

**REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

June 29, 2011

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chairman Hinman, Commissioners Biethan (late), Julinsey, Flynn, Bontadelli and Miller

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED: Vice Chair Wiechers-Gregory, Commissioners O'Hara and Chandorkar

STAFF PRESENT: Kim Dietz, Cathy Beam, Sarah Stiteler, and Thara Johnson, Redmond Planning Department

RECORDING SECRETARY: 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

No changes to the agenda.

ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE

Mr. Tom Markl, CEO of Nelson Real Estate Management LLC, spoke to the Commission. His address in Redmond is 16508 NE 79th Street. Nelson handles the business affairs of CCC2911 LLC, which owns the Redmond Car Care Center. The company has applied for a Comprehensive Plan amendment and rezone of this property from MP to GC. Mr. Markl has provided a letter to the Commission, and he summarized its contents. Staff has recommended rejecting the application and has proposed an alternative solution, creating an overlay for a portion of the MP zone which encompasses the Redmond Car Care Center, and allow some GC uses.

On one hand, Mr. Markl is pleased with this, as he views this as a tacit admission by staff that the applicant's position is valid for that property and the adjoining two parcels proposed to be part of an overlay. Mr. Markl said he accepts the concept of an overlay rather than a rezone, and he is very amenable to compromise. However, the applicant is disappointed that only three GC categories have been proposed as permitted in the overlay area. Mr. Markl has discussed this matter with staff. It appeared to him that staff's position can be summarized in three arguments:

1. There is a wish by staff to prevent businesses that staff feels are better suited for Downtown Redmond from being established in this area.
2. Staff is concerned that broadening the uses allowed in these three parcels will threaten the MP zone.
3. Staff is also concerned that broadening the uses will create traffic problems and parking issues.

The applicant has an answer to all three of these points. He noted that he is talking about only three parcels on the far edge of the MP zone, and the only three MP parcels that are on Redmond Way. The rest are located in the interior and off this busy arterial. The applicant does not believe

this is any threat to the MP Zone or to Downtown Redmond because of the overwhelming presence of GC uses in the surrounding area. The parcels in question are surrounded by GC properties, including a property directly across the street from the applicant. Several large retailers are in this area. Regarding traffic, Mr. Markl asked the question whether this location was better suited for traffic from an asphalt plant or freight yard, both of which are permitted MP uses. The applicant believes the answer to this question is no.

Finally, Mr. Markl pointed out that the applicant has the support of the very types of businesses staff is attempting to protect. In summary, Mr. Markl believes if it walks like a duck and looks like a duck, it is a duck—the duck in this case being the three subject parcels. He said these are General Commercial ducks classified as MP horses. He said he would accept the compromise from staff for an overlay, but he felt that an expansion of the GC uses proposed by staff was needed. He thanked the Commission for their consideration. Chairman Hinman thanked Mr. Markl, and noted this matter would come up under Agenda Item 7. Mr. Markl plans to be at the Commission's meeting in two weeks for a public hearing on this issue. No other comments from the public were received.

REPORT APPROVAL, Community Character and Historic Preservation, presented by Kim Dietz, City of Redmond Senior Planner

Normally, Vice-Chair Gregory has handled this issue. Chairman Hinman took over in his absence, and noted he was ready to move it forward. The Commission had already reviewed the body of the recommendations. Now the attention should be on forwarding the report draft as prepared by staff. Ms. Dietz had no further comments. Chairman Hinman pointed out that CC-44 and -45 were confusing, in terms of graphics. Ms. Dietz explained that the graphic below CC-44 was being deleted and replaced with the Matador remodel, which reflects the policy better. That explanation satisfied Chairman Hinman. He asked about CC-25, at the top of the page, where there was a typo. Ms. Dietz thanked him for the correction. Chairman Hinman noted that the most important revision that took place in this section dealt with community building and events. The language there looked fine to Chairman Hinman. A preamble has been put in right after CC-9.

MOTION by Commissioner Miller for approval of the report for Community Character and Historic Preservation Element, 2010-2011 Comprehensive Plan update; seconded by Commissioner Flynn. Motion passed unanimously (5-0). Chairman Hinman thanked Ms. Dietz for her work on this topic.

PUBLIC HEARING AND STUDY SESSION, Natural Environment Element, Limited Shoreline Master Program Amendment & Critical Areas Ordinance Amendment - FEMA Floodplain Management, presented by Cathy Beam, City of Redmond Principal Planner

Chairman Hinman opened the public hearing. He noted that the Natural Environment Element of the Comprehensive Plan would be open for written comments until the next meeting of the Planning Commission. One person from the public was signed up to speak. Howard Harrison of 17719 NE 110th Way, Redmond, WA 98052, spoke to the Commission. Mr. Harrison said he was a long-time Redmond resident, and noted that he had served on the Bear Creek Community Advisory Committee in the past, as well as the Planning Commission and the City Council. He

owns an organic composting service and is a certified horticulturist, so the Natural Environment Element is of great interest to him. He said there is a lot to like about this element.

However, Mr. Harrison is concerned about limiting the use of pesticides for cosmetic uses and the idea that the City would consider banning the use of pesticides, except for emergencies, on City property. He said pesticides are increasingly found to contribute to cancer, ADHD, and other medical problems. He wanted to make sure there was a focus on land near aquifer recharge areas, such as Anderson Park. He said no pesticides should be used there. He was also concerned about the Brightwater plant possibly spreading *gray water* on City land, which he believes could affect City water quality. However, Mr. Harrison liked the precautionary principle and climate change sections of this element. He noted a concern over the flood areas of this element. He has worked with City flood committees before, and is concerned about toxins in flood water affecting the City. He noted that he would send written comments to the Commission.

Chairman Hinman thanked Mr. Harrison for his time. Commissioner Miller asked Mr. Harrison about how neighboring communities handle the pesticide issue. Mr. Harrison said he believed most neighboring communities did the same thing that Redmond did. He noted that Seattle has some pesticide-free parks. Mr. Harrison added that New York State has now banned the use of pesticides on public parks.

Mr. Randall Olsen, an attorney from Cairncross and Hempelmann, 524 Second Avenue in Seattle, WA, 98104 next spoke to the Commission on behalf of RICE, the Redmond Industries for a Clean Environment. He brought a letter from RICE to the Commission and commented on some highlights. Mr. Olsen said that Redmond's objectives to allow for industrial uses and protect wellhead areas do not have to be in conflict. However, he said that some parts of this element put an unnecessary burden on industries in Redmond and conflict with some statewide policies encouraging infiltration. RICE has proposed some simple revisions to these updates, such that water would not be redirected to the City's stormwater system and that industries would not be overburdened. Chairman Hinman thanked Mr. Olsen for his time and noted that the Commission will be paying close attention to these issues.

Chairman Hinman closed the oral portion of the public hearing but kept it open for written comments. Commissioner Julinsey took over the lead role for the Commission on this element at this point, and directed the Commission's attention to staff member Cathy Beam for background. Ms. Beam said these elements address the Limited Shoreline Master Program Amendment, which is part of the revision of the Comprehensive Plan that needs to happen in accordance with FEMA compliance standards. A cursory filing by the City dealing with those issues has been put in with the Department of Ecology, but the formal filing will happen after City Council action. There are four broad categories that the proposed changes from staff reflect:

1. FEMA and Endangered Species Act compliance
2. Regional planning policies with respect to climate change
3. The City goal of becoming a sustainable community
4. Fine-tuning to better align with other elements of the Comprehensive Plan

The FEMA/ESA compliance addresses items found in a Biological Opinion issued in 2008 regarding floodplain regulations. The Opinion requires compensating floodplain storage for all developments in the 100-year floodplain. Currently, the City allows flood storage exemptions for Downtown developments in the Sammamish River 100 year floodplain, which will no longer be

allowed. Ms. Beam mapped out the flood plain areas for the Commission based on FEMA's flood insurance rate maps. Meeting FEMA's regulations are critical in order to maintain flood insurance rates for City residents.

Regarding climate change, some new policies have been introduced that include a Climate Action Plan to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and carbons for the City as well as identifying impacts on hydrological systems. Ms. Beam said the prediction is for drier summers and wetter winters as our climate changes, and the City needs to be aware of this. Regarding the sustainability community policy changes, Ms. Beam said the City is trying to stay consistent with the Comprehensive Plan update and Livable Redmond goals. ICLE, or Local Governments for Sustainability (of which Redmond is a member), and the Star Community Index have helped guide the proposed changes. Ms. Beam said the City is trying to take a long-term approach toward sustainability goals, including the deployment of infrastructure and utility elements to deal with natural disasters.

Ms. Beam noted there also are some issues of low-impact development and water infiltration, and water retention to consider, as noted during the public testimony earlier in this meeting. The Planning Commission will review the Natural Environment Element during the month of June and July, and make a recommendation to the City Council by August. The Council will review the element in August and September with the hope for FEMA approval and Department of Ecology approval by early fall. Ms. Beam said she is looking forward to reading the written comments from the public hearing presenters. She has spoken with a colleague of Mr. Olsen's, and is aware of his concerns regarding wellhead protection. She will review those concerns with the City staff geologists. Ms. Beam said Mr. Harrison's suggestion to ban pesticides in City parks is an idea that merits further discussion.

From the public hearing, two issues will be added to the issues matrix, including a clarification of groundwater policy and the aforementioned pesticide and herbicide issue. Ms. Beam said she needed more background on the City's current policy regarding pesticide and herbicide usage. Regarding Brightwater's use of gray water, Ms. Beam noted that this was a complex political discussion involving several departments. She noted that City Council and the Mayor have discussed Brightwater, as well as other local governments. Chairman Hinman would like to receive some background on how Brightwater affects the Natural Environment Element, specifically. Ms. Beam will add that as an informational topic for the Planning Commission in the future.

Commissioner Julinsey asked about Policy NE-39 and the map of contaminated sites in Redmond. Commissioner Flynn noted that the map points out possible contaminating sources at certain businesses, such as hazardous materials, which is quite different than sites that are actually contaminated. There are some red triangles to indicate actual contamination, as noted by Ms. Beam. Commissioner Julinsey asked if the policy indicated a timeframe where people would have to clean up the contaminated site. Ms. Beam said she suspects that is contained in the Wellhead Protection Program; she will double-check on that.

Commissioner Flynn pointed out that the State Department of Ecology most often manages contamination issues, not the City. He said the Wellhead Protection Program might discover the contamination, but the cleanup would come from a property owner and would be coordinated by the DOE. These cases, in Commissioner Flynn's estimation, often take years and thus would not

have the specific timelines Commissioner Julinsey is looking for. She asked how the public would be kept informed in contamination cases. Commissioner Flynn said the DOE or EPA would handle that information, depending on its state or federal status. He was not sure if the Wellhead Protection Program would deal with that detail, as it is more of a preventative program. Chairman Hinman asked if this issue should be held up such that Ms. Beam could bring back more information on the cleanup process. Ms. Beam said that information would not have a bearing on the policy decision, but she would be happy to bring back those details. Commissioner Julinsey held the issue open.

Commissioner Julinsey next brought up Policy NE-68A, which Commissioner Biethan had asked about, regarding the term *where feasible* in connection to maintaining natural hydrological functions. Chairman Hinman believed the proposed language answered Commissioner Biethan's concerns, in that it now reflects encouragement from the City for restoration to a more natural state. Commissioner Julinsey asked Ms. Beam to speak to Commissioner Biethan in order to close this issue.

Commissioner Julinsey raised the issue of Policy NE-79, brought up by Chairman Hinman, which was a request for a map of the core preservation areas of the City. Chairman Hinman said the staff's proposed additions showed the visualization he was seeking. He was happy to close this issue, with which Commissioner Julinsey agreed.

Issue 4 dealt with Policy NE-114B. Commissioner Flynn had suggested moving some text about air quality closer to the beginning of the element. He was satisfied with the changes made by staff. Commissioner Julinsey closed this issue.

Issue 5 was in regard to Policy NE-33A, also raised by Commissioner Flynn about the Wellhead Protection Program. Staff said this policy currently exists as Land Use Policy 52, but was moved to this Element. Staff has also suggested some language referencing Wellhead Protection Zones 1 and 2. Commissioner Flynn said he has the same concerns about this being a policy rather than a procedural statement. He recommended striking the line that says *incorporate recommendations from the program*, and replacing that with something that speaks to the Wellhead Protection Program protecting wellheads throughout the City, identifying potential sources, and working with owners to prevent contamination of the aquifer. He said that the goal of wellhead protection should show up in the policy statements. Ms. Beam confirmed that Commissioner Flynn is asking to change this language to policy, not introductory text. Chairman Hinman asked if some improved language was still needed with this issue. Ms. Beam agreed, and noted that Mr. Olsen's comments from the public hearing could be incorporated in a revised version of this policy as well.

Commissioner Flynn said that NE-33 looked good, but he noted that he was uncertain about the second part of NE-33A, where it is written that the City should *consider especially whether updates are needed to land use policies*. The word *consider* was his biggest concern, as it seems to indicate to him a work plan of some sort. He suggested a phrase like *occasionally review or update land use policies* instead of *consider*. Ms. Beam agreed to more substantial language, as Commissioner Flynn was suggesting. Chairman Hinman confirmed that this issue would be open until at least the next Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Julinsey moved next to Issue 6, Policy NE-52, which was raised by Commissioner Miller and Chairman Hinman. Staff has revised the language to strike references to Downtown and Overlake and reword the policy. Commissioner Miller and Chairman Hinman were satisfied with the changes, and the issue was closed.

Issue 7 dealt with a concern from Chairman Hinman regarding the introductory text dealing with the City of Redmond and its air quality. He noted that the proposed changes improve and broaden the introductory vision for the Natural Environment Element. Commissioner Julinsey closed the issue.

Issue 8 was raised by Commissioner O'Hara, who made a suggestion to change some introductory text to remove the assumption that all scientists predict climate change. The phrase *some scientists* has been used here instead. Chairman Hinman said this was an issue that might draw more discussion, especially from Commissioners O'Hara and Gregory. Commissioner Julinsey kept the issue open. Commissioner Biethan joined the meeting at this point, around 7:50 p.m.

Issue 9 dealt with air quality issues surrounding Policy NE-113B and Policy NE-114A, with a number of Commissioners offering comments. The concern over these policies dealt with the language, *with attention given to reduction and prevention of inequalities*. People with health issues such as asthma were part of the concern here, as a matter of social equity. Commissioner Julinsey accepted the idea of removing *inequalities* and using *social equity* instead. Chairman Hinman accepted that as well, as the change standardized the usage of the phrase between both policies. Commissioner Julinsey closed the issue.

Returning to Issue 2, Commissioner Biethan thanked staff for the proposed changes. Commissioner Julinsey closed the issue.

At this point, the Commission had resolved some language questions, but added more issues to its matrix to review in the next study session. Those issues include dealing with herbicides, pesticides, and gray water—from Brightwater or as otherwise noted by RICE, whose written comments are forthcoming. Testing floodwater for toxins was another concern, but that was most likely an informational piece, not policy. There were no further comments on the Natural Environment Element at this point. Chairman Hinman noted that the Commission was ahead of schedule on the agenda thus far. Ms. Beam clarified that she would report with new information on Issue 1. Issues 2, 3, and 4 are closed. Issue 5 is still open, and had some public testimony on it. Issues 6 and 7 are closed. Issue 8 is waiting on approval from the Commission, especially Commissioner O'Hara, and Issue 9 is closed. Four new issues have been identified:

1. Herbicide/pesticide use
2. Clarity on the critical aquifer recharge area
3. Gray water issues, including Brightwater
4. Flood water testing

Chairman Hinman agreed those were the topics that needed further discussion, and concluded the oral portion of the public hearing on the Natural Environment Element. He left open the written comment period until the Commission's next meeting on July 13. He thanked Ms. Beam for her time.

STUDY SESSION AND PUBLIC HEARING, Green Building/Infrastructure Incentive Program, presented by Thara Johnson, City of Redmond Associate Planner, Development Review Division

Chairman Hinman noted that the public written comment period on this topic was open through today, and a written comment regarding green building had been received. Ms. Johnson reviewed that written comment, which was from Sustainable Redmond. She said that the comment proposes some changes, including modifying one of the techniques that were included in the draft proposal. It related to a requirement for a site assessment on LID when an applicant elects to use a green roof as a technique as part of the incentive program. Staff is comfortable with making this change. Also, there was another comment about expanding another technique specific to non-residential zones, providing alternative energy sources such as solar or geothermal. The comment suggested expanding this technique to residential zones. Staff is comfortable with this change as well, and both changes will be in the next draft proposal.

Chairman Hinman thanked Ms. Johnson for her work on the matter. Commissioner Flynn asked about the alternative energy provision, and what the timeframe was on it. Ms. Johnson said the time limits of 2013 and 2014 have been removed from this incentive program. Commissioner Flynn noted that the threshold to provide 50% of the energy for a unit through alternative sources seemed high. Ms. Johnson pointed out this would not be a requirement, but a choice to gain points for a developer under the incentive program.

Chairman Hinman confirmed with staff that there were no more public comments on this issue. Ms. Johnson brought up the two remaining issues on this program, Issue 1 and Issue 8. Issue 1 relates to how the City addresses impacts from transportation. Ms. Johnson has included some policies that were part of the Transportation Element, which the Commission reviewed about a month ago as part of the Comprehensive Plan update. There are strategies in those policies to deal with greenhouse gas emissions and stay in compliance with the state and federal Clean Air Acts. There are also some connections to the Natural Environment Element, which the Commission is currently reviewing. Plus, the City's Transportation Master Plan (TMP) Update is the implementation element for the Transportation off the Comprehensive Plan, and that will come before the Commission in September. There are strategies in the TMP Update taking shape that deal with green street treatments, vegetated curb extensions, swales, storm water planters, and permeable pavement. Ms. Johnson noted that there is also a STARS Program getting developed in the City, which stands for Sustainable Transportation Access Rating System. STARS is similar to LEED, but focuses on reducing transportation impacts.

Commissioner Miller said he appreciated the time and effort of staff on this incentive program. However, he is concerned with the application of an incentive-based program to specific development. Commissioner Miller believes the gains from this program could be overwhelmed by the City's lack of requirements for transportation to that specific development project. He would like more details on the incentives to see if they should instead be required for developers. Commissioner Miller said the program needs to incentivize changes in transportation, which is a huge draw for energy consumption and a big contributor of greenhouse gases.

Commissioner Miller and Commissioner Biethan have both talked about when the City should incentivize and when it should require green building initiatives. He would like to see some language that asks the question: If the City fails to enact green building techniques, has the

public health been harmed? Commissioner Miller said if that is the case, green building incentives should instead be requirements. If they are incentives, two other questions arise: Do the incentives provide a benefit to the community the City desires, and can that be measured and predicted? Or, is the requirement so onerous that no developer would want to participate, thus wasting staff time and resources? Overall, Commissioner Miller would like this program to have more focus, to give the City the ability to provide the benefit the policy is seeking. He said the program is not there yet. Commissioner Miller said the construction and operation of the building have to be considered in regard to sustainability. He wanted to see specific goals and benchmarks laid out in the policy.

Commissioner Biethan wanted to make sure the incentives would truly motivate the development community to build in a sustainable way. He would like to see if large or small developers would speak about what motivates them to the Commission. Chairman Hinman noted that some incentives work for some developers, but not others. Ms. Johnson mentioned, as she did at the last meeting, that the City is going through a pilot program regarding sustainability with a project that is currently in the works. The goal is to see what obstacles developers face with the City Code, and how the City could help with those obstacles. The City Council has approved staff's plan to report back to the Commission after that process. Ms. Johnson said another option would be to report back to the Commission a year after this Code is put in place to see what projects have gone through the incentive process and how those projects are doing.

Commissioner Biethan said his only concern is that the Commission would be waiting for information from the pilot project for a period of months, or for a year with the second approach. He said after a year's time, the Commission's review of the Comprehensive Plan should be done already. Chairman Hinman noted that the Comprehensive Plan will move at its own pace. He added that a workshop of some sort might be helpful for the Commission. Ms. Stiteler noted that the green policies of the Comprehensive Plan are in the same spirit, and would incorporate the green incentives the Commission is discussing at this meeting. Regarding a workshop, Ms. Stiteler said that would be contingent on an actual project getting built to see the policies in action. Commissioner Biethan asked if there were other faster ways to determine how developers would respond to these incentives, such as a questionnaire, to create a wish list of sorts.

Commissioner Flynn noted that there was some research done by staff prior to the changes proposed to the incentives program tonight. Ms. Johnson said that is indeed the case. The Code Rewrite Commission has done some work on these incentives as well, complete with a public hearing. Staff contacted some of the larger developers who have worked in Redmond, including those who have worked with Microsoft and Group Health. Through that research, staff determined that developers would appreciate FAR or height bonuses, which are in the incentive program. Commissioner Miller said that this is a matter of finding the middle ground between creating incentives that give away too much, or do too little in terms of incentivizing outcomes.

Chairman Hinman summarized that staff has a pilot project and report on the way, but in the meantime, Commissioners want to know what a meaningful incentive is and who would respond to them. There is also a concern over transportation issues, in that LEED development is good, but creating more greenhouse gases through transportation could present a problem. Chairman Hinman said he would like to explore these issues in the TMP process, but he was not sure how these issues would impact the Commission's present discussion on the Comprehensive Plan. He supported the idea of workshops, but also knows that is not an easy task to accomplish.

Commissioner Biethan asked if information from the large developers who staff has interviewed could be passed along to the Planning Commission members. Commissioner Miller said it is worth taking extra time with this issue to help Redmond become a leader on performance-based incentives. He would like to see language that addresses transportation performance in the incentives discussed this evening. Commissioner Miller was hesitant to move forward until he has more information on quantitative goals for these incentives. Chairman Hinman said in the interest of providing good guidance to Council, he would like to move forward.

Ms. Johnson noted that staff could create a brief survey focused on non-residential development regarding green incentives. It has been determined through questions from staff in the past that developers are looking for lot size reduction and increased density, which the incentives currently provide. Staff would recommend focusing on the questions specific to the techniques presented in the proposal this evening. Ms. Johnson said she could get a survey out and receive information from it back to the Commission in a few weeks. Chairman Hinman asked about the transportation component and how that might be involved. Ms. Johnson said the transportation question is much larger. It does play into green building, but she noted that the TMP Update will bring some big changes to transportation soon. Any proposals from the Commission could be wrapped into that update, including the STARS program. Ms. Johnson said more coordination with City transportation officials would be preferable. The Commission agreed that would be a good course of action, but also asked Ms. Johnson for a summary of the conversations staff has had with major developers about green incentives, to which she agreed. Commissioner Biethan wanted to make sure the conversation was with the decision-maker of the company. Chairman Hinman left this issue open.

Item 8 was the next issue, regarding a change in the text for the green infrastructure incentive program. Ms. Johnson spoke to the Commission about Item 8, the IGCC and how the Commissioners would be involved in its implementation. She noted two scenarios; in one, the state would adopt IGCC and all jurisdictions would follow that law. In the second, if the state did not adopt IGCC, the City of Redmond could adopt it. In this case, the Business Department official would go before the City Council for approval, with a public hearing process. Chairman Hinman confirmed with Ms. Johnson that if the City wanted to adopt more stringent policies than the state, the City would have to go to the State Building Council to make that case. If the Commission wanted to be kept informed, staff could do that as part of the process during presentations to Council.

Commissioner Bontadelli said this was a good approach by staff. He was fairly certain the state would be an early adopter of IGCC, but if it were not, he wanted to make sure the City had this on the radar for alternate adoption abilities. Ms. Johnson pointed out that a new state energy code will come out before the next version of the IGCC, which should be in 2014. Ms. Johnson explained the timeline for the IGCC decision, and Chairman Hinman closed Issue 8. The Commission took a five-minute recess at this point. Returning from recess, Chairman Hinman closed the written public hearing on Green Building Incentives.

STUDY SESSION, Redmond Car Care Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendment, presented by Sarah Stiteler, City of Redmond Senior Planner

There will be a public hearing on this issue on July 13th. Ms. Stiteler showed the Commission a map of the area in question. A private applicant has applied to change the land use and zoning

for the Redmond Car Care site. This site is zoned MP. The applicant has asked to change the land use designation from Manufacturing (MP) to General Commercial (GC). Staff recommends keeping the MP designation and, in addition, allowing three additional land use categories from the Zoning Code to be permitted in a larger area that is also located along Redmond Way and encompassing the applicant's parcel of 2.58 acres. This would be an overlay zone that would allow more uses with some additional flexibility to allow general commercial type uses. The current uses on the site include five one-story buildings, including the Firestone business and other car care businesses.

The proposed overlay area is about 8.5 acres, taking in the applicant's site as well as other properties to the north and south. It is across Redmond Way from Whole Foods and adjacent to a manufacturing park. Staff has considered other alternatives, such as changing the land use designation to GC, but limiting the types of uses to a small menu. Or, staff could keep the MP designation but allow additional uses. The applicant has proposed to make a change from MP to GC, hoping to create more development in this area. Staff's proposal included some new use categories, including heavy consumer goods/rental/sales/service, durable consumer goods/rental/sales/service, and the consumer goods/other category. These uses allow sales of building materials, garden supplies, electronics, appliances, art supplies, and many other goods. More sales are allowed with these new uses, which focus on businesses that would be less likely to locate in the Downtown or Overlake neighborhoods.

Historically, the light industrial use was allowed here, allowing stores like John Deere to sell farm goods in this zone. That changed in the 1990's to the MP designation, which limited sales considerably. A recent MP/BP study by the City prompted the Council to allow some additional sales in the MP zone, such as car sales and car repair, which were not permitted previously. Ms. Stiteler noted there was continuing pressure to allow for more uses. The applicant put in the request to change this zone from MP to GC in 2009, at which time a second phase of the MP/BP study was under consideration by the City that could have affected the applicant's property. The City Council, at that point, decided not to pursue the second phase of the MP/BP study. The applicant re-applied for this change last year, at which time the Technical Committee made a recommendation to deny. The applicant requested that the Planning Commission consider this issue in 2011.

Ms. Stiteler noted that some of the businesses here have a GC flavor, including a climbing gym, a caterer, and printing shop, but the area is still MP. Land uses that would be allowed in staff's proposal include auto repair and sales. Staff has studied trip generation between typical MP and GC uses, and presented those numbers to the Commission. Staff has been considering higher traffic-generating uses, but the tendency is toward limiting that to avoid road congestion. Therefore, staff is proposing retaining the MP zone with the additional uses mentioned: heavy consumer goods, durable consumer goods, and consumer goods/other. Staff said the location of subject MP land is on the heaviest-traveled arterial in the City, and therefore a very unique location for an MP area. More than 39,000 vehicles travel by the applicant's site every day. Staff pointed out that the subject MP overlay area fronts Redmond Way, and 180th Avenue NE and NE 68th Street.

Ms. Stiteler noted that the overlay decision retains the amount of MP land available in the City and de-emphasizes commercial uses. The decision also respects the unique circumstances of the area and minimizes impacts on other businesses in the area, who might feel pressured to change

their business models if the zoning changed. Ms. Stiteler said staff's recommendation recognizes that additional commercial uses are happening in this area, but the recommendation also does not exacerbate onsite congestion or parking issues. Staff is recommending denial of the application to change from MP to GC, but an 8.5-acre MP overlay area has been proposed instead with stated additional uses allowed. Regarding schedule, staff is anticipating a Planning Commission recommendation after the public hearing on this issue in two weeks.

Chairman Hinman asked the Commission for any questions based on the materials. Commissioner Miller asked what the staff recommendation excludes from GC and why uses proposed by the applicant would not be allowed. Ms. Stiteler noted that housing, professional services, veterinary clinics, grocery stores and restaurants would not be allowed in this zone. Chairman Hinman would like to see a matrix of uses to see where they overlap. Ms. Stiteler noted that the applicant's letter had some uses not proposed by staff, including personal services, veterinarian clinics, and professional services. Commissioner Flynn commented that he would like a chart of the added uses compared to what the applicant has proposed, and what the added uses would create in terms of transportation impact. He also asked how this area might compete with Downtown in terms of retail options.

Chairman Hinman noted that the traffic estimates will turn into an issue for the Commission. Commissioner Julinsey said she would like to know how many people live in the multi-family units near this area, to see what the demand for services might be there. Chairman Hinman added that in moving to a larger overlay footprint, other businesses beyond the applicant might have some input. Commissioner Biethan wanted to see what the applicant is interested in compared to what is offered through the overlay. He would like to see what is gained through the proposal, in terms of the applicant's desire, and what could change in the future. Chairman Hinman was concerned about GC creep, which over time could have a big impact on the City, especially Downtown.

Commissioner Miller had two issues he wanted to discuss, including traffic access management on Redmond Way, and what the impact would be with increased GC business to manage and consolidate driveways. Commissioner Miller was also concerned about commercial gentrification in this area and the GC creep Chairman Hinman was talking about, specifically with impacts on MP businesses. Commissioner Flynn asked for some examples of what the applicant is asking for in terms of additional uses. Commissioner Flynn asked if specific parts of the City Code needed to be identified to fit with the additional uses proposed by the applicant. Ms. Stiteler agreed, saying the categories of uses would have to be determined for the specific uses of the applicant.

REPORT APPROVAL, Housing Element, 2010-2011 Comprehensive Plan Update,
presented by Sarah Stiteler, City of Redmond Senior Planner.

Commissioner Gregory has been the lead Commissioner on this issue; Chairman Hinman took his place this evening. The Commission has approved the bulk of the Housing Element. The transmittal report is the only item up for review. Questions surrounding access, the jobs and housing balance, and the Housing Strategic Plan were well reflected in the documents prepared for the Commission this evening, in Chairman Hinman's opinion. Commissioner Miller noted that the revised document properly reflected his concerns, especially with regard to short-term

housing. Mechanisms for planning, monitoring, and implementing housing are noted in the transmittal report as well, Chairman Hinman said.

MOTION by Commissioner Flynn to approve the Planning Commission report for transmittal to the City Council on the amendment to the Housing Element of the Redmond Comprehensive Plan; motion seconded by Commissioner Miller. Motion passed unanimously (6-0). Chairman Hinman thanked Ms. Stiteler for her hard work on this element.

REPORT APPROVAL, Economic Vitality Element, 2010-2011 Comprehensive Plan Update, presented by Sarah Stiteler, City of Redmond Senior Planner.

The next agenda item was to approve the report on the Economic Vitality Element. Chairman Hinman corrected a typo in the following: *improvement of/in the quality of predictability, timeliness, and loss*. The *of/in* will be replaced with *in*. Beyond that, the Commission had no further questions about the proposed changes.

MOTION by Commissioner Julinsey to approve the Planning Commission report for transmittal to the City Council on the amendment of the Economic Vitality Element of the Redmond Comprehensive Plan; motion seconded by Commissioner Bontadelli. Motion passed unanimously (6-0). Chairman Hinman thanked Ms. Stiteler for more good work on this element.

REPORTS/SCHEDULING/TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING(S):

Chairman Hinman asked the Commission to make sure there were no additional absences for the next meeting, on July 13th, due to a public hearing held on that date. There will be at least five Commissioners designated to be there, possibly six with the addition of Commissioner Miller. Also at that time, the Commission will talk about the Capital Facilities Element and the Utilities Element. Chairman Hinman urged the Commission members to volunteer at the City Council's booth between 1 to 2 p.m. on July 9th at Derby Days. He urged the public to attend Derby Days as well. Staff had no further reports.

ADJOURN

Chairman Hinman adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:21 p.m.

Minutes Approved On: Planning Commission Chair
