

Issue/Panel Member	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p>1. Functioning and safety of underground parking (Evans)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> All land uses, including parking garages, can benefit from employing principles of Crime Prevention through Environmental Design (CPTED). The San Diego Police Department offers the following design advice for residential parking garages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Garages should be gated. • Gates that are one vehicle wide are preferred. • Gates should have a sensor to prevent tailgating into a garage. • Where possible, garage entrances should be from within the development. • Carports are not preferred because their roofs block view of the vehicles below. • Vehicles should be registered, and garages should be for residents only. • Cameras could be used to record garage ingress/egress. • Visitor parking should be provided outside the garage <p><u>Public Comment</u> A citizen commented that there are no ramps to underground parking in the neighborhood, and several citizens commented that no underground garages exist in the neighborhood, and that they would not be compatible with the neighborhood. Citizens cited drainage, security, and aesthetic concerns.</p> <p>The applicant commented that the project team had spent a lot of time thinking about how to handle cars on the site. They had considered other garage locations, but settled on the west entrance to best make use of existing topography. The applicant noted that it is a question of trade-offs. The garage allows the surface of the site to be largely vehicle free, and so the surface is safe for kids and adults alike to use for a variety of activities.</p> <p><u>Panel Comments</u> A Panel member expressed strong concern that the underground garage would provide an opportunity for car prowlers. He suggested that there be more eyes on the entrance to the garage, perhaps by moving the entrance to the interior of the development. Another Panel believed that this was largely a question of trade-offs, and felt that the positive attributes of putting cars below ground outweighed the negative attributes, but agreed that the applicant would need to take prudent measures to secure the garage.</p>	<p>Opened 12/15 Closed 1/12</p> <p>Panel requested a north entrance alternative to be presented to the Technical Committee for review.</p>

<p>2. How will stormwater be handled for this proposal? (Black)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> The applicant has provided a conceptual stormwater plan. In it, the applicant shows that he is relying on a combination of swales and an underground vault to handle stormwater. Exact sizing of the vault would follow stormwater calculations, which would be completed during the entitlement phase of this project, if the Review Panel authorizes application for land use entitlement.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> Citizens commented that stormwater runoff is already challenging in the neighborhood, and felt that increased development could lead to additional runoff problems. The applicant described the conceptual stormwater system.</p> <p><u>Panel Comments</u> Panel members noted that City technical staff would have to review a much more detailed plan before any permits could be issued.</p>	<p>Opened 12/15 Closed 1/12</p> <p>Panel urged applicant to work closely with City stormwater engineer to develop a refined and approvable stormwater plan.</p>
<p>3. Compatibility of proposed roof forms with surrounding area development (Meade and others)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> The applicant has provided pictures of single-slope roofs in the Grass Lawn neighborhood. Also, at your January 12th meeting, the applicant will have available boards depicting a gabled roof for homes #7 and #9, which is closest to 132nd Avenue NE.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> Citizens at both the December and January meetings commented that they felt that the proposal did not fit in with the surrounding neighborhood. Some specifically identified the roof forms as not compatible. The applicant showed roof forms from another Grass Lawn subdivision that were single-slope and flat, demonstrating that some non-traditional roof forms exist in the neighborhood.</p> <p><u>Panel Comments</u> Panel members were favorable toward the addition of gabled roofs to homes 7 and 9.</p>	<p>Opened 12/15 Closed 1/12</p> <p>Panel satisfied with gabled roof forms for homes 7 and 9.</p>
<p>4. How many and which trees will be preserved? (Black and others)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> The applicant provided a site plan that shows which significant and landmark trees are proposed to be preserved and which are proposed to be removed and replaced. Staff reviewed the site plan and an arborist report dated March 2008. The arborist used a slightly different classification</p>	<p>Opened 12/15 Closed 1/12</p> <p>Panel noted</p>

	<p>than is typically used in Redmond, so there is some uncertainty as to exactly how many significant trees are on site. If all trees classified as “Fair-Good” or better are counted as healthy, staff estimates that there are 16 significant trees, of which 10 are proposed to be preserved – more than the six that would be required. Of those 10, four could be impacted because of their proximity to structures. An arborist would have to determine that their proximity to the structure would not compromise their long-term viability in order for the City to consider them “saved” trees. If the Review Panel authorizes this proposal to go forward, the applicant would need to provide an updated arborist report that conforms to Redmond’s classification system.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> A citizen commented that a graphic showing trees saved at the back (east) of the property was not accurate because no trees existed there. Citizens commented that where structures impinged upon tree drip lines, trees would be difficult to save. A citizen asked the Review Panel to ensure that the proposal satisfies Redmond’s tree protection regulations. The applicant stated that City staff had received an arborist report, and that the report would be updated during the technical review phase.</p> <p><u>Panel Comments</u> Panel members noted that the applicant would have to meet Redmond’s 35% significant tree retention regulation. Panel members were also mindful of the fact that where structures are built in drip lines, there could be negative impacts to tree health.</p>	<p>that proposal would need to satisfy Redmond’s tree protection regulations.</p>
<p>5. What will the impervious surface area be? (Meade)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> The applicant has provided impervious surface area calculation keyed to a site plan. The proposed impervious surface area is 44.5% according to the site plan; the allowed impervious surface area in the R-6 zone is 65%.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> The applicant described that the proposal has impervious surface area coverage of about 45%, below the maximum allowed.</p> <p><u>Panel Comments</u> Panel members were satisfied with the information provided.</p>	<p>Opened 12/15 Closed 1/12</p> <p>The Panel was satisfied with the information provided.</p>

<p>6. What is the landscaping concept? How will it screen visitor parking and the parking garage? (Several)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> Please see the conceptual landscaping plan and landscaping plan key included in your packet for January 12th. The applicant plans to landscape the site with a mixture of saved trees, new trees, shrubs, grasses, perennials, and groundcover. Many of the species are native and drought tolerant. Visitor parking will be screened by trees, shrubs, and groundcover.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>Panel Comments</u> The Panel asked the applicant to provide additional screening along the south property line to screen the parking garage, and along the west property line to screen the parking area. The Panel requested that the screening west of the parking area not impact the ability of drivers to safely enter/exit the development.</p>	<p>Opened 12/15 Closed 1/12</p> <p>Panel requested additional screening for garage and parking area.</p>
<p>7. Orientation of homes to 132nd Ave. NE (Several)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u></p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> The applicant described how the project team altered the orientation of home 9 to more directly address 132nd Avenue NE.</p> <p><u>Panel Comments</u> At the December meeting, Panel members suggested increasing the degree to which the homes closest to 132nd Ave. NE are oriented to that street. At the January meeting, the Panel saw revised drawings showing increased orientation of home 9 to 132nd Avenue NE.</p>	<p>Opened 12/15 Closed 1/12</p> <p>Panel satisfied with revised plan for home 9.</p>
<p>8 What are the innovative features of the home interiors? (Chandorkar)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> The applicant furnished additional information regarding this issue on Monday, January 12th.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> A citizen commented that the proposal is not innovative. The applicant identified several techniques related to green building that the project team plans to employ in the layout of the site and construction of the homes.</p> <p><u>Panel Comments</u> Panel members were satisfied with the information provided by the applicant.</p>	<p>Opened 12/15 Closed 1/12</p> <p>Panel members were satisfied with the information provided.</p>

<p>9. Perimeter setbacks (All)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> Staff recommended 10-foot setbacks on the south perimeter and five-foot setbacks on the north and east perimeters. Reducing the setbacks allows for adequate community open space and internal building separation. Staff recommends the 10-foot south setback in order to provide additional buffering between the proposed homes and an existing home.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> Citizens commented that five-foot perimeter setbacks were inadequate to ensure privacy. The applicant described the thinking in proposing five-foot setbacks, noting that the architect oriented the homes so that in many cases neighbors would see the corners of homes rather than the entire sides of homes.</p> <p><u>Panel Comments</u> Most Panel members supported 10-foot perimeter setbacks on the north, east, and south sides. They agreed that there could be limited exceptions, such as the corner of a home. Panel members said that an averaging of building setbacks would be permissible, but in no case would setbacks less than five feet be appropriate.</p>	<p>Opened 1/12 Closed 1/12</p> <p>Panel members agreed that perimeter setbacks needed to be 10 feet on average, while allowing for limited exceptions.</p>
<p>10. Community Building (All)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> Staff noted in the staff report that reducing the size of the community building could enable the applicant to meet the setback standards recommended by staff.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> The applicant stated that the community building proposal had been scaled back to a one-story building with a green roof.</p> <p><u>Panel Comments</u> Panel members discussed the pros and cons of including a community building on the site. A Panel member noted that the community building could be a place where neighbors gather. Others noted that removing the community building would result in a more open feel in the center of the site. In the end, the Panel concluded that it would be up to the applicant to weigh the trade-offs in deciding whether or not to include a community building.</p>	<p>Opened 1/12 Closed 1/12</p> <p>Panel concluded that applicant must ultimately decide whether to include community building.</p>