

Greeting Council Members,

I am choosing to write a separate letter to you as an attachment to the final Planning Commission report because I feel that this aspect of the Neighborhood Plan needs to be highlighted. I am in general concurrence with the Planning commission on the overall recommendation, but I feel that your deliberations need to consider some other aspects too. These are my personal views and not necessarily those of the Commission.

**Executive Summary:**

I thank the CAC and Kim and Jeff on their excellent work in making the neighborhood Plan. This is one of the more difficult neighborhoods - planning wise.

I strongly feel that there is little or no synergy between the two halves of the SE Redmond Neighborhood. Problem areas include zoning, transportation, parks and water table issues etc

**Details:**

I call the two parts of the neighborhood as North SE Redmond (North of SR 202) and South SE Redmond (South of SR 202) for the sake of discussion.

***Transportation:***

The issues relating to Transportation are very different between the South part of SE Redmond as compared the North. A lot of what came out of the discussion was the noise generated by trucks supporting the Industrial uses in the Woodbridge neighborhood. This issue does not exist for South SE Redmond.

Light rail will be coming to South SE Redmond. Associated issues such as traffic, parking, noise etc are very specific to South SE Redmond.

South SE Redmond will be a mix of Business Park and Residential. North SE Redmond has industrial uses too - which requires higher capacity and weight of trucks.

With the connection between Union Hill Road and Novelty Hill Road the roads in North SE Redmond will see more traffic as compared to South SE Redmond.

***Zoning:***

As I outlined above, the zoning, transition areas and associated issues like noise, pollution etc are different between the two areas.

***Parks:***

South SE Redmond has a built-in park in the form of Marymoor Park. North SE Redmond has no such thing. The development of Park infrastructure will take different approaches in these areas.

***Water table:***

Building in these two areas is very different. The water table in South SE Redmond is high. Developers will need to use different mechanisms to build in the two areas.

***Summary:***

What has been done in the Planning process so far is completely appropriate and relevant. For example the policies clearly differentiate between the parts of the neighborhood. That is good. My issue is really with considering the two halves of the neighborhood to be one. Typically, a neighborhood Plan has the entire set of policies that are relevant to the entire neighborhood. Take the North Redmond or Bear Creek Plan as an example. This particular neighborhood does not lend itself to such thinking. What I am afraid of is that down the line, there could be policies / regulations that the City may adopt that will be imposed on the two halves and would be unfair or irrelevant to one.

One way of fixing this is to actually consider the two parts of the neighborhood as two separate entities. The work that has been done is not going to be wasted. We anyway consider different regulations for different parts.

The whole idea behind this letter to you is to try and ensure that one part of the neighborhood does not get disadvantaged with respect to the other - that is all. If we feel that the plan as it is written still ensures that then well and good, otherwise it makes sense to consider them as two separate neighborhoods.

In the end I do want to put in my appreciation for the work that staff and the CAC have done. This is not an easy neighborhood to plan for and they have achieved a good plan in spite of the challenges posed by the neighborhood.

Regards  
Vibhas Chandorkar