

**CITY OF REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

July 13, 2016

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Vice Chairman Captain; Commissioners Baker, Haverkamp, Miller and Nichols

STAFF PRESENT: Patrick McGrath, Jeff Churchill, Judy Fani and Sarah Stiteler, Redmond Planning Department

EXCUSED ABSENCE: Chairman Biethan, Commissioner MacNichols

RECORDING SECRETARY: Lady of Letters, Inc.

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Vice Chairman Captain.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

MOTION to approve the agenda by Commissioner Nichols, MOTION seconded by Commissioner Baker. The MOTION passed unanimously.

Vice Chairman Captain introduced the newest member of the Commission, Ms. Sara Baker, who was appointed by the Mayor and City Council on July 5, 2016,.

ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE: None

APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY FOR JUNE 29, 2016:

MOTION to approve the June 29, 2016 Meeting Summary by Commissioner Nichols, MOTION seconded by Vice Chairman Captain. The MOTION passed unanimously.

Public Hearing and Study Session, Amendment to the 2013-30 Transportation Facilities Plan, presented by Mr. Patrick McGrath, Redmond Planning Department

Mr. McGrath explained that the issue before the Commission was whether or not three specific projects should be considered funded system improvements and therefore moved from Transportation Master Plan's Unfunded Buildout Plan chapter to the 18-Year Transportation Facilities Plan (TFP) chapter. The projects were a westbound right turn lane on Redmond Way, the completion of a northbound through lane on 148th from Bel-Red Road to SR 520 and a streetscape improvement including cycle tracks, improved pedestrian facilities and a planter strip on 152nd Avenue NE in Overlake.

The Redmond Way right turn lane, from 166th to 164th, was a part of the Couplet Conversion design constructed in association with the Redmond Triangle Development. The other two

projects were associated with the Limited Edition master plan and development agreement approved by Council in April, 2016.

Commissioner Miller asked if the through lane on 148th currently continued, and Mr. McGrath replied that the northern portion from 22nd to 26th was in the TFP and the portion presented at this meeting was missing from the TFP.

The reasons for adding the projects as funded system improvements were to keep the TFP up to date, to maintain the concurrency system that tracks delivery of transportation improvements in respect to growth, and as a fairness issue to developers as developers are obligated to construct the projects whether they are added to the TFP or not; if the projects are not added to the TFP the developers would continue to be liable to pay the transportation impact fees.

Mr. McGrath stated that an error had been found in the proposed revisions given to the Commission at the last meeting. In the project description NE 26th Street should read NE 22nd. All other maps and project costs were correct.

Vice Chairman Captain opened the Public Hearing and having received no comments and no one wishing to speak, the verbal portion of the Public Hearing was closed, but the written portion was left open until a final recommendation by the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Miller asked Mr. McGrath to describe the City Complete Streets ordinance and how it was applied to the three projects, as well as how the ordinance in content and application differed from the many policies that exist between the Comprehensive Plan and the Transportation Master Plan. Mr. McGrath explained that the Complete Streets ordinance was a Municipal Code that requires that roadway improvements include accommodations for all modes unless an exception is granted consistent with the criteria in the code. Mr. McGrath stated that he was not personally involved in design of the projects, and that an individual who had been involved in the discussions and modal considerations during design would be the person to answer questions. Mr. McGrath was comfortable stating that the 152nd project was substantially non-motorized in nature, the 148th project was an isolated component of a vehicular thoroughfare, and the Redmond Way right turn lane was an isolated component of the Couplet Conversion.

Commissioner Miller stated that the 148th project had been expanded multiple times, seemed to be a capacity adding project and had not been pedestrian friendly for years. Commissioner Miller requested more information regarding the Redmond Way project as the Couplet had been justified to the Commission over the years as improving the pedestrian environment Downtown, and an explanation of the application or waiver of the Complete Streets ordinance was important towards any Commission decision. Commissioner Miller stated being in favor of the 152nd project.

Mr. McGrath asked if the issue was associated with the proposal or an issue independent of the proposal, because the projects were already in the adopted TMP and would be constructed regardless of a Planning Commission recommendation on this amendment. Commissioner Miller asked what was being asked of the Planning Commission outside of bookkeeping if the

project was to be built regardless, and Mr. McGrath replied that what was being asked was if the three projects should be funded system improvements to be defined later in the presentation, or to be held as the developer responsibility. Commissioner Miller asked again for more information and regarding staff capacity. Mr. McGrath explained that City inspections to ensure Redmond construction standards are met would be performed whether the projects were added to the TFP or not. Commissioner Miller asked if public meetings and environmental review had been included, and Mr. McGrath believed they had been as the development agreement had been approved by Council.

Vice Chairman Captain asked Mr. McGrath to bring answers regarding Downtown business community involvement in a memorandum and to have a person able to answer the questions of Commissioner Miller as well. Commissioner Nichols asked for the relevance of the questions of Commissioner Miller in relation to what was being asked of the Commission, and Commissioner Miller replied that the projects should be discussed individually and not as a package and that application of the policies and ordinances the Commission provides oversight for should be ensured. Commissioner Nichols stated that the City would be able to increase the transportation impact fee to developers with these projects and whether or not the projects were system improvements for City streets was what was being asked. Commissioner Miller stated that projects providing temporary traffic relief were not necessarily a system improvement, and the process that brought the projects to the Commission needed to be understood beyond the fact that the projects are shovel ready.

Vice Chairman Captain asked Commissioner Miller if the other projects would be understood if the process for the Redmond Way right turn lane could be evaluated, in order to avoid staff having to verify that the process was repeatedly the same. Commissioner Miller asked that the 148th project be the project to be reviewed. Mr. McGrath clarified that project development history for the 148th project was requested and Commissioner Miller replied yes, to include how the Complete Streets ordinance was applied and that responding with a memorandum was acceptable.

Mr. McGrath answered the first question on the matrix by explaining the definition of System Improvement; those facilities, programs, projects and services that are included in the TFP designed to maintain mobility and meet the transportation level of service standard established in the Redmond Comprehensive Plan, referring to the concurrency section. The level of service section reference states that investments should support the land use vision, keep pace with growth and serve to expand travel choices achieving a multi-modal travel environment. Impact fee eligible projects are defined by state law as improvements on public streets and roads, and the City of Redmond takes the full street into consideration including everything within the right-of-way. The TFP omits projects from impact fees that are off-street such as a trail or programmatic. Pedestrian and bicycle bridges to be built in association with light rail stations, off street but contributing to the system, are counted toward the concurrency system. Mr. McGrath asked if the explanation answered the question, Commissioner Miller stated in the affirmative. Vice Chairman Captain closed the issue on the matrix.

Mr. McGrath presented a project site plan view with relationship to surrounding parcels and transportation improvements in response to the second question. Commissioner Miller stated that

the presentation was helpful. Mr. McGrath stated that the Couplet Conversion was designed to make downtown more of a main street environment and was not intended to be a throughput enhancing project. Vice Chairman Captain stated belief that most downtown businesses would appreciate traffic slowing past them, and Mr. McGrath stated that many businesses will not even consider locating on a one-way street. Vice Chairman Captain closed the second issue on the matrix.

Commissioner Miller stated that Complete Streets ordinances have generated questions by friends and neighbors, and understanding what has been captured on the 148th project was important. Commissioner Miller asked about the timing of bringing the issue to the Commission so late in the planning and Mr. McGrath replied that the timing was dictated by the fact that developers had come forward representing funding and, while previously considered unfunded, could now be considered funded.

Mr. McGrath stated that an additional study session had been scheduled for July 20, 2016 and Vice Chairman Captain asked that the study session remain in anticipation of the memorandum. Mr. McGrath continued that report approval would be requested on August 10, 2016, a Council Study Session on October 11, 2016 and action two weeks afterward. Vice Chairman Captain reiterated that written comments would remain open.

Public Hearing and Study Session, Mobile Services Zoning Code Amendment, presented by Mr. Jeff Churchill, Redmond Planning Department

Mr. Churchill summarized that the applicant request was to modify the maximum dimensions for kiosks or vending carts to allow services such as a mobile hair salon. The Temporary Use chapter addresses mobile services. The Technical Committee recommendation was to exempt mobile services from a Temporary Use Permit requirement if certain conditions are met such as locating outside of the right-of-way, no longer than a seven day stay within three months at the same location, not being located in drive aisles that would impair public safety or access, and that are not located on vacant property.

The Technical Committee examined the protection of on-street parking, limiting impacts to neighbors, protecting public safety and an approach on par with anticipated impact. The applicant has been in support.

Vice Chairman Captain opened the Public Hearing.

Mr. Daniel Bae, 4619 NE 18th Street, Renton, WA, 98059 represented the idea of bringing a mobile hair salon to Redmond. Customers would be mid-size to larger companies, with parking on the company lots and working with human resource departments to become an incentive for employees on a weekly or bi-weekly basis. The service would be different from a food truck in that the population would be coming into a trailer or truck and considered a commercial coach by the State. Every City has different ordinances. Redmond was a desirable location because of contacts at local major corporations. All components would be contained within the vehicles eliminating pollution and would not be left overnight on City property.

Commissioner Baker thanked Mr. Bae for coming and for the submitted letter. She asked staff if time constraints, a three-hour limitation, applied to mobile services in the same way as to food trucks. Mr. Churchill replied that the limitation would not apply to mobile services. The proposed time constraint was not more than seven days and three months at the same location, all day.

Vice Chairman Captain closed the Public Hearing, but left written comments open until a decision would be made. Mr. Churchill asked for any new issues from the Commission and Commissioner Miller asked if there in the Technical Committee's recommendation, would be a code developed to govern the appearance of the facilities. Mr. Churchill replied that, the Design Review Board would not be involved, and if exempt from a Temporary Use Permit, there would be no mechanism to review design as a permanent use permit allows.

Vice Chairman Captain began review of the issues matrix. The first question was whether mobile services should be allowed on vacant lots. Commissioner Nichols asked for the definition of a vacant lot as far as a paved or not paved parcel and asked if language was needed to be added around restrictions on the number of services in a lot. Commissioner Nichols asked that the issue be left open until language could be added or changed.

Vice Chairman Captain read the second question regarding profit or non-profit services. Commissioner Miller stated that the issue could be closed.

Vice Chairman Captain asked Commissioner Haverkamp to comment on the third issue regarding the recommended amendment, as the recommendation had been provided.

Commissioner Haverkamp asked for the issue to be closed.

Vice Chairman Captain asked for any discussion regarding the fourth issue. Commissioner Miller expressed that Mr. Bae's idea was very good, but the concern was possible unintended consequences of allowing the business to locate anywhere and use any appearance. Commissioner MacNichols had authored the question and was not present. Commissioner Miller desired to investigate slight tightening of rules to protect neighborhoods. Vice Chairman Captain agreed that the applicant of the current project did not present concern, but later applications may become problematic. Commissioner Nichols suggested that a different issue be created regarding neighborhood issues as the question of Commissioner MacNichols seemed to be around protecting brick and mortar businesses only. Commissioner Nichols noted distance restrictions in place in Louisiana that could be researched. Commissioner Miller stated that a discussion about residential areas was relevant and, that because brick and mortar businesses are asked to meet a series of regulations in order to do business including around the appearance of the building, a question of fairness needed to be addressed. Commissioner Baker suggested adding a new separate issue regarding residential neighborhoods to the matrix and Mr. Churchill replied in the affirmative.

Mr. Churchill stated that at the meeting next week issues one, four and five would be discussed. If the Commission makes a recommendation next week, a Council review and action would be anticipated later this summer.

Five Minute Break

Vice Chairman Captain excused Commissioner MacNichols who was unavoidably detained.

Study Session, Scope for 2016-2017 Comprehensive Plan Docket, presented by Ms. Judy Fani

Ms. Fani explained that the docketing process for proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan occurs once per year. Exhibit A in the Technical Committee Report provided a short summary of all proposals recommended for the docket. Exhibit B described the one privately-initiated proposal from Quadrant Homes.

The annual docketing process has five milestones: public outreach to inform the community and City staff of an opportunity to submit proposals for revisions to the Comprehensive Plan, the Technical Committee then provides a recommendation on the scope of the docket to the Planning Commission, the Commissioners hold an initial Study Session followed by a Public Hearing and second Study Session to provide a recommendation to Council, listing which proposals should appear on the docket. The Council reviews and approves a docket, and this sets the Planning Commission's work plan for the next year.

During the course of the following year, every proposal on the docket is studied in depth by the Technical Committee and then by the Planning Commission with Study Sessions and Public Hearings, and then reviewed by Council.

The Zoning Code lists criteria for proposed amendments to be given further consideration to be included in the docket scope, asking, for instance, if this is the appropriate process, if the proposal is consistent with the Redmond overall vision and if the proposal is consistent with state, federal and local laws. Another evaluation tool listed on page 10 of Exhibit A analyzes the cumulative impact of each proposal.

There are twenty-seven proposals on the proposed docket; twenty-one are carry-overs from prior dockets, five are new City-initiated proposals and one is a privately-initiated proposal. Some carryover proposals are not on the Commission agenda yet because they are awaiting study results or on hold for timing. The new City-initiated proposals from staff were described as follows: NE Rosehill Sub Area Transportation Policies, Preparation for Light Rail between East Lake Sammamish and Redmond Way, Policy and Regulatory Updates to Multi-Family Housing in Business Park Zones, the Cultural Resources Management Plan, and Updates to the Capital Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan.

The privately initiated proposal from Quadrant Homes is to amend the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code for an estimated 15½ acre site located at the SW corner of NE 124th Street and Willows Road in the northern most portion of the Willows Rosehill neighborhood. The proposal would change the land use designation and zoning from Business Park to Design District. A Design District land use designation is desired where zoning flexibility can enable context or appropriate mix of uses and structure types with site specific policies and regulations. There are already two Design Districts, one in Bear Creek and a second in SE Redmond. Challenges would be transportation access, addressing critical area constraints within the site, using site design and

other techniques to achieve transitions between the property and adjacent business parks, meeting affordable housing requirements and providing on-site recreational open space. The Quadrant Homes proposal would be reviewed as a quasi-judicial proposal, as it would consider the Comprehensive Plan designation of a single parcel. Ms. Fani reviewed the implications of a quasi-judicial action.

The Technical Committee found that the proposed amendment met the seven Zoning criteria for inclusion on the docket and merits further analysis and recommendation as a docketed topic. Quadrant's proposal also met the Design District criteria. The Technical Committee recommended that all twenty-seven proposals be included in the docket for 2016-17. The Public Hearing and Study Session will be held at the meeting next week. City Council activity on the docket is scheduled for September 6, 2016 with an anticipated October 18, 2016 approval.

Commissioner Miller asked how obligations or thresholds might factor into consideration when reviewing the Quadrant Homes proposal in light of its close proximity to Kirkland's zone and use designations.

Ms. Fani replied that effective transitions between properties were a requirement and that Design District zoning offers flexibility and through negotiation standards would be determined for the applicant to follow. Commissioner Miller offered an example of the question how Redmond Codes and Policies, in regard to distances, could be affected by another border jurisdiction with no control by Redmond over that zoning and land use.

Reports/Scheduling/Topics for Next Meeting(s)

Ms. Stiteler stated that there were no reports. Vice Chairman Captain stated that topics for the next meeting had been reported throughout the meeting.

ADJOURNMENT:

MOTION by Vice Chairman Captain to adjourn, MOTION seconded by Commissioner Nichols. The meeting adjourned at approximately 8:45 p.m.

Minutes Approved On:

9-14-2016

Planning Commission Chair



This page left intentionally blank.