

**REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

November 14, 2012

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chairman Franz Wiechers-Gregory, Vice Chair Vibhas Chandorkar, Commissioners Miller, O'Hara, Murray, and Sanders

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED: Commissioner Biethan

STAFF PRESENT: Sarah Stiteler, Gary Lee, Jeff Churchill, Pete Sullivan - Redmond Planning Department; Scott Thomasson - Redmond Utility Engineering Manager

RECORDING SECRETARY: Lady of Letters, Inc.

CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Gregory in the Council Chambers at City Hall.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

There were no changes to the agenda.

ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

There were no items from the audience.

REPORT APPROVAL, Update to Comprehensive Plan Glossary, presented by Sarah Stiteler, City of Redmond Planning Department.

Commissioner Miller thanked the Commission for moving forward on the items in this report approval. He has had a chance to review the changes he suggested with staff and is more than delighted with the results of those discussions. Ms. Stiteler noted that a vote needed to be taken on this approval.

MOTION by Commissioner Murray and seconded by Commissioner O'Hara to approve the report concerning the update to the Comprehensive Plan Glossary. With no discussion or objection, motion approved (6-0).

PUBLIC HEARING AND STUDY SESSION, Downtown Growth, Transportation, and Efficiency Center (GTEC) Policy Update, including zoning map/text changes to Town Center and Anderson Park zones, presented by Gary Lee, City of Redmond Planning Department.

Mr. Lee began the study session on this topic with the Commission and distributed to the Commission members an email from a representative of the Bella Bottega Shopping Center. He also had a new exhibit for the Commission. He noted that this amendment

includes an update to the Downtown Zoning regulations, including revisions to the zoning map, to expand the Town Square Zone into the Valley View Zone. The City owns one of the properties in that expanded area. The intent is also to amend the Downtown Pedestrian System Map. Staff is proposing that one of the segments be removed from City property. The amendment also includes revising the Downtown Land Uses Table in order to reduce the restriction or prohibition regarding ground floor residential uses. Last, this proposal would amend the Town Center regulations to implement an existing Comprehensive Plan policy and add a Comprehensive Plan policy to designate the Downtown Urban Center as a GTEC, or Growth, Transportation, and Efficiency Center.

As background, Mr. Lee pointed out that the Downtown neighborhood zoning was established in 1993, with the intent to create an urban center, intensify the uses of Downtown, and intensify the heights of the buildings and the urban density. Since 1993, Downtown Redmond has had more than 2,250 new dwelling units developed with more than \$400 million in investment. There are 220 new affordable units and Walk Score of above 95 for most of Downtown. There has been a huge increase in transit ridership as well. Mr. Lee showed the Commission the original packet for this study session, which included an expansion of the Valley View District, into a smaller area. At the study session, staff heard interest in expanding this area, and this point has been included in the issues matrix. Mr. Lee showed the Commission the proposal to delete a section of pedestrian walkway and add some pedestrian paths, as well. Mr. Lee said the recommended alternate would be to remove the additions from the last packet and to continue with the deletion of the small segment of pedestrian walkway, otherwise known as Alternate B.

Mr. Lee showed the Commission a letter from the attorney for the Bella Bottega Shopping Center. Mr. Lee has let him know about staff's recommendation to take off the additions to the pedestrian system and also that the Zoning District would extend eastward, not to include the Bella Bottega Shopping Center site. The attorney has been sent the memo, the issues matrix, and the exhibits received by the Commission. The attorney is in agreement with the staff's alternate recommendation.

The other alternate presented would change the pedestrian segment recommended for deletion. That would be changed to a Type IX pedestrian walkway, not a vehicular/pedestrian route, but a pedestrian-only segment. The proposal also includes an amendment of the language of the Type IX pathway to allow it to go through a portal of a building with a reduced width and also to allow it to combine with a driveway as well.

Since the recommendation includes an expansion of the Town Square Zone, there would also be a need to expand the height limit overlay zone to this area, which references the Town Square Zone. Mr. Lee showed the Commission a new exhibit, Exhibit F, which showed the expansion of the Town Square Zoning District and the height limit overlay that goes with it. This would make the height limit overlay map consistent with the newly-expanded Town Square Zone. Staff is recommending that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council Exhibits A through F, including the new alternates contained in Exhibit A and B.

Mr. Lee noted that the Planning Commission did not express concern or question at the last study session regarding several proposed amendments, which include relaxing the zoning prohibition for residential uses on the ground floor of Type II streets. The proposal is to reduce it from 100 feet to 50 feet in some districts. That is Exhibit C in the original packet. Exhibit D did not raise any issues either, which was reflecting the Comprehensive Plan Policy as part of the Town Center District regulations, which basically establishes a minimum of 600,000 square feet of retail space that must be maintained in this zone. Mr. Lee also displayed the new GTEC policy in Exhibit E.

Commissioner Miller spoke about Alternate B, and asked if, with its vote, the Commission would be voting on the recommended alternate as well as the second alternate to Exhibit B. Mr. Lee said the Commission would not be endorsing all of the alternates. The Commission would have to choose one of them.

Chairman Gregory opened the public hearing on this issue and asked if there were any members of the public who were present to testify. Seeing none, he closed the oral public hearing process as well as the written public hearing. He made note to include the email to Mr. Lee from the Bella Bottega attorney and all of the materials with it as part of the public hearing record.

Commissioner Miller revisited the idea of deleting the pedestrian segment recommended by staff and the other alternative of changing it to a Type IX pedestrian path. He was concerned about deleting any element of the pedestrian system map. Staff has explained to Commissioner Miller that this would be a deletion of the vehicular portion, but not the pedestrian portion. Overall, this move would retain a pedestrian corridor, which Commissioner Miller supports. He thought that having a shared vehicle-pedestrian route would be a bit much, in that there is no need for that type of wide, heavily-developed route. However, as policy, he strongly believes in preserving pedestrian connections where possible. He said pedestrian connections make Downtown Redmond a premium location.

Commissioner Miller supports Alternate 2B, which preserves the pedestrian corridor and drops what he believes would be an onerous development of a roadway. He wanted to make sure that the Commission preserved and enhanced the investment of the Redmond community, for the past forty years, in pedestrian corridors through Downtown. He was supportive of the second alternative presented by staff, 2B, in that it allowed the preservation of pedestrian connections. He commended staff for its flexibility on this issue.

Mr. Lee said all the issues surrounding this topic should be resolved by the alternative presented by staff. Commissioner Chandorkar clarified that Alternate 2, Exhibit B has a modification of Type IX. He asked what that might look like. Mr. Lee said the original language would include a thirty-foot wide mid-block pathway in the center with an eight-foot wide sidewalk with eleven feet of landscaping on both sides. The proposal would be to keep the thirty feet in width, with the eight-foot walkway and eleven feet of

landscaping on both sides, but it could also be a fourteen-foot wide pathway that goes through a portal of a building. A building could thus be built over it. Or, the path could be included on a driveway that is twenty feet wide which is paved in such a way to slow down drivers. On the original thirty-foot wide path, driveways were not allowed, so parallel paths with a driveway would have to be provided. Commissioner Chandorkar suggested a connecting word such as *or* should be between the alternatives. Mr. Lee said that would be a good suggestion. Commissioner Sanders pointed out that there were three options, and enumerating them might be a good idea.

Commissioner Sanders asked about the phrase *pedestrian-friendly pattern* contained in the language. Mr. Lee said this would include a paving material, or concrete with patterns in it. The idea is not to dictate a material like concrete or calling specifically for painting on the asphalt. Commissioner O'Hara asked if asphalt was pedestrian-friendly. Mr. Lee said he did not think so. Commissioner Sanders asked if there was an ADA-compliant element to this recommendation, in that the surface should be firm and not gravel. She thought the phrase *pedestrian-friendly pattern* was vague and misleading, and asked Mr. Lee to tighten that up in some way.

Commissioner Miller asked what the Bella Bottega attorney's objection was to the previous version of the staff recommendation. Mr. Lee said the objection was about the addition of the pathways and vehicular ways. Mr. Lee said, regarding the pedestrian segments staff is recommending to remove, that there is a standard allowing for an increase in height from two stories to four stories if a village type of design is used, to include additional vehicular passageways and pathways in the site planning. This would encourage developers to use a compact village design site plan. With that, if developers want to develop in this area, there is a standard in place to provide pathways and vehicular ways. Commissioner Miller agreed with that idea, and said this corridor is basically a loading dock and service route for trucks. He said it would take a massive redesign to create a pedestrian corridor.

Ms. Stiteler added that there would be some opportunities in the Bella Bottega Shopping Center regarding redevelopment in the future, particularly with the incentive of the additional height and density. She said the incentive gave a lot of opportunity to provide more circulation and connection. That was one of the foundations of the decision to recommend removal of the pedestrian linkage proposed in the first alternative. Staff believes that this linkage, at this point, is a bit of a redundancy. The linkage is about 140 feet north of an existing pedestrian pathway. Especially in light of the opportunities Redmond is expecting in the future, the additional pedestrian pathway is probably not necessary. Commissioner Murray confirmed that the Bella Bottega attorney agrees with the alternative recommended by staff. Mr. Lee said Alternate B, or Alternate 2B, would be acceptable to the Bella Bottega group, as these do not affect their property.

Mr. Lee reviewed the issues matrix. Regarding the zoning boundary change, staff recommends expanding the zoning boundary to include the north side of 87th Street but not the vacant lot across from the Jack-in-the-Box. This vacant lot is in the Bella Bottega

Shopping Center, and owners of the center did not want that included in the zoning change. The Commission decided to close this issue.

Moving to issue two, regarding the additions and deletions of Type VII pedestrian segments, Chairman Gregory noted that the staff recommendation is reflected in Alternate B, which would involve the deletion. Alternate 2B has been provided for consideration if the Commission is not in agreement with Alternate B. Commissioner Miller supported 2B to preserve the possibility of creating pedestrian linkages in an area that is increasing in density without the prescriptive definition of a vehicular way or even a specific location. He respectfully disagreed with Ms. Stiteler's argument that there was a pathway 140 feet away. He said the finer the mesh on the Downtown pedestrian system, the more walkable the system becomes. He said even the 140-foot distance would deter people from walking. He wanted to preserve the ability to create an urban, walkable place.

Commissioner Chandorkar asked why Alternative 2 and not 2B was recommended by staff. He thought 2B would be a better solution. Ms. Stiteler said after a number of staff meetings including transportation staff, the idea was that with the existing pedestrian linkage noted to the south, and with the opportunities for additional height and density, any more pedestrian linkage would not be necessary. Commissioner Chandorkar asked if the linkage could be there and not hurt anything, in terms of growth and density. Ms. Stiteler said it would not necessarily hurt anything, but would be an additional requirement on properties to allow for a pathway to cut through them.

Commissioner Miller noted that in Downtown there are dedicated pedestrian ways not shared with a vehicular function that exist within 140 feet of an adjacent street. Those paths are amenities, in his opinion, and he wants to retain the vision of the Pedestrian System Plan. He did not want to throw out the pedestrian connection, and said in the future, if development did happen in this area, it could happen with the best interests of the developer and the people who might live there.

Chairman Gregory noted that the Commission had a choice in front of it with the second issue on the issues matrix between Alternate B and Alternate 2B. Commissioner Murray asked if the Commission was asked to forward one recommendation, or if the Commission could rank the two alternates for the Council. Chairman Gregory said a specific recommendation was preferred. He called for a vote between Alternate B and 2B. Commissioner O'Hara voted to support Alternate B. Commissioner Murray and Miller voted to oppose it. Chairman Gregory abstained from voting, as did Commissioner Sanders and Commissioner Chandorkar. On Alternative 2B, Commissioners Miller, Murray, and Chandorkar and Chairman Gregory voted to approve it. No votes were made to oppose it. Alternative 2B was thus selected by the Commission, and Chairman Gregory asked Mr. Lee to prepare an issues table to reflect that.

Mr. Lee noted that the last issue was a question about what qualifies an area to be a GTEC, and the general answer is that it should be an adopted urban center, which is the case in the Downtown area. The Commission was in agreement with the staff response on

that issue, and the issue was closed. Mr. Lee noted that now all the issues were closed and the Commission could recommend adoption to the City Council Exhibits A through F, including the alternate Exhibit A and Alternate 2, Exhibit B.

MOTION by Commissioner Chandorkar and seconded by Commissioner Murray to recommend adoption to the City Council of Exhibits A through F, including the alternate Exhibit A and Alternate 2, Exhibit B. With no further discussion, or objection, motion approved (6-0).

STUDY SESSION, General Sewer Plan Amendment, presented by Jeff Churchill, Redmond Planning Department.

Mr. Churchill had a number of items to show the Commission, including a short presentation regarding the Rose Hill Heights South Sewer Plan amendment. There is an applicant involved in that case who will provide some testimony in the future, and it may benefit the Commission to wait for that testimony before discussing it much further. Regarding the General Sewer Plan, Mr. Churchill noted that it was one of Redmond's functional plans, much like the Transportation Master Plan. Some elements of the Sewer Plan are required by the Growth Management Act and some elements are simply good practices to have in place. Part of the Sewer Plan is adopted by reference into the Comprehensive Plan, which is why this is in front of the Planning Commission. The Sewer Plan has a plan for every basin in Redmond and identifies existing facilities and needed expansions over the next twenty years, so it is keyed to the Land Use Plan. The Sewer Plan was last adopted in 2009.

Regarding the Rose Hill Heights situation, the applicant was involved in an annexation for the Rose Hill Heights South area. The Council received notice of intent for that annexation process back in 2007, and that annexation was completed at the end of 2008. The applicant subsequently started and completed the Innovative Housing Review process for a nine-home proposal on properties owned by the applicant along 132nd. That approval subsequently expired; Commissioner Chandorkar was actually part of the Innovative Housing Review Panel at the time. Now, there is a short plat with the same applicant under consideration. There is not a formal proposal, but six or seven lots are involved on the same properties. That is the immediate reason for the Sewer Plan amendment before the Commission.

Most of the area on the east side of 132nd is on septic systems, as it was recently annexed and sewer was not available prior to the annexation. Some lots have sanitary sewer connections due to circumstances pre-dating the annexation. Mr. Churchill noted that 132nd marks the city limits. He showed the sewer conditions on the Kirkland side and Redmond side to show the Commission the depth of the sewer line at certain points. He showed how there is a sewer that ends west of 134th, and the City's plan is to extend that sewer west to 132nd and then south from 75th to 70th to serve all the properties on the east side of 132nd and along 75th that do not have sewer service currently. The applicant is proposing to change the plan such that another sewer line owned and maintained by the City of Kirkland, under 132nd, would make the connection to some of these properties.

The Technical Committee is recommending that the City retain its existing Sewer Plan for three reasons noted in the report: technical feasibility, cost, and timing. The City does not believe that the proposed connection to the Kirkland line is feasible, nor does it meet City standards for safe and healthy sewers. The applicant disputes that, but the City is standing by that claim. The City says if the proposal is not feasible, it would not be a good idea to change the Sewer Plan to presume that connection. With regard to cost, it costs more to extend the sewer a number of times than it would to extend the sewer once or twice. If the planned sewer line were cut in half, there are fewer opportunities for the sewer to extend south. Regarding timing, if there are fewer opportunities, the whole process may take longer. The applicant says in his letter that the City does not control the time of development, which Mr. Churchill says is absolutely true. There is no timeline for when people might develop this area. But, if there are fewer opportunities to extend the sewer, there are fewer opportunities for development.

Commissioner Murray asked if by cutting off the southern portion of the proposed sewer network there would be fewer opportunities to build a sewer. Mr. Churchill pointed out that some properties in the area considered do not have sewer and are potential redevelopment sites in the near or mid-term future. The applicant owns two of the properties in question. Commissioner Murray clarified that the applicant is making his proposal for the sake of those two properties, and asked if that would render the property south of his properties connected to Kirkland's sewer. Mr. Churchill said the applicant's plan would connect all of the properties, including his own, to Kirkland's sewer system.

Commissioner Murray asked how the proposal from the applicant limited the City of Redmond from building the sewer plan north of the applicant. Mr. Churchill said the proposal would not limit the ability to extend the sewer, but the properties north of the applicant would have fewer opportunities to connect. None of those properties would be responsible for extending the sewer. Commissioner O'Hara confirmed that there was an existing sewer line down that street, and reiterated that in the applicant's proposal, several properties could connect to the Kirkland sewer. He asked why the City should bother building a sewer ten feet next to the one that already exists. He asked why properties could not connect at the time of redevelopment. He did not understand the timing issue.

Commissioner Chandorkar said there was a clarification of this issue in the technical report. The report says that there is a fixed cost with building a sewer line, no matter how many properties benefit from it. If there are fewer properties, the per property portion of the fixed cost would be higher, thus deterring development in the future. Commissioner Miller said there might be low costs for the first two properties involved, but the marginal cost for future developers would be significant.

Scott Thomasson, the Utility Engineering Manager for the City of Redmond, spoke next to the Commission. He said that his group was responsible for long-range planning, capital improvement planning and administrative duties over the utility. He is also responsible for regional issues and interlocal agreements. Mr. Thomasson pointed out

that Redmond does not have the right to connect to Kirkland's sewer line. The applicant says in his letter that Kirkland has told him it would be okay for him to connect, but Redmond and Kirkland have not had that conversation, city to city. The two cities do not know what the terms of connection would be and if it would be affordable. Connection charges would be at issue as well as repayment for the sewer, and other issues could come up during negotiations. It is not a simple matter to connect to the Kirkland sewer from a political perspective. There are also technical issues and standard service issues.

Regarding sewer extensions, Mr. Thomasson noted that nearly all sewers in Redmond are extended by developers. There have been very few City-run extensions, with 95% of the sewer extensions over the last twenty years done by developers. In this case, to extend sewer service into the newly-annexed area, the usual method is to wait for a developer to propose a development. The developer would then be expected to extend the sewer. The sewer may pass other properties, and the developer could set up a reimbursement agreement where fees would be set up against those other parcels in proportion to the share of the cost. The fewer people who participate in that extension, the fewer people would share in the cost of the sewer connections off of 132nd.

Mr. Thomasson believes the developer's main concern is that he does not want to pay up front for the piece of sewer in question. It is not clear if the price for sewer quoted by the developer in his letter is accurate. Mr. Thomasson believes the price is high, but he has no engineering estimates for this work. The proposal from the applicant is to allow other developers to build the sewer to the north and allow him to connect to Kirkland's sewer, which is across the street from him. The City is recommending against that, the technical issues being the primary ones and the political issues the secondary concerns.

Commissioner Miller asked if there was a precedent of tying into Kirkland's sewer system on other areas on the City of Redmond boundary. Mr. Thomasson said there were two properties in this general area that connect to Kirkland. This connection happened before the properties were annexed into Redmond, and Redmond had no jurisdiction. Kirkland chose to serve properties outside their city limits. The City of Redmond was aware of one property in this situation, where the owners said their septic tank had failed. The City did not argue with Kirkland on that property. With the other property, the City of Redmond was not consulted. There is one other property under development, St. George's Church, on the corner of 100th and 132nd. An agreement has been negotiated with Kirkland for a temporary connection at that property as the City of Redmond waits for development to bring sewer closer to that site. The church was required to build any sewer along its frontages to allow for connection to the City of Redmond sewer when it comes into that neighborhood.

Mr. Thomasson said there were three primary differences between this church situation and the applicant's proposal: the church connection is a temporary one, the church sewer is much deeper and does not have any technical issues, and the church developer extended a fair amount of sewer as a building permit condition. Commissioner Miller clarified that there was no precedent where a parcel currently in the City of Redmond has

tied into Kirkland on a permanent basis. Mr. Thomasson agreed as far as the City has been involved in negotiation.

Commissioner Sanders asked if other neighboring cities, like Bellevue, have had such a precedent. Mr. Thomasson said there was a piece of sewer on Bel-Red Road involving people in Redmond who are actually customers of Bellevue. But from his understanding, that situation existed before the annexation. The City intends to fix this issue, but has not done so yet.

Commissioner Chandorkar asked about the applicant's claims that the depth of the sewer and what the City says that depth would be. Mr. Thomasson said the City does not know what the actual depths of the water mains are. The applicant, when he was doing his prior development, was given the opportunity to provide that. His letter references that he received this information from an as-built structure. The two diagrams from the City show only a foot difference in the depths, nominally, which would have to be verified. Mr. Thomasson said the applicant's letter makes an improper assertion that there is a Kirkland water main involved. Kirkland and Redmond own that water main together. Redmond has a very strong interest in the integrity of that water main, and City standards would say that the sewer pipe should not go over that water main. Mr. Thomasson added that whatever sewer is brought across the street into the development would be a Redmond sewer pipe connected to Kirkland's system, depending on negotiation.

Commissioner Chandorkar asked if there was an aspect of the interlocal agreement with Kirkland that covers technical specifications. Mr. Thomasson said the agreement would address all of the issues, including cost, what would be built, how many people could be served, how big the service area would be, and a number of other issues. Commissioner Chandorkar confirmed with Mr. Thomasson that the drawing presented by the applicant does not appear to meet Redmond's standards. Mr. Thomasson noted that the standard asks for a sewer at least seven feet deep, which is generally enough to get under water mains and power facilities. The sewer should definitely be below the water main. The drawings provided by the applicant show sewer pipes going over the water mains at a very shallow depth, or sewer lines going through the water mains. Overall, Mr. Thomasson said there were some conflicts in trying to build a sewer through this area.

Commissioner Murray confirmed that the City did not know the depth of either water main in this area. Typically, smaller water mains would have at least three feet of cover and the larger pipe would have four feet of cover. The applicant says there might be as much as five feet of cover. Mr. Thomasson clarified that the drawings presented to the Commission showed what the applicant is asking for and what the design standards are, but the actual measurements are not known. Mr. Churchill noted that the only way to determine those measurements would be through digging and locating the pipes. Commissioner Murray asked if the technical feasibility made by the City was based on what the City believes to be in place, and not the actual measurements. Mr. Churchill said if the measurements are close to what the City believes to be in place, then the sewer could not be built to meet standards. Commissioner Murray confirmed that the technical feasibility arguments, at least in part, were due to lack of information.

Chairman Gregory asked how standards would be defined in this case. The attorney for the applicant pointed out that the City had a preferred standard, but a minimal standard or state SEPA standard was not noted. Mr. Thomasson said he wrote the standards, and could help in this matter. The preferred depth is seven feet, which puts the sewer deep enough to serve two sides of a street and avoid other utilities. On some streets, the sewer has to be as deep as fifteen feet for some downhill properties. A minimum cover of five feet is allowed. That deals with the loading of the pipe and if the pipe can support cars driving over it. In some unpaved areas, the pipe could be as shallow as three feet. The five foot standard, the minimum, is a rarity in Redmond and allowed only for unusual circumstances.

Commissioner Miller asked about the material of the sewer main, which was a concern raised by the attorney for the applicant. That attorney writes that the minimum cover over a ductile iron sewer main shall be three feet. Mr. Thomasson said that iron pipe was stronger than PVC, so it could be driven on with fewer issues. But in looking ahead in the future to where other utilities expect to be in this area, they would not expect a sewer main with that little amount of cover. The sewer, Mr. Thomasson said, should be designed in concert with the other utilities in the street.

Commissioner Chandorkar pointed out that the technical report says that the eastern ends of the properties are sloping. The letter from the attorney for the applicant says that is not true. Mr. Churchill said that two sets of contours were being used. The ones used in the City GIS show that the property slopes up to the middle, falls off to the northeast, and continues up to the southeast. The applicant did a site survey a few years back, and those contours show a continuing increase in elevation to the east. Commissioner Chandorkar said this matter had a technical aspect and a policy aspect, as well as a precedent being set. He noted that the technical report spoke to the Neighborhood Sewer Replacement Program from the City, which has stalled due to a lack of budget. Commissioner Chandorkar noted the report said, even with full City funding, it is expected to take twenty years to serve all eligible areas with sewer. He asked how this jibes with the concept that the developer would pay for any sewer extensions.

Mr. Thomasson replied that the majority of sewers are built by developers. In a trial program in the late 1990's, the City built four sewers for neighborhoods on septic systems. Thirty properties benefited from this project, but only three or four have connected. There is a policy issue about requiring people to connect to the sewer or at least requiring they pay if the sewer is built in their neighborhood. This stems from the equity issue that ratepayer money is used for projects such as this to benefit people who have never paid rates. There have been proposals made in the last budget year to revive the Neighborhood Sewer Program, due to water quality issues, but it has not received enough priority to be funded.

Commissioner Chandorkar confirmed that if a developer wanted to work on this site in the near future, that could happen and a sewer could be built in a much shorter time than twenty years. Commissioner Murray noted that the applicant's letter has technical

concerns in points one through five; issues six, seven, eight, and nine are more subjective in nature. Commissioner Murray asked for an issues matrix from staff to help rebut these concerns. Chairman Gregory echoed Commissioner Murray's desire for the issues matrix to cover issues one through five, at the very least. Chairman Gregory noted that issues six through nine are indeed more subjective.

Chairman Gregory was interested in the reimbursement agreement aspects of this situation, in that a developer would have to construct 900 feet of sewer connection to build in this spot and later developers would somehow pay into a reimbursement agreement. Mr. Thomasson said there was a section in the Municipal Code that speaks to reimbursement agreements. A developer who builds a sewer that benefits others can apply for such an agreement, and the City would review it for reasonableness. The Code provides that the agreement has a life of ten years from when the sewer is finished. Mr. Thomasson said the agreement can work well for the City in that the risk of a property not connecting in a ten-year span is borne by the developer. Commissioner O'Hara confirmed that if property owners wait beyond that ten-year span, they would not pay the reimbursement fee but would pay the City's connection charge.

Chairman Gregory suggested that the Commission take up this discussion again at the public hearing, and in the meantime, if Commissioners come up with questions, they may direct those toward staff. Chairman Gregory would especially like to find a reasonably reliable number in terms of the required depth and possibly the actual depth of the sewer in this area. Mr. Churchill said the written materials from the applicant will be given to the Commission members as well for background. Chairman Gregory called for a five-minute recess at this point.

BRIEFING, Digital Comprehensive Plan, presented by Pete Sullivan, Redmond Planning Department.

Mr. Sullivan said that last month, staff distributed a print version of the newly-updated Comprehensive Plan, the work on which concluded last December. Staff chose to produce a limited number of printed versions, given that the document is written in narrative format, and is used differently than a reference like the Zoning Code. The web version of the Comprehensive Plan went live the day before this meeting and is a more 21st-century document. For example, it is driven by an animated Adobe Flash file format and is compatible with most devices and browsers. Functional improvements like hyperlinks, search, and the ability to embed video yield a richer user experience. The navigation is more intuitive and key data is easier to locate. The digital version was developed by the City, and both it and the print version will be maintained and updated by staff as needed to deal with annual amendments.

Mr. Sullivan showed the Commission how to access the digital document, how to navigate on it, how to recognize the appearance of links, and how to search for text. A banner on the City of Redmond home page will direct people to the new release of the digital Comprehensive Plan. The table of contents has links to take a reader to a certain chapter, potentially skipping hundreds of pages ahead. There is a jump menu in a sidebar

that will allow movement to any other part of the document at any time. The maps and tables are featured prominently in the digital Comprehensive Plan for easy access. Maps are also linked to show items such as the designation of a certain parcel. Chairman Gregory asked if individual pages were printable, and Mr. Sullivan said that was indeed possible. One can also access a high-resolution version of maps and tables for optimum printing. He added that the digital Comprehensive Plan works well on all major browsers and devices, answering a concern of Chairman Gregory's on that point. Handheld devices are able to use the digital Comprehensive Plan easily as well.

Mr. Sullivan showed the internal and external links in the digital document. External links take a reader to Zoning Code references or the Transportation Master Plan, for example. He showed the Commission how to search for certain key words and phrases, and asked them for questions, comments, and feedback. Chairman Gregory said the digital Comprehensive Plan looked very impressive.

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

Mr. Sullivan said there was nothing new to report in terms of Hearing Examiner activity. One event between this meeting and the previous one was the kickoff of the Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Plan. Commissioner Biethan was the liaison for that meeting, and other Commissioners attended. Commissioner Murray said he attended and stayed through the public information period of the meeting. He said the focus sessions were the real meat of the meeting, with about sixteen or eighteen residents who showed up and participated. He thanked the staff for facilitating and encouraging the conversation, which Commissioner Murray found to be robust. He hoped that interested residents would continue to participate, and said the people in the Woodbridge area really value their neighborhood and are deeply invested in it.

Chairman Gregory noted that the next meeting for the Commission would be November 28th, and the public hearing and study session on the General Sewer Plan Map Amendment would be featured. He wished a happy Thanksgiving to the Commission members.

ADJOURN

Chairman Gregory adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:18 p.m.

Minutes Approved On:

Planning Commission Chair