Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
1. UC-1: consider adding concept of "economically viable" (Biethan)	Staff Comment/Recommendation The purpose of this policy is to identify mixed-use developments as one strategy for reducing air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. Staff believes that the economic dimension of land use is sufficiently addressed in the Economic Vitality element. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
2. DT-3: What does "small and independently owned" mean? (Biethan)	Staff Comment/Recommendation "Small and independently owned" does not mean independently owned national franchise. When this policy was adopted, there was a desire to especially encourage the success of locally-owned and operated boutique-type businesses, as opposed to national chain stores. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
3. DT-8: what does "honor" mean? (Biethan)	Staff Comment/Recommendation The original language specified that elements (artifacts) of the railroad should be included as part of the trail improvements. The proposed language is broader so as to give designers and the community more flexibility in proceeding with implementation of the Connector while retaining the idea of incorporating Redmond's history into the project. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
4. DT-8: how do we avoid collisions between vehicles and bicycles where multi-use trails cross streets in	Staff Comment/Recommendation Staff believes this is a project design issue that does not need to be addressed in policy. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9

Downtown? (Biethan)		
5. DT-10: "face" vs. "integrate" with respect to how buildings interact with Redmond Central Connector (Biethan)	Staff Comment/Recommendation "Integrate/interact with" the corridor might be better word selections. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
6. DT-13: what does "exceptional" mean? (Biethan)	Staff Comment/Recommendation To implement this policy, the implementing regulations allow up to 8 stories, as a bonus, when a minimum of 20% of the site area is provided as open space available to the public in the form of plazas/arcades. No change is recommended. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
7. *DT-32: consider "parking management and development plan" (Biethan)	Staff Comment/Recommendation The words "development and" were inadvertently deleted. Staff recommends keeping them in the policy. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
8. *OV-42: parking – in what format would it be provided? (Biethan)	Staff Comment/Recommendation See Transportation Element issue matrix for further discussion In 2009 the City completed the Overlake Parking Management Plan. The Plan evaluated a number of future parking strategies, including reduced parking requirements, public-private parking facilities, public parking facilities, and a combination of the above. The Plan is online at www.redmond.gov/cms/One.aspx?portalId=169&pageId=1216. To achieve urban form objectives, the zoning code already prohibits new surface parking lots in Overlake Village.	Opened 2/9

	Public Comment PC Comments	
9. Overall element structure – consider common policies, then DT, then OV (see Ed Hill, Willows neighborhood plans for examples) (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation Staff will evaluate this and bring back a recommendation to the Planning Commission. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
10. Page 5, bullet 1: which 18 hours? Note conflicts in Belltown (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation This is a figure of speech to express that businesses in Downtown are envisioned to be open well into the evening, but that the City is not anticipating 24-hour activity. Staff recommends no change. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
11. DT-1, bullet 3: reduce need for lengthy trips for whom? (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation The sentiment of this policy is that the convenience commercial centers are located at the outer edges of Downtown, closer to the residential neighborhoods, so that those residents need not travel through Downtown, for basic goods and services. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
12. DT-7: would like better link between trails and transportation	Staff Comment/Recommendation Staff will evaluate this and bring back a recommendation to the Planning Commission. Public Comment	Opened 2/9

(Miller)	PC Comments	
13. DT-10: consider also the south side of the rail corridor as well. Can we do more there? (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation Staff suggests "on either side" instead of "adjoining" to address Commissioner Miller's concern. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
14. DT-13: Over the long-term, can we expect more than 5-6 stories? (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation Previous Planning Commissions and City Councils have embraced this policy as integral to the vision for allowed building heights in the Downtown. Staff is not proposing changes to the vision for Downtown or the City as a whole. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
15. DT-29: preserve and defend midblock linkage system (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation Staff recommends adding "preserving" after "Completing". Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
16. DT-34: why constrain conversion of couplet until after 161st and 164th links are complete? What is the relationship? (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation Staff will consult with Transportation and bring back a recommendation to the Planning Commission. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
17. Page 29: why	Staff Comment/Recommendation	Opened 2/9

specify "under" SR 520 for link to Marymoor? (Miller)	Going "under" means under 520, as it rises, not going underground. The concepts currently envision the connections at the east and west ends of Marymoor Park. Staff recommends using "across" instead of "under". <u>Public Comment</u> <u>PC Comments</u>	
18. Page 37: there is a disconnect between honoring existing bungalows and redevelopment to multi-story condos (Miller)	<u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> The intent of the district is stated in the first paragraph of page 37, which is that the area is envisioned to be redeveloped over time. However the word "honor" is probably not a good word to use here. Staff recommends changing the end of the sentence to "… in developments that reflect the characteristics of the existing houses, with similar roof and architectural styles. <u>Public Comment</u> <u>PC Comments</u>	Opened 2/9
19. OV-13: what is this policy trying to say? (Miller)	<u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> The purpose of this policy is to reinforce that, though Downtown and Overlake are both urban centers in Redmond, they are now and are envisioned to be in the future distinct in terms of design and character. Alternative language could be: *"Use neighborhood-specific design standards and other design techniques to help create a character for Overlake that is distinct from the Downtown."* <u>Public Comment</u> <u>PC Comments</u>	Opened 2/9
20. OV-21.1: 51st overpass of SR 520 very pedestrian unfriendly; it's a gateway? (Miller)	<u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> The NE 51st overpass was identified as a gateway by neighborhood stakeholders. Staff recommends keeping the policy even though the area may not be pedestrian friendly. <u>Public Comment</u>	Opened 2/9

	PC Comments	
21. OV-34: Good policy. Need clearer definition of what facilities are meant (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation Staff believes the current policy provides sufficient direction. It identifies "pedestrian and bicycle standards" as the performance criteria for the multi-use pathway. The City's pedestrian and bicycle standards are found in the Transportation Master Plan. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
22. OV-37: "adjoining" is unclear (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation Staff recommends replacing "adjoining" with "at". The station in question is the one that will be at the Overlake Transit Center. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
23. Generally, some policies are very specific and others are more general. Try to operate at same level throughout (e.g., OV-17 is specific) (Julinsey)	Staff Comment/Recommendation Staff agrees with the observation and will look to see if there are policies that are overly broad or specific that could be brought closer into line with the rest of the policies. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
24. DT-8, bullet 1: appears to preclude trolleys and trolley feasibility study is not yet complete (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation Staff will consult with the Parks and Transportation Departments and bring a recommendation to the Planning Commission. Public Comment	Opened 2/9

	PC Comments	
25. OV-9, DT-35: these say the same thing. Should address impacts to streets, ramps (vs. 520 mainline) (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation Staff will consult Transportation and others and bring back a recommendation to the Planning Commission. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
26. Use consistent transit terminology (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation Staff will review the element with this in mind. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
27. Consider duplicating PARCC and TR-1 maps for clarity (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation Staff recommends against duplicating these maps as it is difficult to ensure that the duplicate maps are updated when the original maps are updated, especially because these maps are maintained by departments other than Planning. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
28. 152nd cross section: does analysis show that 3 lanes is preferable to 2 given land-use and character objectives? (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation At the outset of the 152nd Ave NE Corridor Study, the Overlake Neighborhood Plan identified it as a three-lane street. As part of the traffic analysis for the 152nd Ave NE Corridor Study, the City analyzed traffic conditions assuming that 152nd Ave NE would have no turn lanes (i.e., a two-lane street). The analysis concludes that gridlock condition would not develop, but that queues could extend beyond two blocks on 152nd Ave NE. The guiding principles of the 152nd study speak to creating a lively people place, supporting existing business and new development, having an active streetscape on 152nd, and overall	Opened 2/9

	having people who visit say "Wow!" Guided by the principles above, staff recommends a three-lane section for 152nd Ave NE. City staff believes the queue lengths projected for the two-lane scenario would be unacceptable. Staff believes that the scenario with left-turn lanes meets neighborhood plan goals of creating a pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly corridor that will also be an active retail street. Public Comment PC Comments	
29. What does note 5 mean on cross section table? (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation The indication for note 5 should be deleted. It is leftover from the "old" code. It indicates that medians/two-way left-turn lanes are evaluated on a project-by-project basis based on volumes, etc. Because the code ("old" and "new") gives the Technical Committee authority to amend the cross section based on project-specific conditions, this note is not necessary. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
30. Where are BRT stops on 152nd? (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation A BRT stop is planned near the existing Park & Ride. When light rail opens, that station could shift, but that decision has not been made. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
31. Provide information about rain gardens in street/pathway cross sections (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation Information about how rain gardens would be used can be found on pages 46, 50, 51, and 56 of the Street Requirements document provided in your February 9, 2011 packet. On 151st Ave NE, for example, low impact development features run alongside and underneath the urban pathway. Public Comment	Opened 2/9

	PC Comments	

N:\PLANNING\Comp Plan Update Periodic 2010-11\Urban Centers Element\2011-02-16 Issues Matrix.docx