

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? (Flynn, Hinman)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 6/29/11:</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> 7/13/11: Planning Commissioners stated that they wanted to continue consideration of the uses that would be allowed under the staff proposal compared to the applicant’s proposal.</p> <p>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. (See attached chart – Attachment 1)</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? (Flynn)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 7/13/11: Staff provided information about p.m. peak hour traffic generation of different uses. In terms of this data, <i>uses currently on-site</i> generate similar numbers of p.m. peak hour trips to those proposed by staff as well as uses proposed by the applicant. Further, staff-proposed versus applicant-proposed land uses are not significantly different in terms of p.m. peak hour trip generation.</p> <p>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> 7/13/11: Similar comments regarding traffic generation were made by the applicant as by staff. The applicant suggested that the professional/office types of uses (applicant’s proposal) would likely provide a more steady number of trips throughout a weekday, as opposed to creating an increase during peak hours.</p>	<p>Opened 6/29/11</p>

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p><u>PC Comments:</u> 7/13/11: Planning Commissioners requested information from traffic engineering about the types of trips created by the professional/office uses throughout the day. This will be provided at 7/20/11 study session.</p>	
<p>3. What types of land uses could compete with those allowed in Downtown and Overlake? (Flynn)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 7/13/11: Staff indicated that the MP designation policies support the staff recommended uses that include the retail sales, service and repair of heavy, “durable” consumer goods as they are less likely to locate in an Urban Center areas.</p> <p>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><u>Public Comment:</u> 7/13/11: The applicant stated that other retail, “GC-type” uses would not be competitive with Downtown and Overlake, noting that many GC uses are across the street in the Whole Foods complex as well as at the intersection of Redmond Way and 180th Avenue NE.</p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> 7/13/11: Similar to response for item #1: Planning Commissioners stated that they wanted to continue consideration of the uses that would be allowed under the staff proposal compared to the applicant’s proposal.</p>	<p>Opened 6/29/11</p>
<p>4. What are the traffic numbers identified by</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 7/13/11: Trip generation for traditional MP uses, such as</p>	<p>Opened 6/29/11</p>

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p>SEPA Checklist? (Hinman)</p>	<p>warehouse/distribution, or research & development is typically lower than that of retail uses. Some of the current uses as well as anticipated uses (with the staff recommended uses) would likely generate additional trips.</p> <p><u>6/29/11</u>: 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>Public Comment: The applicant noted that the traffic numbers provided in the SEPA Checklist were worst case scenario is the applicant's site were redeveloped with all retail uses.</p> <p>PC Comments: 7/13/11: The Planning Commission indicated that the information provided was sufficient.</p>	<p>Closed 7/13/11</p>
<p>5. What is the approximate number of persons living in this area that is potentially served by businesses in this location? (Julinsey)</p>	<p>Staff Comment/Recommendation: <u>6/29/11</u>: The 2010 Census indicates a population of 4,182 persons living in Southeast Redmond.</p> <p>Public Comment:</p> <p>PC Comments: <u>7/13/11</u>: The Planning Commission was satisfied with the response.</p>	<p>Opened 6/29/11 Closed 7/13/11</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>Staff Comment/Recommendation: <u>6/29/11</u>: No comments have been received to date. 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>Public Comment:</p>	<p>Opened 6/29/11 Closed 7/13/11</p>

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<i>(Hinman)</i>	<p><u>7/13/11</u>: The applicant noted conversation with an adjacent business owner who supports the applicant’s proposal as well as providing a letter from RICE (Redmond Industries for a Clean Environment) also in support.</p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> <u>7/13/11</u>: The Planning Commission was satisfied with the response.</p>	
<p>7. How can we make sure that this change is appropriate?</p> <p><i>(Biethan)</i></p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> <u>7/13/11</u>: Staff presented information about the Manufacturing Park land use designation policy in the Comprehensive Plan, noting that this language provides guidance in determining the appropriate locations for land uses. Staff also indicated that the designation language for MP could accommodate the categories of land uses proposed for the subject area in the staff recommendation, but that it would be more difficult to accommodate the additional uses requested by the applicant unless the Comprehensive Plan designation language is changed. Staff noted further that from a policy standpoint, if the language was changed in the designation policies, it has to fit with other areas in the City that are designated MP.</p> <p><u>6/29/11</u>: 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> <u>7/13/11</u>: Several Commissioners stated that they believed staff had evaluated both proposals according to the evaluation criteria identified above.</p>	<p>Opened 6/29/11</p> <p>Closed 7/13/11</p>

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p>8. What will be the impact regarding traffic management, e.g., access, ingress/egress?</p> <p>(Miller)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 7/13/11: The parking ratios for the staff recommended uses range from 2 to 5 spaces per 1,000 square feet of gross floor area.</p> <p>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> 7/13/11: The applicant stated that there are two driveways on the applicant’s property, one for the applicant’s site and the other that is shared with the business to the south. There currently are no driveways from Redmond Way that access the property to the north, which is the Park East business park. The applicant noted that the Park East property could not obtain a driveway on Redmond Way due to its location near the intersection of Redmond Way and 180th Street, and that they had access from NE 68th Street. The applicant indicated that a parking ratio for “GC-type” businesses would need to be that of what is allowed under GC, or 4-5 spaces per 1,000 square feet of gfa.</p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> 7/13/11: Planning Commissioners requested clarification of what parking ratios were recommended under both the staff and the applicant proposal. Further information about the actual number of parking spaces on the site was requested.</p>	<p>Opened 6/29/11</p> <p>Access issue: Closed 7/13/11</p> <p>Parking issue to remain open 7/13/11</p>
<p>9. What are the possible impacts to existing MP uses? Would a change to GC have an adverse impact</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 7/13/11: Staff indicated that impacts to other businesses could be a concern; also the idea that it would be hard to draw the boundary for the additional “GC-type” uses – that with more of these uses it would be hard to physically</p>	<p>Opened 6/29/11</p>

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p>to these businesses?</p> <p>(Miller)</p>	<p>determine which area should retain the MP versus become MP with more “GC-type” uses.</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 designated 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> <u>7/13/11</u>: The applicant stated that he did not believe there would be adverse impacts to existing MP uses, also citing the conversation with an adjacent auto-body business and correspondence from RICE (Redmond Industries for a Clean Environment. The applicant also noted that the large 4 x 6 white sign on the subject site did not result in any additional comments.</p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> <u>7/13/11</u>: Planning Commissioners wanted to consider this issue further at the next study session.</p>	