

Memorandum

To: Planning Commission

From: Lori Peckol, Policy and Planning Manager, 556-2411

Date: October 4, 2013

Subject: **Study Session, Community Engagement for Planning and Development Projects**

PURPOSE

To discuss community engagement for planning and development projects, including opportunities for improvements to achieve timely public input. The Commission will be joined by staff from Planning (Long Range and Development Review) and Communications.

BACKGROUND

This study session is a follow-up to a June 16, 2013 briefing which addressed administrative updates related to public notice of development activity and also to the Commission's review in August 2013 of proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code, some of which related to notice. The October 9 study session will be broader in scope, and intended to follow up on the Commission's ongoing interest in effective community engagement related to planning and development projects.

MEETING APPROACH AND PREPARATION

We propose to spend about 20 minutes for introduction and to speak to topics Planning Commission has asked about, such as what we do now for outreach (see outline below and also Attachment A). Following the presentation, we would like to brainstorm with the Commission regarding community engagement related to planning and development projects. We have included proposed discussion questions below based on questions that we wrestle with in thinking about community engagement. We would welcome Planning Commission's perspective on these questions, as well as other insights.

Outline

- I. Introduction – types of engagement, questions we consider in designing approach
Lori Peckol, Policy and Planning Manager
- II. Long range plans – what we do now, recent improvements and results
Kim Dietz, Senior Planner
- III. Development projects - what we do now, recent improvements and results
Cathy Beam, Principal Planner; Steve Fischer; Principal Planner
- IV. Citywide communications context
Jeri Rowe-Curtis, Chief Communications Officer

Proposed Discussion Questions – Community Engagement for Planning and Development Projects

- Who are our customers?
- Do we know what is important to them?
- What does success look like with regard to timely public input? What outcome are we seeking?
- What are the gaps in what we do now?
- Ideas for improvement, including how to inform people on process and when to get involved? What are some of the best practices for community engagement?
- Initial thoughts on development project notice?
- What does it take to achieve success and the outcome we are seeking?
- How could we measure success, outcomes?

QUESTIONS

Please contact Lori Peckol, (425) 556-2411, lpeckol@redmond.gov with questions, suggestions and for additional information prior to the study session.

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A: Project Level Public Comment Opportunities

Attachment A

City of Redmond Project Level Public Comment Opportunities

PERMIT PROCESS TYPE	TYPICAL LAND USE PROJECT "PERMITS"	DECISION MAKER	NOTICE OF APPLICATION	NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING	NOTICE OF OPEN RECORD PUBLIC HEARING	NOTICE OF DECISION	APPEAL PROCESS
II (Admin.)	Short plat, site plan entitlement, shoreline substantial development permit, binding site plan	Technical Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 21 days prior to decision ▪ Mailed to property owners within 500 feet of site ▪ Posted notice on site (sign) ▪ Posted notice at City Hall and library 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Required for short plats that have 3 or more lots, critical areas, or are 75% forested ▪ Notice given in same manner as Notice of Application 	Administrative approval. Hearing not required for this permit process type.	Mailed to all parties of record.	Parties of record can appeal decision.
III (Quasi-Judicial)	Preliminary plat, shoreline conditional use permit, variance	Hearing Examiner	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 21 days prior to decision ▪ Mailed to property owners within 500 feet of site 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Required for preliminary plats ▪ Notice given in same manner as 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 21 days prior to hearing ▪ Notice published in newspaper ▪ Mailed to property 	Mailed to all parties of record.	Parties of record can ask for reconsideration and can also appeal decision.

PERMIT PROCESS TYPE	TYPICAL LAND USE PROJECT "PERMITS"	DECISION MAKER	NOTICE OF APPLICATION	NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING	NOTICE OF OPEN RECORD PUBLIC HEARING	NOTICE OF DECISION	APPEAL PROCESS
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Posted notice on site (sign) ▪ Posted notice at City Hall and library 	Notice of Application	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> owners within 500 feet of site and parties of record ▪ Posted notice on site (sign) ▪ Posted notice at City Hall and library 		
IV (Quasi-Judicial)	Conditional use permit, essential public facilities permit	City Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 21 days prior to decision ▪ Mailed to property owners within 500 feet of site ▪ Posted notice on site (sign) ▪ Posted notice at City Hall and library 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Required for essential public facilities ▪ Notice given in same manner as Notice of Application 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 21 days prior to hearing ▪ Notice published in newspaper ▪ Mailed to property owners within 500 feet of site and parties of record ▪ Posted notice on 	Mailed to all parties of record.	Parties of record can ask for reconsideration and can also appeal decision.

PERMIT PROCESS TYPE	TYPICAL LAND USE PROJECT "PERMITS"	DECISION MAKER	NOTICE OF APPLICATION	NOTICE OF PUBLIC MEETING	NOTICE OF OPEN RECORD PUBLIC HEARING	NOTICE OF DECISION	APPEAL PROCESS
					site (sign) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Posted notice at City Hall and library 		