

An asterisk* denotes crossover issue – pertains to other Elements

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p>1. * What is the parking strategy of the City – does it include public parking facilities?</p> <p>(Biethan)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> Please refer to Transportation Element issues matrix.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u> None</p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> Planning Commission questions if policies sufficiently address the need for adequate parking in commercial areas to be provided through various means.</p>	<p>Opened 2/9/11</p>
<p>2. FW-29 speaks to making sure that the cost of capital facility improvements are borne in proportion to the benefit received; it further states, “Allocate the cost of facilities that are generated by and that benefit growth to those generating that growth.”</p> <p>Issue – is this equitable and fair to developers?</p> <p>(Biethan)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> Decision makers have wrestled with the overall question of who should bear the costs of growth, with a great deal of consideration given to the fairness and equity issues. The idea that new growth should pay for itself is one which has been debated at length – with the resultant establishment of a financial plan where impact fees fund a percentage of growth-serving capital facilities as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Fire impact fees - 75% of the \$3.2 million (2006) fire capital program; ▪ Park impact fees – 80% of the \$30.1 million (2006) park capital program; ▪ Transportation impact fees – 38% of the \$396 million (2006) capital program. An additional 15% of program funding is provided by developers through street frontage dedications and improvements, bringing total developer funding to 53% of the transportation capital program. <p>The City collects school impact fees from residential development on behalf of the Lake Washington School District. School impact fees charged to single-family and multi-family residences represent 15% and 5%, respectively, of the cost of school facilities needed to serve growth (2010).</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u> None</p>	<p>Opened 2/9/11</p>

2010 – 2011 Comprehensive Plan Update – GOALS/VISION/Framework ELEMENT

An asterisk* denotes crossover issue – pertains to other Elements

	<u>PC Comment</u>	
<p>3. The vision of two urban centers is very strong in the G/V/F Element and others. Does the strength of that vision diminish that of other areas of the City? E.g., does it marginalize neighborhoods? (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> While the vision for the Urban Centers is strong, it is not intended to diminish the importance of neighborhoods within the overall fabric of the City. Staff will look for opportunities in text and policies to describe the role of neighborhoods in a sustainable community; embracing diversity in architecture, culture and lifestyles, with access to services and amenities by a variety of travel options.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u> None</p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	<p>Opened 2/9/11</p>
<p>4. Old Town should be described as an area within Downtown, not on par with or as a neighborhood (e.g., Overlake, for example). (Hinman)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> As noted by the Commission, text and policies that imply that the historic area of the Downtown neighborhood is a neighborhood unto itself could be a remnant from an earlier draft. Staff will review to make the distinction more clear.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	<p>Opened 2/9/11</p>
<p>5. * Comprehensive Plan needs to be reviewed to make it more accessible for the reader with consistency in terminology and</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> So noted. Staff will work to confirm terminology and make consistent throughout document. Other methods for graphic improvements will be incorporated as drafts progress.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p>	<p>Opened 2/9/11</p>

2010 – 2011 Comprehensive Plan Update – GOALS/VISION/Framework ELEMENT

An asterisk* denotes crossover issue – pertains to other Elements

<p>graphics (e.g., paragraph headings) that provide better “wayfinding” through the document.</p>	<p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	
<p>6. pp. 10-11 speak to both the vision of a green community and preserving elements of the natural environment.</p> <p>Do we need to make distinction more clear? (Hinman)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></p> <p>The vision of Redmond having a green character is accomplished in a variety of ways. The text on p. 10 speaks to protecting/enhancing the natural features that the City enjoys, such as the Sammamish River, Lake Sammamish, Bear Creek, forested hillsides, and the open space/rural character north and east of the City, for example.</p> <p>In addition, the text on p. 11 seems to address more the preservation of natural features in the development context. This also is an important aspect of helping to contribute to the vision of Redmond’s continued green character.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	<p>Opened 2/9/11</p>
<p>7. * Should the City be explicit about mode split goals in policies?</p> <p>FW 32.5 states, “Use performance measures to measure progress towards Redmond’s planned transportation system.”</p> <p>Should the target be included in the policy? (Hinman)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></p> <p>Please refer to Transportation Element issues matrix.</p> <p>Further, our practice is to not put policies, particularly framework policies - in quantifiable or regulatory terms, but use functional plans or regulatory documents for that purpose.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	<p>Opened 2/9/11</p>

2010 – 2011 Comprehensive Plan Update – GOALS/VISION/Framework ELEMENT

An asterisk* denotes crossover issue – pertains to other Elements

<p>8. * What is the relationship between agriculture and recreation: are they always compatible and if not, how do we accommodate both uses? (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> (See also Land Use Element). Through GMA, the cities accommodate and promote urban activities within their boundaries and within the Urban Growth Areas as defined by King County and agreed to by cities in the County. Cities may be allowed under GMA to have land designated for agricultural uses within their jurisdictions, but Redmond has chosen not to have an “Agriculture” designation in its Comprehensive Plan. The Urban Recreation land use designation and UR zoning permit agriculture – as well as other uses, such as ball fields.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	<p>Opened 2/9/11</p>
---	---	----------------------

N:\PLANNING\Comp Plan periodic 2010-11\Introduction, Goals, Vision, Framework Element\Issues Matrix 2-16-11