# REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

December 15, 2010

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**: Chairman Hinman, Vice-Chair Gregory, Commissioners

Biethan, Miller, Flynn and Julinsey

**COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED**: Commissioner O'Hara

COMMISSIONERS CURRENTLY SERVING ON THE CODE REWRITE

**COMMISSION:** Canaan Bontadelli, Vibhas Chandorkar

**STAFF PRESENT**: Pete Sullivan and Kim Dietz, Redmond Planning

Department

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Kathryn Kerby of Lady of Letters, Inc.

**CALL TO ORDER** 

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Hinman in the Council Chambers at City Hall.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA AND MEETING SUMMARIES/MINUTES:

No changes to the agenda.

The Meeting Summaries for December 8, 2010 were approved with no changes.

The Meeting Minutes for November 17, 2010 were approved with no changes.

### ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

There were no questions or comments from the audience.

**REPORT APPROVAL, Overlake Amendments, Phase III,** presented by Pete Sullivan, (on behalf of Jeff Churchill), Redmond City Planner

Mr. Sullivan began by saying that all the Commissioners should have received an email from Mr. Churchill about minor edits made since their last meeting, along with copies of those edits. He asked if there were any questions on those final edits. Vice-Chair Gregory asked Mr. Sullivan to point out the changes made during the prep meeting, since that is not a public meeting. Chairman Hinman and Mr. Sullivan listed the changes:

- 1) The final two words in the final paragraph on page 3 of the report changed from *moving* vehicles to traffic flow. The complete revised sentence became: Suggested making 51<sup>st</sup> Avenue NE active retail street, while 152<sup>nd</sup> Avenue NE would put a greater emphasis on traffic flow.
- 2) Issues table #2 was changed to indicate that although the issue was closed, there would be future follow up to review completed traffic analysis and evaluate street sections. That language also appears within the body of the report.

Chairman Hinman added that other than those changes, the amendment had already been approved. The motion was made and seconded to approve the report. The report was unanimously approved.

**REPORT APPROVAL, Bear Creek Neighborhood Plan Update**, presented by Pete Sullivan, (on behalf of Jeff Churchill), Redmond City Planner

Vice-Chair Gregory reported that there was also a single change to this report on page 4, in reference to the bus pullouts on Avondale Road. In the middle of the paragraph, the text was changed to: *Commissioners questioned the idea of naming that particular solution, specifically given that Metro Transit is known to avoid bus pullouts when it is difficult to pull back into traffic.* Chairman Hinman explained that this amendment had also previously been approved. The motion was made and seconded to approve the report. The report was unanimously approved.

PUBLIC HEARING AND STUDY SESSION, Neighborhood Commercial Development Guide Amendment – Policy and Regulatory Updates, presented by Kim Dietz, Redmond City Planner

Chairman Hinman opened the public hearing. Ms. Dietz began by presenting the amendment revision schedule, which began in November and will extend into January. She emphasized that the written portion of the testimony will remain open until at least the next meeting on January 12<sup>th</sup>. Any written comments submitted prior to the January 12<sup>th</sup> meeting would be presented at that meeting.

Ms. Dietz explained that the amendments focused on the criteria that would permit land use and zoning for neighborhood commercial activity. These amendments included design standards that would improve compatibility for that activity within otherwise residential neighborhoods. This is not a rezone, but rather a refinement of the existing Neighborhood Commercial zone classification. The amendments improve consistency between City policies and regulations, and also served as a timely update to policies, because this portion of the policy and regulations has not been reviewed for some time.

Ms. Dietz spoke with many businesses and citizen stakeholders about this update, along with regional experts. She surveyed businesses in both Redmond and beyond, focusing on the small businesses types that could most likely occur in a neighborhood setting. Alongside her research, the City's ongoing Comprehensive Plan update to sustainability policy has relevant sections pertaining to Neighborhood Commercial zoning. The City also has a Healthy Eating and Active Living grant which featured aspects of healthy food access and non-motorized mobility.

Neighborhood Commercial was just one of Redmond's several commercial land-use and zoning classifications. Others included General Commercial and Gateway Design Districts. Neighborhood Commercial was the smallest of the commercial zones, and was intended to be distributed outside of the City's urban centers. It was intended to provide daily goods and services conveniently close to both residential and business areas. The City has proposed two types of Neighborhood Commercial zones:

2

- 1) NC-1
  - a. Smaller scale

- i. One acre or less parcel size
- b. Everyday goods and services
  - i. Cafes, restaurants, groceries, salons, spas
  - ii. Professional services
  - iii. Cultural, recreational and government services
- 2) NC-2
  - a. Medium scale
  - b. Additional goods and services
    - i. Medical/dental
    - ii. Fuel
    - iii. Auto/marine parts & service

Ms. Dietz explained that Neighborhood Commercial parcels would meet the following criteria:

- 1) Walkable
- 2) Bikeable
- 3) Connected to City paths, sidewalks, trails and easy access to transit service
- 4) Compatible with existing nearby activities
- 5) Serve as a community gathering place, typically by featuring some kind of plaza

The Neighborhood Commercial parcels would need to serve the following functions:

- 1) LU-8: maintain development regulations to promote compatibility between uses and neighborhood character, ambience, environmental quality and minimize potential impact on public facilities
- 2) LU-10: promote compatibility between land uses by minimizing adverse impacts on lower-intensity and/or more sensitive areas
- 3) LU-11: minimize land-use conflicts when there is potential for adverse impact by:
  - a. Ensuring that uses or structures meet performance standards to limit impact
  - b. Create effective transition between adjacent land uses

### Siting criteria would be:

- 1) NC-1:
  - a. One acre or smaller parcel size
  - b. Mixed use
  - c. Collector arterial and non-motorized connections
  - d. Within walking/biking distance of City parks
  - e. At least a half a mile from Urban Centers
- 2) NC-2:
  - a. Three acre or smaller parcel size
  - b. Mixed use
  - c. Multimodal corridor
  - d. Located at intersections of collector arterials
  - e. Multi-family
  - f. On or near non-motorized connections
  - g. Within walking or biking distance of City parks
  - h. One mile from Urban Centers

Ms. Dietz displayed a series of City maps. The first showed two existing Neighborhood Commercial sites, one in the northeast corner of the City and the other centered along the western boundary. The second map displayed population densities by neighborhood, with the

Education Hill area as the most populous, and the Sammamish valley being the least populous. Ms. Dietz overlaid a map of collector arterials, non-motorized paths and trails, and finally other zoning and land-use classifications, to show how each of those features served different City neighborhoods. That combination revealed three likely locations for Neighborhood Commercial land use:

- 1) Northwest and southwest corners of the City
- 2) Eastern
- 3) Southeastern boundary areas

Southeast Redmond's neighborhood plan actually already proposed three potential areas for the Neighborhood Commercial zone, which was based on earlier analysis.

Design criteria for Neighborhood Commercial structures would include:

- 1) Lighting that focused downward to limit off-property light spillage.
- 2) Signage would be limited to placement on facades, and not be self-illuminated.
- 3) Articulation and modulation consistent with nearby residential designs.
- 4) Windows and glazing to avoid blank walls on any façade, i.e., no blank walls.
- 5) Outdoor storage of certain elements would be allowed, such as flowers, produce.
- 6) Smaller parking lots would need landscaping for better blending.

This concluded Ms. Dietz's presentation. Chairman Hinman opened the public hearing. No one from the audience came forward. Chairman Hinman closed the oral portion of the public hearing but left open the written portion of the testimony until at least the January 12<sup>th</sup> meeting. He indicated that staff had received one email on this topic and he invited Ms. Dietz to go over the contents of that email. Ms. Dietz explained that John Shively from King County had called to discuss several questions with staff, and then had submitted an email to Ms. Dietz, as a summary of those discussions:

- 1) The county did support smaller forms of commercial zoning.
- 2) In those smaller zones, the County allowed different standards than otherwise permitted.
- 3) Specifically, in the area of 116<sup>th</sup> and Avondale, the County had already determined that commercial development in that area would fail travel-shed standards as stipulated in Level of Service B standards. However, the portion just north of 116<sup>th</sup> that lies within the county jurisdiction does not fail that standard.
- 4) The County would support those land uses with the caveat that development is done carefully to avoid failing Level of Service standards.

Commissioner Biethan asked if Ms. Dietz could restate those concerns in less technical terms. He wanted to know why Neighborhood Commercial would fail the travel-shed standards. Ms. Dietz replied that Mr. Shively was concerned about traffic delays either approaching and/or going through an intersection. For instance, if traffic regularly backed up in advance of an intersection even though traffic moved through the intersection smoothly, that would still constitute a failure to meet Level of Service guidelines. Mr. Shively simply wanted to point out that some loss of Level of Service standards would be acceptable to the County in exchange for the other benefits offered by the Neighborhood Commercial development. However, that tolerance was limited and Mr. Shively simply wanted the City to be aware that careful development was warranted in those areas. Commissioner Biethan asked if that was the County's analysis of County intersections, or County analysis of City intersections. Ms. Dietz replied that the 116<sup>th</sup> and Avondale intersection was right at the edge between City and County jurisdictions.

At present, that intersection did not fail the County's Level of Standard criteria, and the County supported Neighborhood Commercial in principle.

Chairman Hinman added that the Level of Service definitions are tied to specific definitions that can be measured. Vice-Chair Gregory asked if the City was still using Level of Service criteria. He was under the impression that that measurement system had been replaced by the new mobility unit standards as part of the City's shift to concurrency. Chairman Hinman replied that Redmond did prefer to use mobility units; however traffic analysis conventionally used Level of Service instead to measure performance. Commissioner Miller added that Level of Service measured only vehicular movement through any given area, while mobility units included all transit modes, including pedestrian, bicycle, mass transit and vehicular. So it was possible that Level of Service for vehicular traffic might suffer but overall mobility units could increase simultaneously. He read Mr. Shively's letter as being generally supportive of Neighborhood Commercial.

Chairman Hinman proposed that they go over the issues matrix, starting with Issues #1, #4 and #6, each of which are closed pending additional language, then they could go over the active items. Commissioner Miller had initiated those three issues pending acceptable language, so Chairman Hinman invited him to review them.

Commissioner Miller was still of the opinion that Neighborhood Commercial was a very good concept in general. However, he was still concerned because of incompatibility between old zoning paradigms versus new expectations for land-use performance. For instance, Neighborhood Commercial development that provided goods and services within walkable distance would meet every sustainability goal listed elsewhere in the City's policies. Yet zoning rules were still created in a proscriptive manner, by listing what could not be done on any given parcel. Commissioner Miller felt that zoning should be done in a prescriptive manner, i.e., listing what can be done, rather than what cannot be done. For instance, Issue #1 related to the requirement that either NC-2 be within access of existing mixed-use neighborhoods. That added a layer of proscriptive requirements which limited where this otherwise desirable land use could be implemented.

Ms. Dietz replied that for Issue #1, staff had revised LU-40's text from be within a mixed-use neighborhood to provide a variety of uses, to be within a mixed use neighborhood that includes residential and business concentrations. Staff also added to provide a variety of land uses including housing, retail and office. Furthermore, Vice-Chair Gregory had previously pointed out that references to a sense of place were more accurately described by an integrated neighborhood place.

Commissioner Biethan asked whether NC-2 still required proximity to parks. He pointed out that different meeting summaries listed that inconsistently. He asked what the current status of that requirement was. Ms. Dietz said she had included references to the parks requirement within both NC-1 and NC-2 because that was how both of those definitions were proposed, even though that part of the definition is currently being reconsidered. Chairman Hinman asked if the parks proximity was a requirement or a preference. Ms. Dietz replied that park proximity was a requirement of NC-1, but only a preference for NC-2. Commissioner Biethan will hold the rest of his comments until discussion of that particular issue.

Commissioner Miller was willing to wrap up his comments on #1, #4 and #6 by saying he questioned the requirement that either NC-1 or NC-2 have requirements to be near mixed-use neighborhoods. That could remain a preference, but he suggested eliminating the requirement. Otherwise, he was concerned that this good concept would otherwise never find a home due to all the requirements. He requested they defer Issue #1, but they could go ahead and close Issue #4. Issue #6 dealt with minimum parking requirements. The language in question is at the top of Page 12. Commissioner Miller would still prefer to eliminate such minimum language, but for this issue that concern applied more to NC-1 than NC-2. He felt it was sufficient to encourage walkability and bikeability and reduce dependence on autos. Dictating parking requirements should be left to negotiations between the bank and the developer, rather than the City getting involved. Ultra-small-scale Neighborhood Commercial did not need to be defined by parking requirements. Commissioner Miller was willing to close the issue.

Chairman Hinman introduced Issue #2, regarding the creation of a Neighborhood Commercial zone even smaller than the proposed NC-1. He invited Ms. Dietz to go over the staff's most recent discussions on this issue. Ms. Dietz said one thing staff had discussed was the requirement for multiple uses on site. They wanted to keep that criteria because having more than one business and/or tenant would provide dense commercial development and substance, and encourage small business. That requirement would also increase shopper traffic to the variety of businesses, thereby helping ensure no one business failed to thrive. A solo business might otherwise not get enough customer traffic. That stipulation is supported by land-use experts whom staff consulted. The required or preferred elements would bump any given development from a struggling single business to a neighborhood's pivotal gathering place. Furthermore, such diversity often helped carry those parcels through economic downturns where customer traffic might slack off and any solo business would go under.

Chairman Hinman added that any allowance for a so-called NC-.05 would still carry triggers or criteria, and suggested taking advantage of neighborhood network processes to gain perspective of neighborhood residents. Ms. Dietz added that the triggers were:

- 1) In a thriving economy, demand for NC-1 and NC-2 remained absent.
- 2) Nearby residents voiced concerns about NC-1 and/or NC-2.
- 3) The City received a variety of inquiries even in the absence of submitted plans.

The City's new Neighborhood Network could also provide feedback on how well the NC-1 and NC-2 land uses are serving those areas and whether changes are still needed.

Commissioner Miller replied that his concern was not to put more restrictions on NC-1 or NC-2 but to remove those restrictions. He wanted to move away from what cannot be done towards what can be done, which is what he was trying to express in his earlier comments. Commissioner Flynn added that he disliked the one-acre requirement for NC-1 because that might be too much commercial development in an otherwise very quiet neighborhood setting. On the other hand, he was increasingly in favor of something like an NC-.05 but he felt that was different enough as to merit a separate discussion. Commissioner Miller asked if there was any current allowance for a bed-and-breakfast type business within City neighborhoods. Ms. Dietz said that bed-and-breakfast businesses were already allowed as special uses, with its own set of requirements. She had explored the concept of an NC-.05 during her research. Issues like deliveries and garbage service are an issue for most businesses. One business that Ms. Dietz specifically looked at was a

small bakery. If that bakery operated with typical breakfast service, deliveries would often occur during very early hours.

Commissioner Flynn felt that parcels with multiple businesses, even small ones, should be located farther away from neighborhoods to reduce neighborhood impact from those early-hour services. He asked at what point the City would be interested in exploring the NC-.05 concept further. Commissioner Miller added that he would like to differentiate between those criteria for design of the building versus criteria for the operation of the building. He pointed out that garbage trucks and delivery vehicles already operate in his residential neighborhood even without commercial activity. Construction crews could be required to meet certain hourly restrictions to reduce noise but operational noise was already present.

Ms. Dietz replied that most deliveries could not always be scheduled by individual businesses since they are on a fixed delivery route. Additionally, a bakery might feature early morning deliveries while a café might receive deliveries during the day. Another issue is the amount of product sold per unit time. The more product turned over, the more deliveries. So the delivery frequency and schedule would vary by type of business. Ms. Dietz showed a slide of several neighborhoods of varying densities:

- 1) Vicinity of the Third-Place Books in Seattle's Ravenna neighborhood.
- 2) Vicinity of the Jackson's Corner Market area in Bend, Oregon.
- 3) Vicinity of the Grass Lawn neighborhood in Redmond.

The reason Redmond has set up their land-use guidelines differently than other urban areas are because the City neighborhoods are already different. In the three aerial photos, the parcels and homes are clearly larger in Redmond than in Seattle, so the population densities per unit area are also different. Therefore, the neighborhood businesses in Seattle which they would like to emulate in Redmond may actually not work as well in Redmond. Hence the caution in setting up land-use principles to encourage and govern commercial land use. City planners wanted to allow for this type of land use while protecting the City from situations like a lot of empty storefronts because neighborhood density was too low to support the business.

Commissioner Miller wanted to comment on the Jackson's Corner Market since he was the one who drew attention to that area. It is a new 2,000 square feet stand alone business which changes its character during the day. In the morning it serves as a bakery and coffeehouse. During the day it is a deli and lunch counter with a small market component; at night it is a pizza place with live music, and closes at 10:00 p.m. All within a single-family neighborhood and less than half a mile from downtown. It has already become a neighborhood icon. Bend, Oregon has other such icons.

Commissioner Biethan agreed with many of the divergent statements. He would like to see more NC-1 and NC-2 type developments scattered around Redmond, and he would also like to see fewer restrictions. Specifically, he really did not see the need to locate near a park. He understood the preference but not the requirement. Perhaps the resolution would be to go ahead and have a split vote, where the majority of the Commission agreed to the amendments as proposed, but the minority went ahead and declared that they liked the concept yet disliked the mechanism to achieve the concept. Commissioner Biethan was wary of creating any land-use designation which featured either ambiguity or barriers. Chairman Hinman asked if their concerns would be satisfied by changing the language, perhaps from proscriptive to prescriptive as defined by Commissioner Miller. He warned that that would stand out as being a departure

from how staff usually expresses new amendments. However, Chairman Hinman wondered if perhaps they could get past these objections by repackaging the language. He asked Ms. Dietz and Vice-Chair Gregory whether perhaps they could address all these issues in some integrated fashion.

Vice-Chair Gregory agreed that the Issues Matrix was probably not the best way to address the issues which keep arising. He kept hearing a need to be more innovative. Yet the proposed amendments had taken existing code and tweaked it to allow for a new land use. He also pointed out that staff was justified in trying to proceed with an abundance of caution, because there were risks that this new concept would not always manifest in desirable ways. Vice-Chair Gregory agreed with Commissioner Miller's observation that perhaps they should move away from what's prohibited to what's encouraged. All those concerns gelled with Commissioner Flynn's observations that the type of business would in part determine how intrusive that land use would be in a neighborhood. Finally, there is the need to respect what the neighborhood wants. To integrate all these ideas, he was most in favor of Chairman Hinman's suggestion to start with a pilot program to help flesh out some of these issues. Commissioner Flynn believed that a pilot program would help the City determine whether staff merely needed to tweak existing regulations, or be bold and remove a lot of barriers in favor of a new, but quantified idea.

Chairman Hinman asked the Commission whether the main sticking point was the difference between the suggested NC-.05 and NC-1, such that NC-2 was acceptable as-is. Commissioner Miller said he felt the NC-2 designation simply provided a container for existing parcel developments and he did not see much new demand for additional parcels in that category. However, the proposed criteria fit that larger parcel size a lot better. His objections really were regarding the smaller NC-1 parcel size. Commissioner Miller felt that the smaller the parcel size, the greater the incentives and/or flexibility should be. Those would also be more relevant to the City's stated goals for sustainability and walkability.

Chairman Hinman asked Commissioner Julinsey for her comments. She replied that she was comfortable with the language for NC-2. For NC-1 and NC-.5, she felt it was too early to make that distinction. She would like more input from neighbors and businesses via either the Neighborhood Network and/or a pilot program. She felt that they could move forward with NC-1 for the moment, but perhaps insert language to revisit this topic in the future.

Chairman Hinman asked Ms. Dietz whether they could separate NC-1 from NC-2 approval, so they can move on with NC-2, yet address these additional concerns for NC-1. Ms. Dietz and Chairman Hinman agreed to summarize the guiding principles and call out the threads which have run through all the individual issues. Then they can discuss those threads separate from the details which they are stuck on at the moment. The discussion can then be continued during their next meeting. Ms. Dietz believed that the real source of those threads went back to the Siting criteria and how the two NC categories would fit into various neighborhoods. She reminded the Commission that three guiding principles were to:

- 1) Meet the ambience needs not only for the immediate neighborhood but also bordering neighborhoods, in the cases where a suitable location was at the boundary between two or more areas.
- 2) Not interfere with Downtown business activities.
- 3) Avoid commercial spread such that there was no longer a distinctive break between Downtown commercial activity and residential areas.

Chairman Hinman asked the Commission if everyone agreed on these general principles, and if the obstacle was how those principles were to be implemented. Commissioner Miller believed that if they focus on protecting the urban centers and ignore what the neighborhoods want, they have missed the point. Ms. Dietz suggested that they go through the general principles to see which of those values were causing the issues. She started by asking if the one acre and/or three acre size stipulation was a problem. Commissioner Flynn wanted to clarify that NC-1 could go up to one acre, but did not need to be exactly one acre. Ms. Dietz replied that NC-1 could be parcels smaller than but not larger than one acre. Commissioner Julinsey clarified that she felt the City ultimately answered to the Redmond public. The Commission could come up with whatever criteria they thought best, but if the public demanded something else then the City had to look at how to provide it. Chairman Hinman felt that part of the problem lay in the fact that the City was acting proactively in this instance, making available a land use that planners thought was desired even though specific instances of it were uncommon. Chairman Hinman felt that proactive stance would prove to enable the fruition of such anticipated demand. He asked if there were any further concerns about the specific one acre/three acre criteria. There were none.

Chairman Hinman asked about the next criteria, the stipulation for mixed use, which could refer to either the types of neighborhood where this land use could occur, and/or for the number of businesses on any given parcel. Ms. Dietz suggested they start with the mixed-use neighborhood aspect, where this land use would be permitted within neighborhoods that already featured a mix of residential and business parks. Chairman Hinman asked if anyone had comments or concerns. Commissioner Miller felt that that requirement was limiting. He pointed out that while staff had consulted with business owners and development experts, Commissioner Miller had not yet heard a lot of input from the residents themselves. They have talked over the years about how neighborhoods have lost their sense of place and a nucleus for the community. He felt that providing that gathering place could have benefit even if the surrounding neighborhood is monochromatic. Commissioner Miller felt those neighborhoods which were categorically prevented from tapping this type of land use could ironically need it the most.

Commissioner Flynn felt that the combination of parcel size and multi-use were mutually exclusive. The multi-use requirement would work well on a one-acre parcel, yet would be too much commercial activity for an average neighborhood. The smaller parcels would work well in a quiet neighborhood setting, but would not meet the NC-1 multi-tenant criteria. Ms. Dietz flagged both aspects of the multi-use criteria as being problematic and in need of further discussion. She asked if the next item, namely the proximity to roads, trails and pathways, was a problem. Commissioner Miller said he felt walkability was more important in this context than bikeability, given the proposed radius. The solution could be as simple as providing sidewalks.

Chairman Hinman went back to the topic of mixed use, because there was the issue of multiple land uses within a given neighborhood, as well as multiple uses on any given parcel. Commissioner Biethan pointed out that even within multiuse on a given parcel there might be multiple tenants all providing similar services, or multiple tenants all providing very different services. Chairman Hinman proposed that they use the term mixed use to designate a neighborhood with a mix of different land uses, but use multi-tenant to describe what would be required on any given parcel. Commissioner Miller asked if part of the parcel use would also potentially include housing, for instance in a work-below-live-above arrangement. Ms. Dietz confirmed that was not only an allowed use, it was incentivized by allowing more square

footage. On this issue, she had marked down that they wanted to further discuss the multi-tenant aspect. Commissioners Flynn and Miller both said such an allowance for single tenants on those smaller parcels might succeed where they would struggle on larger parcels. Chairman Hinman said this was where he felt the City was simply trying to reduce risk of vacant storefronts. Commissioner Biethan said even a two-tenant property could end up with one of the spaces vacant at any given time. He doubted the validity of the theory that the remaining tenant or tenants could carry the costs of the property until that vacant space was refilled. Commissioner Miller added that the City has taken this same risk in the past, with vacancies at the very innovative Lionsgate. Yet that same development became more popular over time. Risk is not always bad.

### **BREAK**

Chairman Hinman started the conversation on listing parks as either a required or preferred element for permitting a Neighborhood Commercial land use. Ms. Dietz commented that she wanted to emphasize the concept of *integrated place* as one of the reasons for requiring or preferring a park to be nearby. Commissioner Biethan said he believed that desirable sense of place was more dependent upon how the parcel is used; for instance if it is adjacent to a lake or a stream, or has some kind of internal landscaping, rather than arbitrarily requiring that it be near a City park. Ms. Dietz asked if proximity to Urban Centers was an issue. Chairman Hinman said he felt many of Commissioner Miller's comments were driven not by a concern about radius but rather about range of uses in different areas. He invited Commissioner Miller to expand on that distinction.

Commissioner Miller said that he differentiated between NC-1 and NC-2 in this regard. NC-2 has a legitimate need for a distant radius, due to the additional uses permitted for that classification. However, for NC-1 he felt that the radius was inappropriate because it conflicts with the goal of walkability which begs the question of what defines walkability. Access, distance, and topography would all be considerations, as would the need to cross arterials with high speeds and high volumes. The reason Commissioner Miller brought up Bend, Oregon's example is because their code took that prescriptive approach of defining what they wanted, rather than what they did not want. He believed Chairman Hinman was exactly correct when he suggested the code could generally list what they want to see, yet allow for details to protect the City from undesirable consequences, such as dilution of the Urban Center. He also did not like defining that protection goal in terms of radius and buffer zones.

Chairman Hinman proposed they go back and look through the definitions provided for NC-1 to see which seemed appropriate and which could be reworded. Ms. Dietz added the encouragement to synch up the listed uses for NC-1 with the definitions to ensure that both the general concept and the specific definitions were appropriate. Also, if some definitions were missing, look for the use that would allow those definitions to be there.

Chairman Hinman wanted to discuss Issue #7 regarding floor area, and how that relates to affordable housing and green incentives. He hoped to discuss this without bringing up the issues which have already bogged down the other topics. Since Commissioner Flynn had commented on this previously, he invited Commissioner Flynn to start the conversation. Commissioner Flynn said he was still trying to understand what was meant by floor-area ratios. He was satisfied with the reply provided by staff. Chairman Hinman asked whether green building incentives

would realistically make a difference on such compact parcels. He suspected it would not make much difference for development of small parcels. Ms. Dietz replied that affordable housing incentives would add up such that developers could conceivably create another 1300 square feet of living space, enough for one or two additional units for an NC-1 parcel. The green construction incentives operated in a similar way. She offered to bring back revised language to make those incentives clearer. Chairman Hinman asked if the Commissioners had any other questions regarding incentives. Commissioner Flynn asked if the affordable housing and/or green incentives were new. Ms. Dietz said no, those incentives have been around for awhile. He asked if they were working to increase either affordable housing or green constructions. Ms. Dietz indicated they were making a difference. The Downtown area is about to have many residential units come onto the market which were built using these incentives.

Chairman Hinman suggested they abbreviate Ms. Dietz's planned presentation on kiosks and a few other topics, so that they would have time to go over reports. Ms. Dietz quickly went through the rest of her items. Carts and Kiosks would be allowed under the Neighborhood Commercial designation. Vending carts and drive-up stands were the two most likely implementations of that, and she provided details on both. The main difference between a cart and kiosk is that a cart is a temporary structure while a kiosk is a permanent structure. Ms. Dietz showed two aerial examples of how either of those structures could be accommodated for either NC-1 or NC-2.

Chairman Hinman suspended further discussion on this topic so that they could stay on schedule. He invited Mr. Sullivan to proceed with reports.

#### **REPORTS**

Mr. Sullivan reported on City Council's study session regarding principles of sustainability. He had provided that report to the Commissioners in their meeting packet. These emerged from November's Livable Redmond event, which he summarized in a previous meeting. City Council had requested a study session on the topic due to the far-reaching implications for City implementation of these principles. Staff then created an issues matrix listing each principle, corresponding principles or goals from the Comprehensive Plan, and examples of current City actions to achieve those items. The result of that study session was that all segments of Redmond society would need to be involved in implementation of those goals. Staff continued to solicit input on what City government's role should be in achieving those goals. City Council is scheduled to approve the principles on January 4<sup>th</sup>. The final report is available on the City website.

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

## **ADJOURN**

Chairman Hinman adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:00 p.m.

Minutes Approved On: Planning Commission Chair