

Jodi L. Daub

From: Sarah Stiteler
Sent: Wednesday, January 13, 2016 1:46 PM
To: Jodi L. Daub
Subject: FW: COMMENTS ON SEPA-2015-02323 Zakhareyev Comprehensive Plan Amendment

Jodi – for PC packet, please send 1) the response to Susan and 2) the comments she sent along with my response to Planning Commission.

Thanks,
Sarah

Susan,

Thank you for your comments on this application. I will forward your e-mail to the Planning Commission.

In response to your question regarding temporary uses: you are correct that short term temporary uses such as Christmas tree lots or temporary encampments are allowed in residential areas currently as Type I, administrative permits but with the proposed amendment they would require a Conditional Use Permit.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Thanks,
Sarah

Sarah Stiteler, AICP, Senior Planner
City of Redmond
15670 NE 85th Street
Redmond, WA 98052
(425) 556-2469
sstiteler@redmond.gov

From: Susan Wilkins [mailto:susanwi_1234@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, January 11, 2016 1:49 PM
To: Sarah Stiteler
Subject: COMMENTS ON SEPA-2015-02323 Zakhareyev Comprehensive Plan Amendment

Comments on the State Environmental Policy Act Determination of Non-significance
for the Zakhareyev Comprehensive Plan Amendment
Project: SEPA-2015-02323

Dear Planning Commission Members,

The Friends of Overlake Neighborhood Group has proposed an amendment to the Redmond Comprehensive Plan that would require a Conditional Use Permit for all non-residential uses in Residential Zones.

The Redmond Zoning Code currently allows uses in residential zones for a number of non-residential uses. In my neighborhood, non-residential uses include a number of schools (RHS, RMS, Mann, Rockwell, Einstein and many preschools) as well as Hartman Park and the Redmond Pool. I am concerned that - under this new amendment - any modification to these properties would be require Conditional Use Permits. For example, playground replacements at the schools or restroom remodels at Hartman Park currently require a construction permit. Under this amendment, I believe that these improvements would require a Conditional Use Permit since they are non-residential uses.

Additionally, I am concerned that Temporary Use Permits that are currently issued for non-standard activities in residential areas would also fall under the terms of this amendment and each Temporary Use Permit would require a Conditional Use Permit. (I could be wrong on this interpretation - could this issue be clarified?)

Land Use Policy LU-30 in the Comprehensive Plan would have the following sentence appended to it:

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 Zakhareyev amendment would apply to all residential neighborhoods in the entire city. It would add a layer of cost for all applications since Conditional Use Permits require a hearing before a hearing examiner. It would require additional time for each application. This amendment would be an undue burden and its overall effect should be carefully considered.

Please consider my comments when reviewing the approval of this amendment.

Sincerely,
Susan Wilkins
18024 NE 99th Ct
Redmond, WA 98052

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.

Jodi L. Daub

From: Lori Peckol
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2016 1:50 PM
To: doll@tmw-law.com
Cc: Sarah Stiteler; hozaifa@cassubhailaw.com
Subject: LAND-2015-02261; comments

Mr. Doll,

Thank you for your comments regarding this requested amendment. You may recall that in response to your earlier request to be treated as a party of record, I asked for your mailing address since that is what we need for all parties of record. When you provided it to Ms. Stiteler on January 13 of this week, we were able to fully respond to your request.

Best regards,

Lori

From: Brad Doll [mailto:doll@tmw-law.com]
Sent: Thursday, January 14, 2016 1:29 PM
To: Sarah Stiteler
Cc: Hozaifa Cassubhai
Subject: LAND-2015-02261; comments

Good afternoon Sarah,

Thank you for taking my call on January 11, 2016 regarding the proposed Redmond Comprehensive Plan Amendments designated LAND-2015-02261 and SEPA-2015-02323 (the "Plan Amendments"). As I relayed in our call and in a voicemail, I represent Anjuman-e-Burhani. During our call I reiterated the request earlier made to Ms. Peckol that I be treated as a party of record for notices concerning the Plan Amendments.

During our call you alerted me to the City's issuance of a DNS for the Plan Amendments. I had not received notice or a copy of the DNS. I downloaded a copy the City's DNS on January 11, 2016, following our call.

In response to the question you asked on January 11, 2016, regarding why Anjuman-e-Burhani might appeal the City's Determination of Non-significance, I relayed that Anjuman-e-Burhani has several concerns regarding the Plan Amendments. Those concerns include that the Plan Amendments are not consistent with the City's code, the GMA and the City's Comprehensive Plan. I also expressed that the Plan Amendments are unnecessary given the scope of the City's existing provisions for review of land use permit applications.

In addition, I relayed to you that Anjuman-e-Burhani is concerned that the Plan Amendments are intended to discriminate against Anjuman-e-Burhani and prevent the construction of a mosque on property currently zoned residential but just outside the current OBAT boundaries. I also commented that Anjuman-e-Burhani believes the adoption of the Plan Amendments would violate the state and federal constitutions' protections for religious freedom.

Thank you for receiving these comments by phone on the Plan Amendments and the City's SEPA determination.

Best regards,

Brad

Bradford Doll

Tupper|Mack|Wells PLLC

2025 First Avenue | Suite 1100 | Seattle, WA 98121

206.493.2300 | 206.493.2310 (fax)

doll@tmw-law.com

www.tmw-law.com

Click [here](#) to report this email as spam.