Iss	sue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
1.	What are the land uses that	Staff Comment/Recommendation:	Opened 6/29/11
	would not be allowed in the	<u>6/29/11</u> :	
	staff proposal – conversely,	Public Comment:	Closed 7/20/11
	what land uses has the		
	applicant requested in	PC Comments:	
	addition to the staff	6/29/11: Commissioners indicated that a chart would be helpful to show	
	proposal for the designated	allowed land uses under both the staff proposal and the applicant's proposal,	
	area? (Flynn, Hinman)	and where there is overlap between the two.	
		(See attached chart – Attachment 1)	
		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.	
		7/20/11: Commissioners acknowledged the land uses that would be allowed	
		under the various alternatives.	
2.	What is the trip generation	Staff Comment/Recommendation:	
	of the uses proposed by the	6/29/11: Examples of land uses and trip generation rates are cited from the	Opened 6/29/11
	applicant; how do they	International Transportation Engineers (ITE) Trip Generation Handbook.	
	compare to those of MP	Several examples were presented by staff at the 6/29/11 study session, (6/29/11	Closed 7/20/11
	uses and the staff proposed	slides) and a copy of the presentation is attached. Other examples will be	
	additional uses? (Flynn)	provided at the 7/13/11 public hearing.	
	, ,		
		$\frac{7/13/11}{1}$: Staff provided information about p.m. peak hour traffic generation of	
		different uses. In terms of this data, uses currently on-site 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.	
		Banaraman	
		7/20/11: Staff consulted with Public Works/Transportation staff who said that	
		for the uses proposed by staff and the applicant, there was not sufficient data to	
		indicate a difference between trip generation throughout the day or if a majority	
		of trips were during the p.m. peak.	
		or tripo more during the prim pount	

	Public Comment: 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. PC Comments: 7/13/11: Planning Commissioners requested information from traffic engineering about the types of trips created by the professional/office uses throughout the day.	
	7/20/11: Planning Commissioners agreed with staff that the trip generation data was inconclusive.	
3. What types of land uses could compete with those allowed in Downtown and Overlake? (Flynn)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 6/29/11: The land uses allowed in GC that could potentially compete with uses in Downtown and Overlake are within the following categories: Professional Services and Administrative Services, Full-service restaurant, Ambulatory and outpatient care services, Personal services, Cafeteria or limited service restaurant, Bar or drinking place, Multi-family or Mixed-use residential structure, Grocery, food and beverage, Pet and Animal Sales or Service, Convenience store, Health and personal care, Finance and insurance and Real estate services. The applicant has proposed those that are underlined above. 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 area. 7/20/11: Staff emphasized that the current MP designation policies in the Comprehensive Plan would not support the additional uses proposed by the applicant.	Opened 6/29/11 Closed 7/20/11

	Public Comment: 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 180 th Avenue NE. 7/20/11: The applicant reiterated his comments from 7/13/11 on this issue. PC Comments: 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. 7/20/11: Planning Commissioners acknowledged the land uses that would be allowed under the various alternatives; the majority supported the concept that the staff recommended uses would compete less with Downtown and Overlake.	
4. What are the traffic numbers identified by SEPA Checklist? (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 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. 7/13/11: Trip generation for traditional MP uses, such as 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. 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. PC Comments: 7/13/11: The Planning Commission indicated that the information provided	

		was sufficient.	
5.	What is the approximate number of persons living in this area that is potentially served by businesses in this location? (Julinsey)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 6/29/11: The 2010 Census indicates a population of 4,182 persons living in Southeast Redmond. Public Comment: PC Comments:	Opened 6/29/11 Closed 7/13/11
6.	Have there been any comments or questions from other business occupants in or near the designated area – or any other comments? (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 6/29/11: 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. Public Comment: 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. PC Comments:	Opened 6/29/11 Closed 7/13/11
7.	How can we make sure that this change is appropriate? (Biethan)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 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. 7/13/11: 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	Opened 6/29/11 Closed 7/13/11

		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. Public Comments: PC Comments: 7/13/11: Several Commissioners stated that they believed staff had evaluated both proposals according to the evaluation criteria identified above.	
8.	What will be the impact regarding traffic management, e.g., access, ingress/egress? (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation: 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 68 th 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. 7/13/11: Staff recommends that a parking ratio of 3-4 spaces per 1,000 square feet of gfa is maintained, consistent with MP parking standards.	Opened 6/29/11 Access issue: Closed 7/13/11 Parking issue to remain open 7/13/11 Closed 7/20/11
		Public Comment: 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 180 th Street, and that they had access from NE 68 th 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.	

7/20/11: The applicant noted that his letter of $7/15/11$ gave information
regarding the current number of parking spaces as well as the additional spaces
that could be obtained on site. He said that the current ratio was 3.5 spaces per
1,000 square feet of gfa and could get up to 3.7 with additional spaces. This is
close to what retail uses would require – e.g., a ratio of 4 to 5 spaces per 1,000
feet of gfa. There would be a mixture of both MP uses as well as GC-type uses
under his proposal, so the parking ratio would work. Further, prospective
tenants would self-select based on parking and other issues.

PC Comments:

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.

<u>7/20/11:</u> The Planning Commission thanked the applicant for the parking information and determined that the existing available parking was consistent with the uses recommended.

9. What are the possible impacts to existing MP uses? Would a change to GC have an adverse impact to these businesses?

(Miller)

Staff Comment/Recommendation:

6/29/11: 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.

<u>7/13/11</u>: Staff indicated that impacts to other businesses could be a concern;

Opened 6/29/11

Closed 7/20/11

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 determine which area should retain the MP versus become MP with more "GC-type" uses.

<u>7/20/11:</u> Staff reiterated that the more GC uses allowed in the proposed overlay area, the greater the pressure for those types of uses to want to locate in nearby properties.

Public Comment:

<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 autobody 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.

<u>7/20/11:</u> The applicant noted that there was already a considerable amount of GC nearby – that the proposed overlay area was essentially surrounded by GC already.

PC Comments:

 $\frac{7/13/11}{1}$: Planning Commissioners wanted to consider this issue further at the next study session.

<u>7/20/11:</u> The Planning Commissioners voting in the majority (in favor of the staff recommendation) agreed that there would likely be additional pressure for properties nearby to want to convert to GC-type uses.