CityofRedmond
WASHINGTON

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE REPORT TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

To:	Planning Commission
From:	Technical Committee
Staff Contacts:	Rob Odle, Planning Director, 425-556-2417 Lori Peckol, AICP, Policy Planning Manager, 425-556-2411 Sarah Stiteler, AICP, Senior Planner, 425-556-2469
Date:	January 15, 2016
Project File Number:	LAND-2015-02261
Project Name:	Amendment to Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Regarding Non-Residential Uses in Residential Zones and to Extend the Overlake Business and Advanced Technology Zone (OBAT) Height Limit Overlay.
Related File Numbers:	SEPA-2015-02323
Applicant:	Friends of Overlake Neighborhood Group
Applicant's Contact:	Eugene Zakhareyev
Recommendation and Reasons:	The Technical Committee recommends:

1. Amend the Redmond Zoning Code to require a neighborhood meeting for three non-residential uses in Residential zoned areas including A) Community indoor recreation; B) Parks, open space, trails and gardens; and, C) Religious institutions with fewer than 250 seats because:

- The requirement for a neighborhood meeting for these non-residential uses will provide opportunity for public input while continuing to allow nonresidential uses that are appropriate for residential zones to be permitted through an administrative rather than discretionary type of review and decision making process,

- Current review time and permit costs will be maintained and not increase,
- Special Regulations and other provisions within the Zoning Code will continue to be used for evaluation of non-residential uses regardless of the review process used, and
- The proposal supports Comprehensive Plan policies that encourage use of options for public involvement and communication such as websites, surveys, workshops, open houses and other meetings, and policies that encourage an applicant to involve the community early in the design process in a manner appropriate to the scale and nature of the proposal.

2. Deny the applicant's request to require that all non-residential uses within Residential zones require a Conditional Use Permit and to add this policy direction to Comprehensive Plan policy LU-30 because:

- Many non-residential land uses that are allowed by the Zoning Code such as home businesses, public parks and religious institutions with less than 250 seats would no longer be permitted provided code requirements are met and instead would require a quasi-judicial, discretionary decision process for uses that do not warrant it, and
- It would create additional review time and permit cost and could deter development of these land uses that are commonly located in residential neighborhoods.

3. Deny the applicant's request to require the extension of the OBAT Height Limit Overlay Areas by 300' into adjacent Residential zones because:
    - The applicant's proposal is not consistent with the purpose of the OBAT Zone Height Limit Overlay Areas, which is to minimize adverse impacts such as height and glare from office and commercial uses permitted in the OBAT zone on residences in adjacent zones,
    - The Comprehensive Plan supports non-residential uses in Residential zones and the Zoning Code provides for exceptions to height that allow for the specific needs of certain non-residential uses such as icons that are part of religious structures or antenna structures, and
    - The proposal to extend the OBAT Height Limit Overlay into adjacent Residential zones will conflict with these height exceptions in the Zoning Code.

I. APPLICANT PROPOSAL

The applicant proposes to amend the Comprehensive Plan by adding language to two Comprehensive Plan policies, LU-30 and OV-77 to: 1) require all non-residential uses within Residential zones be reviewed through a Conditional Use Permit (CUP) process, and; 2) extend the height limit overlay area of the OBAT zone by 300 feet into nearby residential zones. While the applicant did not identify proposed amendments to the Zoning Code, amendments would be necessary to implement the requested policy amendments. See Exhibit D for the applicant's application.

II. RECOMMENDATION

The Technical Committee recommends amending the Zoning Code to require a neighborhood meeting as part of the development review process for the three non-residential uses listed below when an applicant proposes either a new use or a substantial improvement to an existing use that would increase the capacity for people to gather. Currently, these uses are permitted outright in Residential zones and do not require a neighborhood meeting. These uses are:

- **Community indoor recreation**
- **Parks, open space, trails and gardens**
- **Religious Institution with fewer than 250 seats**

The neighborhood meeting requirement would allow additional opportunity for public input since only written comments are received under the current review process. Also, the neighborhood meeting provides for public dialogue about a proposal early in review process as well as the opportunity for interested parties to ask questions about the City's review process and schedule.

The Technical Committee recommends denial of the applicant's request to amend Comprehensive Plan policy LU-30 to require a Conditional Use Permit for all non-residential uses within Residential zones since this would result in a discretionary review process, additional time and cost, and could deter location of these uses in residential zones.

The Technical Committee also recommends denial of the applicant's request to amend policy OV-77 to extend the OBAT Height Limit Overlay into adjacent Residential zones by 300 feet. The purpose of the OBAT Height Limit Overlay is to limit heights of commercial and office structures within the defined areas to limit impacts on adjacent residential areas. Extending the Overlay would maintain the residential height limits of 35 in these Residential zones. However, the Overlay area with the 45 feet limit would exceed the 35 feet height limit in Residential zones. These height limits could interfere with the location of non-residential uses in Residential zones by not allowing height exceptions for uses which are governed through Special Regulations specific to the use, such as religious institutions and communications structures. Further, height limits in the Residential zones adjacent to the OBAT height limit overlay areas are not warranted and

would be inconsistent with Residential zones elsewhere in the City where there are not similar height limitations.

Exhibit A shows the Technical Committee recommended amendments.

III. BACKGROUND, FACTORS CONSIDERED, AND ALTERNATIVES

A. BACKROUND AND REASON FOR THE PROPOSAL

1. Non-Residential Land Uses in Residential Zones

The applicant has requested a policy amendment to require that all non-residential uses in Residential zones be reviewed through a Conditional Use Permit process. The applicant states that the proposed amendment "will better protect the interests of the residents in Residential zones, as well as allow the City to better enforce zoning requirements." The applicant also states that allowed nonresidential uses in Residential zones may greatly affect the character of the neighborhood, but Conditional Use Permits are not required for all uses. Further, the applicant states that the change will impose conditions on new developments so that the compatibility with residential uses can be enforced, as well to ensure greater resident participation in the land use application approval process.

The Redmond Zoning Code (RZC) identifies six types of review processes based on: the public notice that is required, the level of discretion, e.g., whether it will be administratively reviewed and decided upon or if it is to be a Hearing Examiner and/or City Council review and decision, whether a public hearing is required, and the appeal body in the event of an appeal.

Comprehensive Plan policy LU-30 speaks to non-residential uses within Residential zones. Additional text requested by the applicant is in italics:

- Allow some compatible nonresidential uses in Residential zones, such as appropriately scaled schools, religious facilities, home occupations, parks, open spaces, senior centers and day care centers. Maintain standards in the Redmond Zoning Code for locating and designing these uses in a manner that respects the character and scale of the neighborhood. *To maintain the character of the residential areas and impose conditions for future compatibility, require a Conditional Use Permit for all non-residential uses in Residential zones.*

The Comprehensive Plan supports the location of non-residential uses within residential zones, recognizing that having schools, parks, religious institutions, home businesses and day cares nearby is important for residents' access to these services and contributes to the fabric of a community.

Some nonresidential uses may only be appropriately located on certain parcels within a residential zone due to the potential impacts. The Zoning Code requires a Conditional Use Permit for these non-residential uses so that the City's Hearing Examiner and City Council can consider the appropriateness of the use on a

specific parcel in terms of compatibility with other uses in the same zone and vicinity and impose conditions to ensure compatibility. The City requires a Conditional Use Permit for the following non-residential uses within Residential zones:

- Schools (K – 12)
- Public safety, e.g., fire stations
- Religious institution (250 to 750 seats)
- Equestrian facility (allowed in RA-5 and R-1)
- Bed and Breakfast Inn (between three and eight rooms)
- Regional utilities
- Antenna support structures
- Antenna array and base station (CUP may be required)
- Heliport
- Float plane facility
- Day care centers
- Athletic sports and play fields
- Golf course
- Marine recreation
- Commercial swimming pool

These land uses may be appropriate to locate within Residential zones in certain locations and conditions. RZC 21.76.070 K includes decision criteria for Conditional Use Permits (CUP) that address considerations such as characteristics of the subject property and immediate vicinity, the size and characteristics of the proposed use in relation to adjacent uses, traffic, and adequacy of public facilities and services.

The Conditional Use Permit is considered a Type IV review, which involves a series of actions including:

Review Procedures for Type IV Permits – Conditional Use Permits	
Notice	Notice of Application, mailed to owners and occupants of properties within 500'; Major Land Use Action sign for notice of public hearing
Review	Technical Committee, Hearing Examiner then recommendation to City Council

Comment	Written and Public Hearing
Decision	City Council
Appeal	Superior Court

Conditional Use Permit reviews and decisions are quasi-judicial and discretionary in nature. The Hearing Examiner holds a public hearing on the proposal and makes a recommendation to the City Council, based on the Technical Committee recommendation, consideration of established review criteria within the RZC, public testimony and other factors. As the legislative body for the City, the City Council makes the decision on the proposal which is appealable to King County Superior Court.

Non-residential land uses in Residential zones that *do not* require a Conditional Use Permit include the following:

- Local utilities
- Amateur radio towers/ Large satellite dishes
- Roadside produce stand
- Bed and Breakfast Inns (two or less rooms)
- Crop Production
- Road, Ground, Passenger and Transit Transportation (Regional light rail transit system only, no vehicle storage)
- Family day care providers
- Home business
- Pier, dock, float
- Water-oriented accessory structure
- Community indoor recreation
- Parks, open space, trails and gardens
- Religious institutions with less than 250 seats
- Short-Term temporary uses, e.g. seasonal retail sales; encampments

Review and decisions for these land use proposals is done through an administrative process. Some of these land uses are Type I review, including home businesses, family day care providers and certain types of amateur radio towers, which require administrative review and decision by the appropriate department. The majority are Type II reviews that require the following actions:

Review Procedures for Type II Permits – Administrative	
Notice	Notice of Application, mailed to owners and occupants of properties within 500'
Review	Staff review, using RZC Special Regulations and other applicable RZC provisions
Comment	Written
Decision	Technical Committee
Appeal	Hearing Examiner

The RZC does not require a CUP and discretionary decision making process for these non-residential uses as fewer impacts are anticipated and these uses are appropriate to locate in residential zones. If a Type I or Type II proposal is determined to meet established review criteria, the proposal may be approved by the appropriate department (Type I) or the Technical Committee (Type II).

The Special Regulations associated with many non-residential uses are used to review a proposal whether it involves either a Type I or II permit type or a Type IV CUP. For example, Religious institutions that have less than 250 seats as well as those with 250 – 750 seats are subject to Special Regulations (RZC 21.08.280) that require a traffic mitigation plan, and address the storage of large vehicles, maximum building height, design and location within shoreline areas.

Other non-residential uses such as home businesses are specifically regulated in the RZC and include limits on total trips; day care providers are limited to 12 children and are also regulated through the State; and amateur radio towers and monopoles also are evaluated with Special Regulations. The RZC contains specific Special Regulations for the following non-residential uses in Residential zones.

- Float plane facility
- Antenna support structures
- Large satellite dish/amateur radio tower
- Antenna array and base station
- Day care center
- Family day care provider
- Religious institution
- Home business
- Pier, dock, float
- Water-oriented accessory structure

Some of the above uses require a CUP/Type IV review; others are a Type I or Type II, administrative use. In either case the Special Regulations are used for evaluation and decisions.

2. Extension of OBAT Height Limit Overlay

The OBAT Height Limit Overlay map in Exhibit B was established to reduce height and glare impacts from employment campuses on adjacent residential areas. Within the reduced height areas, structures such as buildings on the Microsoft campus within 300 feet of a Residential zone are limited to either 35 or 45 feet in height, depending on the location.

The applicant requests that these existing height limit overlays be extended into adjacent Residential zones for 300 feet in width to "serve the best interests of the community by making sure new developments do not compromise established residential neighborhood quality of life".

The applicant also proposes additional text to policy OV-77 as follows in support of the recommendation: (see italics)

- Emphasize transitions from the Employment Area to the single-family portions of Overlake through entryway treatments, such as landscaped medians similar to those located at NE 51st Street and 156th Avenue NE. Work in collaboration with residents to find opportunities to create and maintain neighborhood entryways that incorporate landscaping and other natural features where right-of-way is sufficient or upon appropriately located public land. *Extend any overlays defined for OBAT in the Redmond Zoning Code into nearby Residential zones.*

The RZC allows non-residential uses in Residential zones some exceptions to height based on the specific characteristics of the use. In Single Family Urban Residential zones for example, the standard maximum height of structures is 35 feet, and non-residential uses may exceed that under certain conditions as identified through the Special Regulations for a specific use.

Religious institutions in Residential zones are allowed a height of up to 50 feet including any religious symbols; however, structures must conform to additional Special Regulation location and setback requirements. For example, a minimum setback of 20 feet from all property lines is required for a structure, with an additional five feet of setback required for each one foot of height over 30 feet.

Other examples of exceptions to height within Residential zones include mechanical (HVAC) or fire station equipment (e.g. hose towers) –which may exceed the highest point of the existing or proposed structure by no more than 15 feet. (RZC 21.08.170M). In addition, monopoles and amateur radio towers are allowed to extend up to 65' or higher in Residential zones. (RZC 21.56 Wireless Communication Facilities).

B. FACTORS CONSIDERED AND ALTERNATIVES

Staff considered several factors in the process of developing a recommendation as summarized below.

1. What would be the major process differences if all nonresidential uses in Residential zones were required to be reviewed through a CUP process compared to administrative review?

   The key differences between the CUP (Type IV review) requested by the applicant and administrative review are:

   1) Opportunity for comment,

   2) Cost and time for permitting,

   3) The amount of discretion allowed the decision maker: more discretion for CUP or Type IV permit types and least amount of discretion for administrative decisions, and

   4) The appeal body in the event of an appeal.

   As noted, a Type IV, Conditional Use Permit requires a public hearing and review by the Hearing Examiner and decision by the City Council. Type I and Type II decisions are administrative: Type I review requires no Notice of Application and decisions are made by the appropriate department; Type II processes provide a Notice of Application which interested persons may respond to in writing.

   The time involved for review under an administrative Type I or Type II process versus a Type IV (CUP) process will depend on the nature of the proposal and its specific issues. In general, a Type IV review is longer because of the need to schedule a public hearing with the Hearing Examiner with notice to the public 21 days in advance of the hearing, and subsequent review by the City Council. Permit costs for the CUP are approximately $1,300 higher than Type II reviews for example, if undergoing the Pre-Review Entitlement Process (PREP). A CUP is considered to be a Major Land Use Action and requires a large, 4 x 8 sign to be posted, estimated to cost approximately $400.

   The CUP/Type IV review is a discretionary, quasi-judicial process with a recommendation by the Hearing Examiner and a decision by City Council. In general, appeals for administrative decisions are heard by the City's Hearing Examiner and appeals for a Type IV, CUP would be heard by Superior Court.

   Considering these differences, non-residential uses currently permitted within Residential zones do not warrant a CUP/Type IV review, which elevates the decision on a proposal to a quasi-judicial one involving the Hearing Examiner and City Council. The Technical Committee does recommend requiring a neighborhood meeting for three nonresidential uses to gain the benefit of opportunity for additional public comment without the added time and expense of a Type IV process.

2. Have there been issues in terms of impacts associated with nonresidential uses in Residential zones?

   Staff has researched experiences with certain non-residential uses within residential zones in Redmond and the extent to which impacts such as additional traffic, overflow parking and lighting have been an issue and how these issues were addressed. For parks located within Residential zones, the City has worked with residents to mitigate issues that were raised in neighborhood meetings such as lighting and overflow parking. In one situation, No Parking signs were installed to discourage on street parking and lighting was designed to provide safety while minimizing spillage into nearby residences. For Religious institutions, parking overflow has been addressed by shared parking with other facilities and the religious institution holding additional services at non-peak times. The City has issued parking tickets when excessive parking has not abated. The City has sufficient code authority to condition and enforce for these kinds of impacts.

3. Does the current review process allow adequate opportunity for public input regarding proposed development of nonresidential uses in Residential zones?

   Currently, Type II permit decisions typically do not require a neighborhood meeting. When an application is accepted by the City, a Notice of Application is sent to owners and occupants of properties within 500 feet of the proposed action. For these administrative decisions, if a proposal meets the specific review criteria for the land use action requested, a permit will be approved by the Technical Committee.

   In reviewing the types of non-residential land uses permitted in Residential zones, three uses were identified that typically involve gatherings of people and the potential for associated impacts: 1) Community indoor recreation, 2) Parks, open space, trails and gardens, and 3) Religious institutions with fewer than 250 seats.

   Public input to inform design of new community indoor recreation facilities and new parks, open space, trails and gardens will likely be provided through a park master plan process. If there is a change or addition to an existing park, it may not be sufficiently large to warrant a master plan but a neighborhood meeting is typically held. Applicants for religious institutions with fewer than 250 seats are not currently required to seek public input.

   For the three uses cited above, the Technical Committee recommends the addition of a neighborhood meeting as a requirement when these uses are proposed in Residential zones. The neighborhood meeting requirement for Community indoor recreation and Parks, open space, trails and gardens formalizes a process and requirement for public input that is now general practice. For religious institutions with less than 250 seats, a neighborhood meeting will support a more transparent process. It will provide a public forum for interested persons to ask questions, learn about and comment on a proposed project while still allowing smaller congregations the ability to apply

for a Type II permit with less review time and lower cost than what is required through the CUP process.

4. What is the reasoning for requiring these three non-residential uses to have neighborhood meetings as opposed to others?

   The RZC allows non-residential uses in Residential zones and encourages their location within Residential zones under specific conditions. Many non-residential uses in Residential zones require either the Type I or Type II, administrative review, as they have been determined to result in fewer impacts than those requiring the CUP/Type IV review. However, Community indoor recreation; Parks, open space, trails and gardens; and Religious institutions with less than 250 seats are uses in which it is anticipated that people will gather and should include opportunities for additional public input. A neighborhood meeting for these uses will allow additional input for proposals that are appropriately reviewed under an administrative review process while balancing the needs of the applicant and the public.

5. Is there another option for the type of review process that could be appropriate when considering non-residential uses in Residential zones?

   Staff considered the Type III review process which would require a public hearing and decision by the Hearing Examiner. If all non-residential uses in Residential zones were required to go through this process, it would involve considerable additional time and cost for such proposals. Also, similar to a Type IV decision, it would no longer be an administrative review and decision and would become discretionary. The Technical Committee believes that this is not an appropriate solution; however, the addition of a neighborhood meeting for three non-residential uses in which people gather will provide opportunities for public input.

6. Should the Overlake Business and Advanced Technology Zone (OBAT) Height Limit Overlay Areas be extended into adjacent Residential zones?

   The Technical Committee does not recommend the extension of the OBAT height limit overlay as the purpose of the OBAT height limits is to limit the height for commercial and office structures within the overlays that may have impacts on adjacent Residential zones. In addition the proposal to extend the OBAT Height Limit Overlay into adjacent Residential zones will conflict with height exceptions which are necessary for the location of non-residential uses in Residential zones.

C. ALTERNATIVES

1. Require a neighborhood meeting for three non-residential land uses in Residential zones: A) Community indoor recreation; B) Parks, open space, trails and gardens; and C) Religious institutions with fewer than 250 seats.

Also, maintain the current review process for these uses and the OBAT Height Limit Overlay map as shown on Exhibit B. This would allow public dialogue about and comment on a proposal early in development review as well as the opportunity for interested parties to ask questions about the City's review process and schedule. The Technical Committee recommends this alternative: the effect will be to keep the review process the same for these non-residential uses in Residential zones except to add the requirement for a neighborhood meeting. This will not add significantly to costs and the neighborhood meeting for the three land uses would be a minimal addition to review time. In addition, with no extension of the OBAT Height Limit Overlay areas into adjacent residential areas, some exceptions to height for non-residential uses in Residential zones would continue to be allowed per the RZC.

2. Require a Type III process for non-residential uses within Residential zones.

   This would require review and public hearing by the Hearing Examiner and provide additional and formal opportunity for public input compared to existing conditions. Similar to the Type IV process, it is a quasi-judicial, discretionary review that is lengthier with additional expense, but with a decision by the Hearing Examiner instead of City Council. Examples of the types of applications that require this type of process are designations or demolitions of landmark structures, master planned developments and shoreline conditional use permits. This alternative would extend the review process and require additional cost for proposals that do not warrant this. Decisions on proposals under this alternative would become quasi-judicial and discretionary. The Technical Committee does not recommend the additional review and expense for non-residential uses that are currently allowed in Residential zones through an administrative review. In addition, this change would be inconsistent with the overall classification of permit types and decisions in the RZC.

3. Require a Type IV permit type – CUP and extend OBAT Height Limit Overlay into residential zones (applicant's request).

   Similar to Alternative 2, this alternative would provide additional and formal opportunity for public input compared to existing conditions. However, requiring a CUP for all non-residential uses in Residential zones will add time and expense and inappropriately require a quasi-judicial review which may not result in a better outcome since several non-residential uses are already required to comply with special regulations. For example, religious institutions regardless of size are required to meet special requirements for parking, traffic, lighting and proximity to an arterial street. Home businesses are required to meet special requirements such as for parking, utility demand, traffic, and size.

   The proposal to extend the OBAT Height Limit Overlay into adjacent Residential zones would further limit the height of all non-residential uses and support greater consistency in structure heights in Residential zones.

However, it would also likely have adverse impacts on the opportunities for religious institutions and communication and utility uses to locate in residential zones since these uses tend to include features that exceed the height of single family homes. In addition, it would result in a special height limit in a Residential zone when it is not warranted and would create an inconsistency with Residential zones elsewhere in the City where there are not similar height limitations The Technical Committee does not recommend this alternative.

IV. ADDITIONAL SUPPORTING ANALYSIS

A. COMPLIANCE WITH CRITERIA FOR AMENDMENTS

Redmond Comprehensive Plan Policy PI-16 directs the City to take several considerations, as applicable, into account as part of decisions on proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.

The following is an analysis of how the Technical Committee recommendation complies with the requirements for amendments. Additional analysis is provided for how the applicant's proposal addresses these requirements.

1. **Consistency with Growth Management Act (GMA), State of Washington Department of Commerce Procedural Criteria, VISION 2040 or its successor, and the King County Countywide Planning Policies.**

   The Technical Committee's recommendation takes into account direction by the GMA, including citizen participation and coordination as one of the Act's stated goals: "Encourage the involvement of citizens in the planning process and ensure coordination between communities and jurisdictions to reconcile conflicts." The proposed amendment would provide additional opportunities for citizen input and transparency into development projects. GMA, the State of Washington Department of Commerce, VISION 2040, and King County Countywide Planning Policies also emphasize creating opportunity for public review and participation.

   The applicant's proposed amendments are consistent with the above in terms of being supportive of public participation. However, the applicant's proposal is inconsistent with GMA Goal #7 which states that applications for both state and local government permits should be processed in a timely and fair manner to ensure predictability. In addition, the applicant's proposal to require a CUP review for all non-residential uses within Residential zones and additional height limits within Residential zones could result in negative impacts to the efficient provision of public facilities and services such as parks.

2. **Consistency with Redmond's Comprehensive Plan, including the following sections as applicable:**

   a. **Consistency with the goals contained in the Goals, Vision and Framework Policy Element.**

   One of the eight goals for Redmond contained in the Goals, Vision and Framework Policy Element is, "to cultivate a well-connected community, working together and with others in the region to implement a common vision for Redmond's sustainable future." The Technical Committee's proposed amendment supports this goal and policy FW-2 as well: "Encourage active participation by all members of the Redmond community in planning Redmond's future" and is consistent with other goals within this Element. Further, the Vision speaks to Redmond having infrastructure and services that meet the needs of a growing population that promote a safe and healthy community.

   The applicant's proposed amendments could interfere with the provision of land uses and services by making the review process longer and more costly and by resulting in fewer potential places for non-residential uses such as religious institutions and communication infrastructure to locate due to additional height limits.

   b. **Consistency with the preferred land use pattern as described in the Land Use Element.**

   The Technical Committee's recommendation is consistent with Redmond's preferred land use pattern by continuing to support a permit process that provides for location of non-residential uses in residential zones in a predictable and effective manner. The applicant's proposal could detract from the preferred land use pattern by making the review process for these uses longer and more costly and by resulting in fewer potential places for non-residential uses such as religious institutions and communication infrastructure to locate due to additional height limits.

   c. **Consistency with Redmond's community character objectives as described in the Community Character/Historic Preservation Element or elsewhere in the Comprehensive Plan.**

   The Technical Committee's recommendation is consistent with policy PI-3 which reads, "Provide opportunities for public review of plans, regulations and development proposals, while tailoring the review approach and specific issues to the appropriate stage of plan preparation and implementation." In addition, PI-8 states "Use all public involvement and communication options at the City's disposal, such as websites; surveys; workshops, open houses and other meetings; and citizen advisory groups." The recommendation for additional public input by requiring a neighborhood meeting for three non-residential land uses in Residential zones support these policies.

The applicant's proposed amendment to require a CUP process would also support these policies but would add unnecessary permit processing time and additional cost.

d. **Consistency with other sections including the Transportation Element as applicable.**

The Technical Committee recommendation supports Neighborhood Policy NP-6: "Identify techniques and methods that can be used to address neighborhood issues and opportunities. Choose solutions that are compatible with Redmond's Comprehensive Plan and development regulations." Utility Policy UT-9 speaks to providing expeditious permitting, recognizing that avoiding utility project delay can minimize service disruptions and associated costs for residents and businesses. If approved, the applicant's proposed amendments could result in such delays with extended review times. The Technical Committee's recommendation is also consistent with policy LU-30 "Allow some compatible nonresidential uses in Residential zones, such as appropriately scaled schools, religious facilities, home occupations, parks, open spaces, senior centers and day care centers. Maintain standards in the Redmond Zoning Code for locating and designing these uses in a manner that respects the character and scale of the neighborhood."

3. **Potential general impacts to the natural environment, such as impacts to critical areas and other natural resources, including whether development will be directed away from environmentally critical areas and other natural resources.**

The proposed amendment is not likely to impact the natural environment including impacts to critical areas and other natural resources.

4. **Potential general impacts to the capacity of public facilities and services. For land use related amendments, whether public facilities and services can be provided cost-effectively and adequately at the proposed density/intensity.**

The proposed amendment is not likely to impact the capacity of public facilities and services. The Technical Committee's recommendation to require a neighborhood meeting will provide additional public input to the process of locating these services, i.e., community indoor recreation, parks and religious institutions with less than 250 seats. The applicant's proposal to require a discretionary review for non-residential uses in Residential zones and additional height limits could prevent public facilities and services from being provided cost-effectively.

5. **Potential general economic impacts, such as impacts for business, residents, property owners, or City Government.**

The Technical Committee's recommendation is intended to allow for greater opportunity to anticipate and address potential impacts related to the

development of three non-residential land uses in Residential zones: Community indoor recreation; Parks, open space, trails and gardens; and Religious institutions with fewer than 250 seats. The requirement for a neighborhood meeting with any of these land uses will allow the public to ask questions and provide additional input to an applicant and the City when considering a new or expanded development. Providing facilities and services in an expeditious manner will benefit business, residents, property owners and City Government.

6. **For issues that have been considered within the last four annual updates, whether there has been a change in circumstances that makes the proposed amendment appropriate or whether the amendment is needed to remedy a mistake.**

   The amendment has not been considered within the last four annual updates, nor has there been a change in circumstances.

V. AUTHORITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL, PUBLIC AND AGENCY REVIEW

A. AMENDMENT PROCESS

RZC Sections 21.76.070.AE and 21.76.050.K require that amendments to the Comprehensive Plan or Zoning Code (except zoning map amendments consistent with the Comprehensive Plan) be reviewed under the Type VI process. Under this process, the Planning Commission conducts a study session(s), an open record hearing(s) on the proposed amendment, and makes a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council is the decision-making body for this process.

B. SUBJECT MATTER JURISDICTION

The Redmond Planning Commission and the Redmond City Council have subject matter jurisdiction to hear and decide whether to adopt the proposed amendment.

C. WASHINGTON STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (SEPA)

A Determination of Non-Significance and SEPA Checklist was issued for this non-project action on December 28, 2015.

D. 60-DAY STATE AGENCY REVIEW

State agencies will be sent 60-day notice of this proposed amendment no later than January 20, 2016.

E. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The public has opportunities to comment on the proposed amendment through the Planning Commission review process and public hearing which will be held on February 10, 2016. Public notice of the public hearing will be published in the Seattle Times on January 20, 2016.

F. APPEALS

RZC 21.76.070.J identifies Comprehensive Plan Amendments as a Type VI permit. Final action is by the City Council. The action of the City Council on a Type VI proposal may be appealed by filing a petition with the Growth Management Hearing Board pursuant to applicable requirements.

VI. LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit A:	Recommended Amendments to the Redmond Zoning Code and examples
Exhibit B:	OBAT Height Limits – Map 12.7
Exhibit C:	SEPA Threshold Determination
Exhibit D:	Applicant's requested amendments

Conclusion in Support of Recommendation: The Technical Committee has found the recommendation to be in compliance with the Redmond Zoning Code, Redmond Comprehensive Plan, Redmond Municipal Code, and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).

ROBERT G. ODLE,
Planning Director
Planning and Community Development Department

LINDA DE BOLDT,
Director of Public Works
Public Works Department

Type VI proposal may be appealed by filing a petition with the Growth Management Hearing Board pursuant to applicable requirements.

VI. LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit A:	Recommended Amendments to the Redmond Zoning Code and examples
Exhibit B:	OBAT Height Limits – Map 12.7
Exhibit C:	SEPA Threshold Determination
Exhibit D:	Applicant's requested amendments

Conclusion in Support of Recommendation: The Technical Committee has found this recommendation to be in compliance with the Redmond Zoning Code, Redmond Comprehensive Plan, Redmond Municipal Code, and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).

Colleen Kelly for Rob Odle

ROBERT G. ODLE,
Planning Director
Planning and Community Development Department

Linda De Boldt

LINDA DE BOLDT,
Director of Public Works
Public Works Department