

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p>1. What are the land uses that would not be allowed in the staff proposal – conversely, what land uses has the applicant requested in addition to the staff proposal for the designated area? (<i>Flynn, Hinman</i>)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 6/29/11: See attached chart – Attachment 1</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> 6/29/11: Commissioners indicated that a chart would be helpful to show allowed land uses under both the staff proposal and the applicant’s proposal, and where there is overlap between the two.</p>	<p>Opened 6/29/11</p>
<p>2. What is the trip generation of the uses proposed by the applicant; how do they compare to those of MP uses and the staff proposed additional uses? (<i>Flynn</i>)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 6/29/11: Examples of land uses and trip generation rates are cited from the International Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Handbook. Several examples were presented by staff at the 6/29/11 study session, (6/29/11 slides) and a copy of the presentation is attached. Other examples will be provided at the 7/13/11 public hearing.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	<p>Opened 6/29/11</p>
<p>3. What types of land uses could compete with those allowed in Downtown and Overlake? (<i>Flynn</i>)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 6/29/11: The land uses allowed in GC that could potentially compete with uses in Downtown and Overlake are within the following categories: <u>Professional Services</u> and <u>Administrative Services</u>, Full-service restaurant, <u>Ambulatory and outpatient care services</u>, <u>Personal services</u>, Cafeteria or limited service restaurant, Bar or drinking place, Multi-family or Mixed-use residential structure, Grocery, food and beverage, <u>Pet and Animal Sales or Service</u>, Convenience store, <u>Health and personal care</u>, <u>Finance and insurance and Real estate services</u>. The applicant has proposed those that are underlined above.</p>	<p>Opened 6/29/11</p>

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	
<p>4. What are the traffic numbers identified by SEPA Checklist?</p> <p><i>(Hinman)</i></p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 6/29/11: The traffic data noted on item 14.e. of the SEPA Checklist was provided to the applicant by Transportation Engineers Northwest, a transportation consulting firm. The applicant stated that the traffic numbers are trip generation data for general retail uses. Under item D.6, staff comments in the margin indicate that GC uses (generally) result in increased trips and parking when (generally) compared to MP uses.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	<p>Opened 6/29/11</p>
<p>5. What is the approximate number of persons living in this area that is potentially served by businesses in this location?</p> <p><i>(Julinsey)</i></p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 6/29/11: The 2010 Census indicates a population of 4,182 persons living in Southeast Redmond.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	<p>Opened 6/29/11</p>
<p>6. Have there been any comments or questions from other business occupants in or near the designated area – or any other comments?</p> <p><i>(Hinman)</i></p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 6/29/11: No comments have been received to date, other than a letter provided prior to the start of Planning Commission review by Redmond Industries for a Clean Environment. One call was received upon receipt of the SEPA DNS to surrounding properties. The caller wanted information and did not have a comment about the proposal.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p>	<p>Opened 6/29/11</p>

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	
<p>7. How can we make sure that this change is appropriate? (Biethan)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 6/29/11: The consideration of any land use/zoning change has to be evaluated according to a variety of criteria as identified in the Redmond Zoning Code, Section 21.76.070(J). In addition, Section B of the Technical Report identifies other criteria that must be considered in any review of a land use change proposal. Consistency with the City’s and other regional planning documents, potential traffic impacts and impacts to other businesses and residents in the adjacent area need to be considered, among other factors. Both the applicant’s and the staff proposal have been evaluated according to these criteria.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	<p>Opened 6/29/11</p>
<p>8. What will be the impact regarding traffic management, e.g., access, ingress/egress? (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 6/29/11: The applicant’s site is served by two driveways from Redmond Way, as well as a dedicated left turn pocket from eastbound Redmond Way. The designated larger area includes properties to the north which are accessed from NE 68th Street. The current uses are likely to have been developed to MP standards which require less parking than GC. MP: 2 to 3 parking spaces per 1,000 feet of gross floor area (gfa); GC: 4 to 5 parking spaces per 1,000’ gfa. With the addition of more “GC” type uses there could be more turning movements and additional parking congestion.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	<p>Opened 6/29/11</p>
<p>9. What are the possible</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></p>	<p>Opened 6/29/11</p>

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p>impacts to existing MP uses? Would a change to GC have an adverse impact to these businesses?</p> <p><i>(Miller)</i></p>	<p><u>6/29/11</u>: Staff acknowledges that any additional “GC” type uses will likely result in other similar businesses wishing to locate within the staff proposed area; both the staff proposal and the applicant’s proposal could result in this kind of change. While businesses currently located here are allowed uses in MP, some are more service-oriented than more “traditional” manufacturing uses, e.g., a climbing/fitness center, and a catering/restaurant business. If the area was changed to General Commercial/GC, non-conforming businesses could result. Further, the addition of more General Commercial uses such as proposed by the applicant, even if the MP designation and zoning is maintained, would result in the location of more “GC” type uses. Traffic impacts resulting from more of these kinds of uses would be additional traffic and on-site congestion.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	