion tonight, or make two motions at the next meeting for the recommendation, and the report, when Ms. Jonas returns. Ms. Stewart says she would feel more comfortable waiting, and the CRC members agreed. Ms. Stewart would also like to involve Mr. Pantley in that final vote. Mr. Churchill asked for a straw vote from the CRC on this issue, so that Ms. Jonas could proceed confidently with the CRC's report to the Council. CRC members voiced no objections to that idea, and were in general support. The CRC took a short break at this point.

### **INTRODUCTION AND DISCUSSION, COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND DESIGN DISTRICT ZONES:**

Mr. Churchill brought some new material to the CRC on these different zones. The CRC is nearly done with two packages of material, and there are nine left. This will be the first of four zone-based packages. The schedule for this package is slightly different than what the reflected agenda shows, regarding Mr. Churchill's attendance. The public hearing has already been advertised for January 25<sup>th</sup>, so that will stay the same. From 400 to 500 postcards have been sent out to people in these zones to encourage public comment. Mr. Churchill is hoping to wrap up this discussion March 1<sup>st</sup>. At the same time, permit review procedures will be discussed. Mr. Churchill, on this evening, plans to show CRC members the basic code as it is, offer his criticism, and get some early feedback from the CRC.

There are seven zones in this package: neighborhood commercial, general commercial, business park, manufacturing park, industry, gateway design district, and Bear Creek design district. Most of these zones are intended for commercial enterprise, though some

residential and mixed-use developments are allowed. The Bear Creek design district is a special purpose zone for retirement residences and wetland banking. The urban centers will not be addressed in this discussion directly, but they will influence the CRC's considerations. Mr. Churchill showed the Commission different photo examples of the zones in question, and a map of the zone locations in the city.

Staff has identified a few key issues with this section of Code, including unnecessary text. There are a huge number of footnotes, text that is duplicative, and different definitions for the same word in different zones. There are also confusing and unnecessary permit process provisions, as well. Land use names are not the same in each zone. Mr. Churchill noted a cross-reference between 20.C.50.25-080(2)(A), about landscape area requirements, and another part of the Code. When you go to that other part of the Code, it makes a circular reference back to the first code. There are uses listed as conditional uses, and permitted uses, that follow special use criteria. There are *restaurants* in some zones, and *eating and drinking establishments* in others.

Staff is proposing having separate chapters for each zone, in order to have a zone-based zoning code, as the CRC has requested. Staff also wants a consistent organization for each zone. A few of the zones are organized differently; they should all look the same. Another key element for staff is items like *lot coverage* should mean the same in every zone, which is not the case now. Cross-references need to be corrected, and staff is also proposing a chapter consolidating common references. For example, residents could read, *if you are using a shoreline area, you should use this chapter*.

Footnotes have been eliminated, and the content has been placed in other parts of the Code. Duplicative regulations have been eliminated, as in the case of pedestrian standards, which are already laid out in transportation standards. The need for special use permits should be reduced with the proposed revisions to the Code. Mr. Churchill laid out the organization of the chapters, which would lead with a purpose statement, the maximum development yield, and regulations that are common to all uses. That would be followed by allowed uses and basic development standards, and then cross-references.

The land-based classification system highlights a problem in the Code, in that the same use is called many different things. That prevents the City from having a city-wide use chart. For example, retirement residences are called five different things in the Code. Mr. Churchill says that model is not workable. He is trying to make sure the same things are called the same things, and also make sure that staff does not reinvent the wheel in this process. The land-based classification system is a standard way to classify land uses. Staff would like to focus on the function of land, with a secondary focus on structures on land in using this system. Mr. Churchill says the reasons for using a land-based classification system include the fact that the current system is not working, and will not work in the future. The land-based system has been vetted by other professionals, and is flexible enough to refer to broad-use categories and narrow-use categories. It can be tailored to meet the City's needs, in Mr. Churchill's opinion. There is some useful reference material behind this type of system, which provides some helpful

documentation. Also, the City just updated its land use database, and that is modeled on the land use classification system.

Mr. Nolen asked if there were any other widely-used classification system, and why they were rejected. He also asked why material was not placed in these classification matrices in the revised Code. Mr. Churchill responded that there is a North American Industrial Classification System, sometimes called NICS or NAICS. That classifies economic activity, mainly. The reason staff chose the land use model was because it dealt specifically with land use, and because it is being used with the land use database, helping simplify the job of staff members. Regarding the matrix, Mr. Churchill says the number on the left of the tables presented is a Code citation. Mr. Nolen asked if, in the second column, there could be a common description added to bring clarity. Mr. Churchill says that method has been adopted by some communities, but some Redmond Code elements do not map well to the land based classification system.

Also, the state has specific requirements about code regulations that do not match that system, so a code number cannot be added in all situations. Mr. Churchill says all of the uses are defined in the Code, so it will be clear what uses fit into that box. Many uses map easily, such as housing for the elderly, but the terms are not always easy to determine. Other uses do not map easily, such as single entries that are six lines long, which match to several other uses.

There is an opportunity to reduce the need for special use permits through this revision. The City can review applications during a normal process and use the special use criteria, as needed. So, there is not a lot of value left in having a specific special use permit in 9 out of 10 cases. Mr. Churchill would like to incorporate some of those uses right into the table to allow applicants to see what they need to do, up front. Ms. McCormick has some questions about that method, and says there are valid reasons for some special uses, which require public hearings. Mr. Churchill noted there was only a public notice requirement for special uses; conditional uses do have a public hearing requirement. Staff is not going to change that. There is a provision in the procedures chapter that allows the Technical Committee to call for a public hearing. Mr. Churchill asked the CRC to find other glaring deficiencies in the Code, and if staff's approach appears to be the right one. He invited the CRC members to raise other issues for discussion.

The only things that are different in Exhibits A through G are the listed uses and their criteria. The format is the same. The listed uses and criteria honor, to the greatest extent, what is already in the zoning Code. The main changes are in organization. Mr. Nolen asked if staff could go through one of the revised areas and what has been done to change that organization. That could help the CRC interpret what the Code is trying to convey. Ms. McCormick asked about neighborhood commercial zones, and if limited hours of operation apply. The Code notes that hours may be limited if residential use is located in the upper stories. But Ms. McCormick says, in her memory of developing the Code, the zoning determination had nothing to do with what was on the property; it had everything to do with surrounding properties. Mr. Churchill says he will review the footnotes to get

more information on that zoning area. Ms. McCormick also noted the revised Code somehow grew two pages.

For the sake of example, Mr. Churchill reviewed Section 10, outlining the purpose statement. That statement is derived from Comprehensive Plan language. In Section 20, maximum development yield, there are two variables, the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) and the height. Base FAR and base height are illustrated, as well as what bonuses are available, maximum FAR, and maximum height. In the neighborhood commercial zone, there are no bonuses available. Floor space on multiple stories, based on the FAR, shrinks the overall footprint of the building. Mr. Fitzmaurice would like to see a definition of FAR in the Code, but has not seen it other than in one of the appendixes. He also asked about a two-story building with an FAR of 0.3, where each floor would have a value of 0.15. The area covered by the floor plate should be equal to 15% of the site, but that is not reflected well in the picture in the Code. Mr. Churchill says that is a function of how the computer generated that picture.

Mr. Fitzmaurice asked further about doing the math on the FAR, and if Mr. Churchill had taken into account parking spaces on these different lots, as well as setbacks. Mr. Churchill says regarding Section 20, the only thing taken into account is FAR and height. Mr. Churchill remarked that this issue Mr. Fitzmaurice is discussing will come up later.

Section 30, regulations that are common to all uses, exists in order to fit Section 40 into the Code. There were too many columns in Section 40 to fit on an 8.5" x 11" piece of paper. In certain circumstances, the City can reduce setbacks. Fences and flagpoles are permitted in the setbacks. Also, there are provisions for projections or equipment. These are common to all uses, and that is why they have been put in Section 30. Maximums are listed for impervious surface area, height, and FAR. There are some items that end with (SMP), which stands for Shoreline Master Program. Items that end with that designation cannot be changed, according to Mr. Churchill. Those words are fixed, and changing them would require going through the SMP amendment process.

Mr. Nolen asked about showing the *real maximum* in the Code, to show how the bonus can be applied. Mr. Churchill noted there was an unfortunate page break that might confuse the issue. Mr. Nolen asked if there was a way to show a table that included maximum, base FAR, then FAR with bonus. Mr. Churchill noted the bonus would not apply to the maximum FAR, 0.3, except when there are multi-family dwellings on top of other uses. Otherwise, the FAR is not additive. Mr. Nolen said the table was then very confusing. If there are no bonuses available, but you can double the maximum FAR, there appears to be a problem. That is an issue of mixing uses, according to Mr. Churchill. The maximum FAR for all uses is the same, 0.3. But when there are multi-family dwellings, the FAR can be added to whatever else you have. That could be construed as a bonus. Mr. Churchill noted that designation might make sense. Mr. Churchill confirmed there were no other ways to extend the FAR, other than residential uses, in this zone.

Mr. Fitzmaurice asked about Section 20, and the pictures included. He asked about including a third picture, to depict a one-story building with an FAR of 0.3, which would be the same size as a two-story building with the 0.6. Mr. Churchill says there is no minimum height limit, so a one-story building could be done. Mr. Fitzmaurice says that *third option* needs to be shown, to indicate how the bonus is applied. It would be an additional example of a single-story building, with an FAR of 0.3. Mr. Churchill responded that, in some zones, there are base heights of four stories, and that does not mean developers could not build one, two, or three story buildings. Mr. Nolen pointed out that a developer could not cover 60% of the lot, and have two stories, unless there was a multi-family situation.

Mr. Churchill says the reason only two examples have been shown is to match the pattern of all the zones. There will always be an example of maximum height without any bonuses, and what the maximum height is with all bonuses, and nothing below that. In this case, there is only one option below what is pictured; in other cases, there are four or five other options. Mr. Fitzmaurice says he likes the format. He simply is trying to relate the different pictures seen in the different categories. He says the perspective or viewpoint appears different for some of these pictures, such that in going from zone to zone, the drawings do not match up. Mr. Nolen asked if adding some text to explain these pictures might help, like *two stories with 30% lot coverage*. He added there is a de facto lot coverage maximum, because a single-story building can only have a certain FAR, if it meets all the other standards. Mr. Churchill says that was correct. Mr. Nolen pointed out the Code makes exceptions to the lot coverage for things like decks, which might not count. Mr. Churchill noted there was a difference between impervious surface and lot coverage.

Mr. Fitzmaurice looked at *Setback* in Section 30, and in the definition section, in the effort to clean up the Code's language. The setback line is the line beyond which, toward a property line, no structure may extend or be placed, except as permitted by regulations of the title. However, parking can be placed in this area. Mr. Fitzmaurice then pointed out that looking at the definition of *structure* it reads, *that which is built or constructed, an edifice of any kind, or any piece of work artificially built or composed of parts joined together in some definite manner*. Mr. Churchill says that definition does not include a surface parking lot, but would include a parking garage.

Mr. Fitzmaurice asked if manholes or water valves count as *structures*. He says engineers ask him this question a lot. Mr. Fitzmaurice asked if *building setback* would be better than *setback*. Mr. Churchill said that could be a possibility, and noted that some mechanical equipment is allowed in the setback area, which are not *structures*. Mr. Churchill noted that there is a landscaping chapter that could help developers with these types of questions, too. This section of the Code says, 25% of the site area needs to be landscaped. Mr. Fitzmaurice likes the reorganization. He is just concerned about the definitions, and allowing developers a quick reference for the constraints they have to build. Mr. Nolen noted the use of the word *buffer* could be confusing in this situation, as well. He asked again about *structures*, and if manholes classify as a structure. He asked if

a structure was something simply built above ground, and made noise. Mr. Churchill says he will work on the *structure* definition to improve the clarity.

Mr. Fitzmaurice asked about parking structures below grade, and how those affected FAR. Mr. Churchill says that does not count for parking, unless the developer is selling cars. So, the structure could be in the setback, if it is below grade. Mr. Churchill will look at that section of Code, as well.

Mr. Churchill moved to Section 40, the use and site requirement chart, combined. The text tells a person how to use it, reading down the left-hand column title use to find what you want to build. When that is located, a person would read across to see what regulations apply. Some permit types are indicated here as well, to show people what permits they need to get what they want. Section 030, which shows minimum parking requirements, is a good example of how a *landscape category* will be added to different sections of the Code. This would be a Type 2 process, which means it is a site plan entitlement or administrative modification. There are a few provisions that limit what can be done, in terms of hours of operation and size of the building.

Mr. Nolen asked about the land use classifications, and why gas stations are lumped in with car dealerships and rental shops. He asked if breaking out gas stations as a sub-type would be a good idea, rather than listing a number of exceptions, which is the current situation. Mr. Churchill says he will look into that, and admitted labeling categories can be a rigid system. He brought up the debate of broad versus narrow use categories, and what would be clearer for users. Mr. Nolen said for many of the uses, it would make sense to use the broader category, but with others, it would not. Mr. Churchill noted this discussion would come up again, and moved on.

Section 40 works the same for every use that is listed. There are eight use categories in the land-based classification system, starting with residential, then and general sales. Section 50 was the last one presented to the CRC, which references two other chapters that are still in working draft form. Mr. Churchill is asking for some high-level comments on those drafts, which include how to define site requirements like height and setbacks, and the cross-reference chapter, the *other standards that may apply to you* chapter. The CRC decided to look through the material, and figure out new questions for the next meeting. Mr. Churchill said he would come back with some revisions.

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

Ms. McCormick asked about a list of topics she had seen before that would be removed from this Code, and placed in the Municipal Code. She asked if the CRC had already finished this action. Mr. Churchill says the idea has only been introduced to the City Council and Planning Commission, but the substance of those changes has not been identified as of yet. The CRC will see that material and approve the changes before the City Council sees it.

Staff members noted that the extended agenda has been modified. The discussion on the Commercial, Industrial, and Design District zones has been moved to the 11<sup>th</sup> of January.

The introduction to the procedures chapter will happen on January 25<sup>th</sup>, with a hearing scheduled for February 8<sup>th</sup>. The next extended agenda will have that information.

Mr. Nolen asked about recommendations made to the Council by the CRC, as well as some questions the CRC had for the Council. Mr. Fischer did bring up that discussion with the Council, but it was not talked about at length. Staff members noted there was a summary provided for the Planning and Public Works Committee, as well. Last month, the CRC had requested to see a draft of that before it went to the Committee. So, at the CRC's next meeting, on the 11<sup>th</sup>, Commission members will see that draft. The CRC had also requested a monthly report of items identified to track resolutions, as well. That will also be included in the packet at the meeting on the 11<sup>th</sup>. Staff members could not recall any specific questions the Committee wanted the Council to consider. Mr. Nolen says at the next meeting, CRC members will highlight the issues they would like clarification on from the Council or Committee.

The meeting on the 11<sup>th</sup> will start at 5:30 to have a staff-CRC conversation. That part of the meeting will not be televised. Staff will have preliminary items for discussion at that time about process issues and how the CRC is doing. Staff will have a brief report, but will ask for input from the CRC as well on what is going right and what could be improved with the revision process. This meeting may last longer than 30 minutes. Mr. Nolen pointed out he may have some suggestions to the style of the matrix, and he would like to see that new style presented soon. Mr. Nolen would like to see the matrix in column form to help simplify the revision process. He recommended staff could provide a mock-up or template of what the matrix would look like, so CRC members could help guide what the final format would look like.

There is also a push to get more public involvement. That issue was discussed on December 14<sup>th</sup>, but Ms. McCormick and other staff members would like to talk further about that. Some of those efforts to involve the public are still in development for different land uses, such as the very broad area of residential zones. Ms. McCormick brought up the idea, again, to ask people who have applied for certain permits to review the process. Regarding procedures, staff will be sending out mailings to all the applicants of land use entitlements over the past three years, as well as all the parties of record. Staff will lay out the action plan for public involvement at the meeting on the 11<sup>th</sup>, and get input from the CRC. There is a new web consultant the City has taken on, and Ms. Stewart noted there are too many layers on the City's page. She wants a link on the home page to simplify this matter. Staff members would like this too. They are sending out updates on Twitter and Facebook to reach out to the public as well.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

Chairman Nolen adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:27 p.m.

Minutes Approved On:

Code Rewrite Commission Chair