

Memorandum

To: Planning Commission

From: Kim Dietz, Senior Planner, 425-556-2415, kdietz@redmond.gov
Patrick McGrath, Planner, 425-556-2870, pmmcgrath@redmond.gov
Sarah Stiteler, AICP, Senior Planner, 425-556-2469, [sstiteler@redmond.gov](mailto:ssiteler@redmond.gov)

Date: July 15, 2015

Subject: **Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments for the Old Town Historic Core Overlay and for Gilman Street**

MEETING PURPOSE

On July 15, 2015 the Planning Commission will seek public testimony and continue discussion on the Technical Committee's recommended package of Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code amendments for the Old Town Historic Core Overlay and Gilman Street.

Proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan include:

- Identifying the Old Town Historic Core and continuing policy emphasis regarding character and uses as currently called for regarding the Old Town zone.

Proposed amendments to the Redmond Zoning Code include:

- A new section that identifies the proposed Historic Core overlay which would continue to implement the vision, goals, and requirements of the Old Town zone;
- Design standards for the proposed Historic Core overlay; and
- Changes to the Pedestrian System Map

The Planning Commission's review of the package of proposed amendments is scheduled to extend through August 19, 2015. This packet provides staff's analysis of the Commission's second set of discussion topics, using the Commission's preferred evaluation criteria.

PREPARATION FOR JULY 15 PUBLIC HEARING AND STUDY SESSION

Please continue reviewing the June 26, 2015 Technical Committee Report and exhibits focusing on the amendment topics identified below. Please also identify questions and discussion topics by Sunday, July 12 and email them to Kim Dietz at kdietz@redmond.gov.

New topics for discussion at the July 15, 2015 study session include:

- Sequential Pedestrian Experience (Exhibit B – New Section – Old Town Historic Core Overlay, pp. 21-22)

- Streetscape Elements (part of Sequential Pedestrian Experience) (Exhibit B – New Section – Old Town Historic Core Overlay, p.22, items iii - vi)

Please also review Attachment C: Planning Commission Issues Table which includes the discussion topics identified at your July 8 study session. Please let staff know if any topics are missing or inaccurately summarized. These discussion topics involve the following sections of the proposed package:

- Comprehensive Plan updates (Exhibit A)
- Tripartite architecture (building base, middle and cap) (Exhibit B – New Section – Old Town Historic Core Overlay)
- Building materials (Exhibit B – New Section – Old Town Historic Core Overlay)
- Proposed changes to the Pedestrian System Map (Exhibit B)

Attachment A includes staff's analysis of these topics using the Commission's evaluation criteria. Also, *Attachment B* describes differences between the current Zoning code and the proposed standards and highlights from staff's consultation with the Design Review Board for each of the amendment topics.

REVIEW SCHEDULE

Staff requests that the Commission keep the public hearing open for oral and written testimony until August 5, 2015. Staff also proposes that the Commission accept written testimony on the proposed amendments until August 12, 2015.

Topics for scheduled for subsequent Planning Commission review and discussion are as follows:

- **July 22** – building entries and corners, windows, signs, and other elements
- **August 5, 12 and 19** – building mass, height and setbacks and on August 19, complete recommendation
- **August 26** – Planning Commission report approval

City Council review and action would follow during the fourth quarter of 2015.

Please contact Kim Dietz or Sarah Stiteler regarding proposed amendments to design standards, or Patrick McGrath regarding Gilman Street prior to the meeting if there are questions or concerns.

ENCLOSURES

Attachment A: Evaluation of Amendment Topics Using Criteria

Attachment B: Comparison to Current Code & Design Review Board Consultation and Perspectives

Attachment C: Planning Commission Issues Table

Attachment A: Staff Evaluation of Amendment Topics Using Planning Commission Criteria

	10 Design Standard Principles (City Council & Makers)	Integration with the Historic Core Character	Impact Economic Conditions & Balance Community, Business, and Property Owner Interests	Encourage Mobility in Historic Core and Downtown	Implications on Parking Opportunities	Integration with the Downtown
Policies: Community Character & Historic Preservation and Urban Centers – Downtown Section	↑	↑	↑	↑	↔	↑
	General policy support for principles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9	Policies increase emphasis on compatible, complementary design, and pedestrian experience including additional nonmotorized connections	Policies specifically promote economic vitality, engagement with businesses, and enhancements to infrastructure for the Historic Core	Policies call for additional nonmotorized connections and enhancements to a variety of aspects regarding the pedestrian experience	No effect on parking	Policies emphasize compatible, complementary design and promote the pedestrian experience including additional nonmotorized connections that connect the Historic Core to Downtown Park and to the adjacent Anderson Park zone
Exhibit B - Zoning Code: Tripartite Architecture and Design, pages 19 to 32	↑	↑	↔	↑	↔	↔
	Supports principles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 10	Emphasizes and clarifies tripartite building design, Citywide design standards	Maintains allowed uses and does not affect floor area ratio. May have positive impact on economic conditions of businesses in the area by supporting an attractive and engaging pedestrian environment. Higher standards for materials may also result in increased costs for developers.	Emphasizes human-scale and pedestrian experience at building base	No effect on parking	Tripartite architecture and design has been applied on buildings in other locations within the Downtown. This form of architecture/design will help support the unique character of the Historic Core and the relationship of this area with the rest of Downtown.

	10 Design Standard Principles (City Council & Makers)	Integration with the Historic Core Character	Impact Economic Conditions & Balance Community, Business, and Property Owner Interests	Encourage Mobility in Historic Core and Downtown	Implications on Parking Opportunities	Integration with the Downtown
Exhibit B – Zoning Code: Materials, pages 6 to 10	↑	↑	↔	↔	↔	↔
	Supports principles 1, 2, 5, 7, 8, 9, 10	Increased emphasis on material and complementary character, particularly regarding historic and landmarked masonry structures such as the Bill Brown building and the Stone House	May have positive impact on economic conditions of businesses in the area by supporting an attractive and engaging pedestrian environment. Higher standards for materials may result in increased costs for developers. Overall, maintains balance between community’s interests and property or developer interests.	No effect on mobility	No effect on parking	Maintains current code intent that speaks to Old Town and the area specific to the Historic Core being distinctive, with visual interest, and having an engaging pedestrian experience; Increased emphasis on material and complementary character.
Exhibit B – Attachment 3: Pedestrian System Map Amendment – Historic Core Pedestrian Connection	↑	↑	↔	↑	↔	↑
	The design standard principles are oriented toward building features, though the proposed additional pedestrian connection on the Pedestrian System Map supports principles 3 & 6	New nonmotorized connection may encourage property owners, developers, and business owners to activate the portion of their property or business that fronts this public space or corridor. This interior connection may also increase visibility of the Historic Core from destinations such as Downtown Park.	Developers may also choose to incorporate the connection into the interior of their development thus creating a public space similar to gallerias. Depending on architects or designers implementation of the new connection, the property owner may experience a reduction in portion of commercial floor area.	Would likely enhance pedestrian-friendliness through the internal portion of the Historic Core, in connection with Downtown Park’s pathway network, while retaining vehicular access.	No change; existing on-street parking is retained. Though this connection would require nonmotorized connections through the middle of blocks, it would not include mid-block crossings because of smaller, shorter block length.	Would create additional visibility of businesses and activities in the core of Downtown.

	10 Design Standard Principles (City Council & Makers)	Integration with the Historic Core Character	Impact Economic Conditions & Balance Community, Business, and Property Owner Interests	Encourage Mobility in Historic Core and Downtown	Implications on Parking Opportunities	Integration with the Downtown
Exhibit B – Attachment 3: Pedestrian System Map Amendment – Leary Way Width	↑	↔	↑	↑	↔	↔
	The design standard principles are oriented toward building features, though the proposed Pedestrian System Map amendment for Gilman Street supports principle 3	Maintains the current sidewalk width, which would also maintain consistency with building’s locating at the back of sidewalk similar to location of existing structures, some of which are historic or landmark.	Allows buildings to develop to the current back of sidewalk which creates an addition of four linear feet that could be added to floor area across the building façade and over a height of three stories. Café seating, when desired by businesses, could be located within the respective building, such as through an alcove that opens to the sidewalk.	No effect on mobility compared to current conditions.	No change; existing on-street parking is retained.	Limited to Leary Way
Exhibit B – Attachment 3: Pedestrian System Map Amendment - Gilman Street	↑	↔	↑	↑	↔	↔
	The design standard principles are oriented toward building features, though the proposed Pedestrian System Map amendment for Gilman Street supports principle 3 & 6	Consistent and integrated with roadway treatments in Historic Core including Cleveland Streetscape and Couplet Conversion.	Proposed map amendment allows for wider sidewalk, which will create new opportunities for sidewalk activation, as well as curbside design that retains parking and supports use of the street for events.	Enhances pedestrian-friendliness along Gilman while retaining vehicular access.	No change; existing on-street parking is retained.	Limited to Gilman Street and is consistent with Downtown East-West Corridor Study.

	10 Design Standard Principles (City Council & Makers)	Integration with the Historic Core Character	Impact Economic Conditions & Balance Community, Business, and Property Owner Interests	Encourage Mobility in Historic Core and Downtown	Implications on Parking Opportunities	Integration with the Downtown
NEW 7/15/15:	↑	↑	↔	↔	↔	↑
Exhibit B – Zoning Code: Sequential Pedestrian Experience, p. 21 and 22	Supports Principles 3 and 6: 3-“Activate the urban environment by encouraging pedestrian friendly streetscapes and block fronts and by incorporating landscaping.” 6-“Encourage more public spaces (plazas or green spaces) in conjunction with new development.”	Increase in variety of architectural detail within base of building will support traditional, smaller scale character of Historic Core. Also serves to enhance the pedestrian experience which is consistent with the vision of both Old Town and proposed Historic Core.	Provides more specific requirements for implementation of elements to support the pedestrian experience. Proposed requirements are consistent with existing standards, but more explicit. May have positive impact by supporting an attractive and engaging pedestrian environment.	No change.	No change; however may assist in providing more interesting, compelling pedestrian experience such that persons are willing to park and walk farther to destinations.	Serves to enhance the pedestrian experience which is consistent with the vision for Downtown.
NEW 7/15/15:	↑	↔, ↑	↔	↔, ↑	↔	↔
Exhibit B - Zoning Code: Streetscape Elements (part of Sequential Pedestrian Experience, p. 22, items iii-vi).	Supports Principles 3 and 6: 3-“Activate the urban environment by encouraging pedestrian friendly streetscapes and block fronts and by incorporating landscaping.” 6-“Encourage more public spaces (plazas or green spaces) in conjunction with new development.”	Little change from existing code which encourages amenities such as potted plants, benches, and historic lighting to support the Historic Core as the first business district in Redmond. However, new standards would require awnings for year-round weather protection and would require consistency of design approach among streetscape elements such as for seating and wayfinding signage.	Overall, little change from existing code. Consistent with existing standards which support attractive and engaging pedestrian environment which may benefit business. New standards require awnings which may add costs.	Overall, little change from existing code though new standards would require that awnings be provided to support year-round weather protection to enhance pedestrian comfort.	No change; existing on-street parking is retained.	Little change; serves to enhance the pedestrian experience which is consistent with the vision for Downtown.

Attachment B: SUMMARY COMPARISON TO CURRENT CODE & DESIGN REVIEW BOARD CONSULTATION AND PERSPECTIVES

(7/8/15) Topic: Tripartite Architecture & Design, Exhibit B – pages 19 to 32

Appropriate:



Summary of Staff Proposed Code:

Intent:

- Promote architecture and design that strengthens the unique character and sense of distinction in the Historic Core Overlay.
- Foster visual interest and opportunities for pedestrian engagement.
- Visibly anchor and complete buildings.

Specificity: Defines and includes proposed standards for the three portions of the structure:

- Base – focus, distinction, variety
- Middle – rhythm, character
- Cap – distinction and complete building

Other Aspects: Incorporates some additional and maintains other flexibility for architects, designers, and builders to implement the code such as through use of a variety of design treatments.

Summary for Comparison to Current Code:

- Citywide design criteria requires Building Scale Articulation to reduce the apparent scale of buildings. Tripartite articulation, described below, is listed as one of seven techniques for achieving this requirement. Examples of other techniques include window treatments, materials, upper story setbacks and landscaping
 - Provide tripartite building articulation (building top, middle, and base) to provide pedestrian scale and architectural interest.

Inappropriate:



Design Review Board:

- Felt that the proposal would ensure suitable architecture and design in the Historic Core.

Attachment B: SUMMARY COMPARISON TO CURRENT CODE & DESIGN REVIEW BOARD CONSULTATION AND PERSPECTIVES

(7/8/15) Topic: Building Material – Exhibit B, pages 6 to 10		
<p>Appropriate:</p> 	<p>Summary of Staff Proposed Code:</p> <p>Intent: To ensure that materials used on the exterior of new construction:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reflect the time period when the individual structure was built and create a sense of timelessness through the use of high quality material; • Complement materials used on historic and landmark structures; • Achieve visual interest and distinctive architecture and design, and emphasize tripartite form; and • Support a comfortable, consistent and engaging pedestrian experience along the street front. <p>Specificity: Would require use of distinctive masonry over at least 60 percent of building exterior.</p> <p>Would not allow use of exposed/unfinished concrete, corrugated metal, mirrored glass, or vinyl siding.</p> <p>Other Aspects: Allows for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Material variation, including allowing for new material and innovative design treatments. • Deviations from standards for material would need to be approved by the Design Review Board. 	<p>Summary for Comparison to Current Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires residential facades in Downtown to be clad with superior exterior cladding materials on 100 percent of the facades. • Encourages vernacular architecture and materials similar to existing historic structures: brick, stucco, wood, and stone. • Requires architectural detailing reflected in Old Town with design details consisting of contrasting material or color. • Requires details around windows in brick and stone structures. • Preferred colors reflect the historic pattern of Old Town with allowances for other complementary colors.

Attachment B: SUMMARY COMPARISON TO CURRENT CODE & DESIGN REVIEW BOARD CONSULTATION AND PERSPECTIVES

<p>Inappropriate:</p> 	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Maintaining similar color preferences though introducing some opportunity for variability and use of contrasting colors for accent.	<p>Design Review Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Believed proposed code should require use of distinctive masonry though with no specific minimum amount.• Also believed certain materials should not be allowed such as vinyl and mirrored glass.• Suggested maintaining opportunities for variation and flexibility in design treatments; the Board could work with the applicant to finalize the preferred building materials and design.• Felt that proposal should accommodate future use of new high-quality materials and innovative design treatments.
--	---	---

Attachment B: **SUMMARY COMPARISON TO CURRENT CODE & DESIGN REVIEW BOARD CONSULTATION AND PERSPECTIVES**

7/8/15 Topic: Pedestrian System Map, Exhibit B – Attachment 3		
 	<p>Summary of Staff Proposed Map Amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Add pedestrian connection through Historic Core, between Cleveland Street and Redmond Way, to/from Downtown Park and to/from 164th Avenue NE. Not to include mid-block crossings. • Change sidewalk standard for Leary Way to reflect sidewalk width of 12 feet, as currently built. • Change Gilman Street classification to reflect ROW width, combined ped/vehicle street, and wider sidewalk. 	<p>Summary for Comparison to Current Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Leary Way (Type D): A 14 foot urban walkway with 4-feet for tree grates and pedestrian amenities, an 8-foot sidewalk, and a 2 foot setback area for planters and building modulation. • Gilman Street (Type VII): A 30-foot wide shared pedestrian and vehicular lane.
		<p>Design Review Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff did not consult with the Board on this proposed amendment though did consult with staff from transportation planning, parks, economic development, fire, utilities, development review and traffic operations and following evaluation, consensus was to recommend this change

Attachment B: SUMMARY COMPARISON TO CURRENT CODE & DESIGN REVIEW BOARD CONSULTATION AND PERSPECTIVES

NEW (7/15/15) - Topic: Sequential Pedestrian Experience – pp. 21-22 of Exhibit B – New Section – Old Town Historic Core Design Standards

<p>Appropriate:</p>  	<p>Summary of Staff Proposed Code:</p> <p>Sequential Pedestrian Experience: 6.C.2.d.</p> <p>Building Base: 6.C.</p> <p>Intent: To foster visual interest and a variety of opportunities for pedestrian engagement.</p> <p>Specificity: Defines and includes proposed standards for the base portion of the structure along with other elements.</p> <p>Other Aspects: Proposed amendment: the Building Base shall be differentiated along the building’s horizontal exterior length by variation in material, modulation, wall penetrations such as windows and doors, architectural treatments and artistic elements.</p> <p>For the Sequential Pedestrian Experience, proposed standards identify intervals of horizontal building plane that must be broken up or differentiated by some form of change depending upon linear feet of building – such as door or window treatment, variation in building material, modulation or change in storefront.</p>	<p>Summary for Comparison to Current Code:</p> <p>Redmond’s current code does not address this concept directly, however, there are other code elements that can affect the sequential pedestrian experience:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Examples of other techniques: Old Town existing standards suggest window treatments, entry or corner treatments, materials and use of colors to provide variety at the pedestrian level. • Also, Citywide design criteria requires Building Scale Articulation to reduce the apparent scale of buildings which is experienced at the pedestrian level.
<p>Inappropriate:</p>		<p>Design Review Board:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The DRB supported the concept of wider intervals for enhancements to the sequential pedestrian experience;

Attachment B: **SUMMARY COMPARISON TO CURRENT CODE & DESIGN REVIEW BOARD CONSULTATION AND PERSPECTIVES**

		<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Emphasized allowing designers to have flexibility in meeting the design intent.• Staff revised the recommended intervals to be wider as a result of discussion and included a menu of suggested options to meet the requirement.
---	--	---

Attachment B: SUMMARY COMPARISON TO CURRENT CODE & DESIGN REVIEW BOARD CONSULTATION AND PERSPECTIVES

NEW (7/15/15) - Topic: Streetscape Elements – Exhibit B, page 22, items iii-vi (Part of Sequential Pedestrian Experience, pp. 21-22)

Appropriate:



Summary of Staff Proposed Code:

Intent: To foster visual interest and a variety of opportunities for pedestrian engagement.

- Informal gathering places should be created and shall be consistent and integrated with the streetscape through design and amenities such as by using complementary surface material, seating, pedestrian-scale lighting and wayfinding signage.
- Permanent public seating, when provided, shall be located within the parcel. Temporary or movable public seating may extend into the first two feet of the sidewalk, measured from the parcel boundary.

Summary for Comparison to Current Code:

- Old Town Zone design standards, Pedestrian/Customer Elements:

The Old Town zone characterizes a pedestrian shopping and gathering environment, with comfortable and attractive sidewalks, plazas, informal seating areas and pedestrian amenities that are consistent with the historic character of the zone.

The current standards:

- Encourage creation of informal gathering places integrated with the streetscape
- Street furniture should be of uniform design
- Encourage use of street trees, potted plants and flowers

Attachment B: SUMMARY COMPARISON TO CURRENT CODE & DESIGN REVIEW BOARD CONSULTATION AND PERSPECTIVES

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The use of potted plants and flowers as well as street trees is encouraged, provided pedestrian access is maintained. • Street lighting should relate in scale and design to the historic character of the area • Awnings shall be provided to support year-round weather protection and allow for removal as requested by the City for sidewalk and utility maintenance. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Street lighting should relate in height and scale to the character of the area, and should enhance a historic theme.
<p>Inappropriate:</p> 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Design Review Board <p>Additional items would be consistent with the goal of enhancing Old Town as a pedestrian friendly area. Would like a broad list of suggestions for designers to choose from to encourage variety.</p>

Discussion Issues

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>A. Community Character & Historic Preservation and Urban Centers – Downtown Section (Policies, Exhibit A)</p>		
<p>What is the relationship of the proposed policy amendments to the Transportation Master Plan (TMP): Are they consistent with and/or guided by the TMP? -(Miller)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation:</u> The community’s vision guides the development of the City’s priorities and the Comprehensive Plan. From these, the City developed its guiding principles and the overarching transportation vision. Using this citywide transportation vision, five transportation strategies were developed as part of the 2013 TMP update. Each of the five strategies describes core activities needed to achieve desired outcomes. The five strategies provide the basis for identifying projects and programs to be completed by 2030. Implementation activities needed to achieve each strategy will also be guided by the sustainability principles of safety, maintenance, environmental stewardship and economic vitality.</p> <p>The five transportation strategies are found in TMP Chapter 1, on page 3 and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prepare for Light Rail • Ensure Strong Support for Urban Centers • Improve Travel Choices and Mobility • Increase Neighborhood Connections • Enhance Freight Mobility <p>Below is an analysis of how the proposed policy amendments and proposed new policies would facilitate the TMP strategies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed new policy CC-32(b) speaks to a plan that would continue to provide strategies and support for the Downtown’s urban center. • Proposed new policy DT-25(b) is consistent with the TMP urban center strategy by calling for design standards that address high quality and complementary designs as 	<p>Opened 7/8</p>

Old Town Historic Core & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for July 15, 2015, *last updated on July 10, 2015*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>well as ensuring the creation of an engaging pedestrian experience in the Historic Core.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed amendments to existing policy DT-28 and DT-29 and proposed new policy DT-30(b) and DT-30(d) support the TMP urban center and light rail strategies particularly by calling for seating and landscaping as components of the streetscape, by calling for landscaping between on-site parking and the pedestrian realm, and by encouraging other outdoor seating, dining, landscaping, and coordinated waste disposal in the context of pedestrian activity and the future Downtown light rail station. • Proposed new policy DT-30(c) supports the TMP urban center strategy by calling for visibility for and connection to the commercially-based Historic Core, particularly from Downtown Park. • Proposed new policy DT-25(b), amendment to policy DT-28 and DT-29, and new policies DT-30(b), (c) and (d) support travel choices and mobility associated with the Historic Core and may provide some support for connections. <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	
B. Tripartite Architecture and Design (Zoning Code, Exhibit B, pages 19 to 32)		
<p>At what threshold would the new standards apply when renovating a structure?</p> <p>- (Murray, Biethan)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion:</u> Commissioners asked if implementation of the proposed new standards would be required in the case of a tenant improvement to a building or a minor exterior renovation. They asked staff to provide more information of what threshold of renovation would require the application of the proposed new standards.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation:</u> Staff’s response and recommendation regarding thresholds in this section of the issues matrix will also include thresholds regarding material, listed in section C. Material, item #1. Staff will provide additional information on this item.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u> How will amendments affect existing buildings? At what point such as</p>	<p>Opened 7/8</p>

Old Town Historic Core & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for July 15, 2015, *last updated on July 10, 2015*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	during tenant improvements will the new design standards become requirement? (Johnson)	
C. Materials (Zoning Code, Exhibit B, pages 6 to 10)		
At what threshold would the new standards apply when renovating a structure? -(Murray, Biethan)	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion:</u> (See also, item B. above) Commissioners asked if implementation of the proposed new standards would be required in the case of a tenant improvement to a building or a minor exterior renovation. They asked staff to provide more information of what threshold of renovation would require the application of the proposed new standards.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> Staff’s response and recommendations regarding threshold, warrants, and triggers related to proposed design standards is addressed in section B. Tripartite Architecture and Design, item #1 in this issue matrix.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	Opened 7/8
D. Pedestrian System Map Amendment – Historic Core Pedestrian Connection (Exhibit B, Attachment 3)		
What is the purpose of the proposed Pedestrian Connection and how will it function? -(Miller)	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u> 4-Mobility</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion:</u> Commissioner Miller asked if the proposed new east/west pedestrian connection will support pedestrian mobility and requested more information on how the connection is proposed to function, especially without proposed mid-block crossings on Leary Way and Gilman Street.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	Opened 7/8

Old Town Historic Core & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for July 15, 2015, *last updated on July 10, 2015*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
E. Pedestrian System Map Amendment – Leary Way Width (Exhibit B, Attachment 3)		
<p>What is the appropriate cross-section for Leary Way and how should we accommodate parking and pedestrian mobility?</p> <p>What is the relationship to mobility needs in the context of future light rail? What is the relationship to parking?</p> <p>- (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria: 4-Mobility, 5-Parking</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation:</u> Staff will provide additional information on this item.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	<p>Opened 7/8</p>
F. Pedestrian System Map Amendment – Gilman Street (Exhibit B, Attachment 3)		
	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u> Should Gilman be closed to auto traffic? Seems that current use is more in line with parking versus for through trips. Should the street create a place for people? (Buhlman)</p>	
G. Pedestrian Experience and Streetscape Elements (Zoning Code, Exhibit B, pages 21 to 27)		

Old Town Historic Core & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for July 15, 2015, *last updated on July 10, 2015*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u> Can and how can the sidewalk along Leary Way be improved? Pavers have been damaged and tree grates seem to need maintenance and/or updating. (Sherpa)</p>	
H. Building Corners and Entries (Zoning Code, Exhibit B, pages 13 to 18)		
	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	
I. Building Windows (Zoning Code, Exhibit B, pages 10 to 13)		
	<p><u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u></p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	
J. Signs (Zoning Code, Exhibit B, Attachment		

Old Town Historic Core & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for July 15, 2015, *last updated on July 10, 2015*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
6)		
	<u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u> <u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>Public Comment</u>	
K. Building Height (tbd)		
	<u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u> <u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>Public Comment</u>	
L. Building Mass (tbd)		
	<u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u> <u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>Public Comment</u>	
M. Building Stepbacks (tbd)		
	<u>Planning Commission Evaluation Criteria:</u>	

Old Town Historic Core & Gilman Street (PR-2015-00795)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for July 15, 2015, *last updated on July 10, 2015*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>Public Comment</u>	
Additional Topics		

Questions

1. Question? (Commissioner{s})

Answer/reply/information