

Planning Commission Report

To: City Council

From: Planning Commission

Staff Contacts: Rob Odle, Planning Director, 425-556-2417, rodle@redmond.gov
Lori Peckol, Policy Planning Manager,
425-556-2411, lpeckol@redmond.gov
Sarah Stiteler, Senior Planner, 425-556-2469,
sstiteler@redmond.gov

Date: October 12, 2011

DGA Number: L100259

**Planning
Commission
Recommendation:** Approval

**Recommended
Action:** Adopt amendments to the Introduction of the Redmond Comprehensive Plan as shown in *Exhibit A*. Adopt Reconciliation items as shown in *Exhibit B*.

Summary: The recommended amendments are part of the 2010-11 Periodic Update to the Comprehensive Plan. Key components of the update to the Introduction, including the Vision 2040 Statement and Reconciliation Items are described below.

- Redmond's Principles for Sustainability – The amendments add content to the Introduction, including Redmond's six Sustainability Principles. In addition, employment and demographic data has been updated in the Introduction.
- Vision 2040 Statement – The Vision 2040 statement is included as a preface to the Introduction. This statement describes how the Comprehensive Plan amendments are consistent with the Puget Sound Regional Council's VISION 2040 multicounty planning

policies and relevant planning requirements in the Growth Management Act.

- The reconciliation items include a variety of edits to Plan text, policies and maps to address any issues that have arisen following initial review of the elements.

Reasons the Proposal should be Adopted:

The recommended amendments should be adopted because:

- They reflect citywide goals, current and anticipated conditions, resolve inconsistencies between elements reviewed previously, and reflect work to date in the update to the Transportation Master Plan;
- They emphasize Redmond’s planning goal of being a sustainable community;
- They update employment and demographic data, including Redmond’s 2030 employment target; and,
- They clarify portions of the text and make the document easier to read.

Recommended Findings of Fact

1. Public Hearing and Notice

a. Public Hearing Date

The City of Redmond Planning Commission held a public hearing on the proposed amendments on September 28, 2011. No oral or written testimony for the public hearing was received.

b. Notice

The public hearing was published in the Seattle Times. Public notices were posted in City Hall and at the Redmond Library. Notice was also provided by including the hearing in Planning Commission agendas and extended agendas mailed to various members of the public and various agencies. Additionally, hearing notification was posted on the City’s web site. The hearing date was also included in the Comprehensive Plan Update quarterly newsletter mailed to several hundred citizens that have indicated interest in planning issues.

Recommended Conclusions

1. Key Issues Discussed by the Planning Commission

Exhibit C includes a summary of the Planning Commission's discussion issues and staff responses. Below are key issues discussed by the Planning Commission.

Reference to WI-FI in Economic Vitality element policy EV-18

The Planning Commission initially requested that more specific reference to WI-FI technology be included within the Economic Vitality element. Staff suggested that such a reference could be inserted into policy EV-18 and included it on the list of recommended items for reconciliation. The Planning Commission discussed the desirability of having the reference to a specific technology within the policy language and determined that a more general reference would be preferred. In addition, this approach is consistent with text and policy statements within the Utilities and PARCC elements.

Adequate parking, particularly in Urban Centers

The Planning Commission considered the issue of adequate parking and if the Comprehensive Plan addressed this issue sufficiently, particularly for Urban Centers and transit centers. Staff identified various elements in the Comprehensive Plan where the issue of parking is addressed. In the Transportation Element policies TR-19, 20 & 21 speak to Citywide parking strategies; in the Urban Centers Element, policies UT-24, UC-25 and DT-43 also address parking management and encourage multi-modal activity as well as parking access to businesses. When the Council reviewed the Comprehensive Plan Package 1 amendments, the question of the City's overall parking philosophy was identified on the Council issues matrix. At the time of Package 1 review Council agreed to maintain policies as proposed and to further discuss parking strategies as part of the Transportation Master Plan update. The Planning Commission determined that at this time the Comprehensive Plan provides sufficient policy direction regarding parking. They will continue to be interested in reviewing additional parking issues as they are addressed through the Transportation Master Plan, particularly how parking is managed at transit stations in the near term.

Use of numeric terms for describing Utilities Policy:

The Planning Commission requested clarification in policy FW-28, in which the phrases *near, middle, and long-term* are used to describe planning horizons for capital investment planning. During the Planning Commission's initial review of FW-28 in conjunction with Goals, Vision and Framework Policies, each phrase had been defined by a range of numeric years, e.g. *near* (0-6 years), *middle* (6-18 years) and *long-term* (18+ years). Staff subsequently removed the numeric modifiers in response to further work on the Capital Investment Strategy, which is intended to implement FW-28 and other policies in the Capital Facilities Element.

Because time horizons will shift following planned biennial updates to the Capital Investment Strategy (i.e. the length of time between present day and 2030 becomes

shorter), the numeric modifiers in FW-28 would also need to shift accordingly. Staff proposed removal of the modifiers to avoid the need to continually update FW-28.

In response to the above change, the Planning Commission - though recognizing the problem posed by the numeric modifiers – found that, standing alone, the terms *near, middle and long* do not provide sufficiently clear sense of time scale. The Planning Commission requested that a new modifier be inserted to provide the needed sense of time scale. Staff indicated that *near, middle and long* are approximately ‘thirds’ of time over the course of the Comprehensive Plan’s overall 2030 planning horizon. The language was changed in FW-28 to reflect this discussion:

- Optimize strategic actions and investments over near- middle- and long-term portions of the Comprehensive Plan’s 2030 planning horizon, while recognizing the need to retain flexibility to leverage opportunities and respond to changing conditions;

Introduction and Vision 2040 Statement:

The Planning Commission reviewed and recommended the Introduction and Vision 2040 Statement with minor edits.

2. Recommended Conclusions of the Technical Committee

The recommended conclusions in the Technical Committee Report (*Exhibit D*) should be adopted as conclusions.

3. Planning Commission Recommendation

The Planning Commission adopted a motion to recommend approval of amendments to the Introduction, including the Vision 2040 Statement and Reconciliation Items by a vote of 6-0 at its September 28, 2011 meeting.

List of Attachments

- Exhibit A:** Recommended Amendments to the Introduction, including the Vision 2040 Statement
- Exhibit B:** Reconciliation Items: Recommended amendments to text, policies and maps
- Exhibit C:** Planning Commission Final Issues Matrix
- Exhibit D:** Technical Committee Report with Exhibits

Robert G. Odle, Planning Director

Date

Thomas T. Hinman, Planning Commission Chairperson

Date

Approved for Council Agenda

John Marchione, Mayor

Date

N:\PLANNING\Comp Plan Update Periodic 2010-11\Intro & Wrap-up\Planning Commission review\PC Report.docx