### REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

September 22, 2010

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT**: Chair Hinman, Vice Chair Gregory, Commissioners Flynn,

Bontadelli and Julinsey

**COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED**: Commissioner O'Hara, Biethan

COMMISSIONERS CURRENTLY SERVING ON THE CODE REWRITE

**COMMISSION:** Phil Miller, Vibhas Chandorkar

**STAFF PRESENT**: Kim Dietz, Sarah Stiteler, Pete Sullivan, Redmond

Planning Department

**RECORDING SECRETARY:** Kathryn Kerby, Lady of Letters, Inc.

#### **CALL TO ORDER**

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

### APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

No changes to the agenda.

### ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Bob Yoder, 10019 - 169<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE, Redmond, wanted to speak about the Neighborhood element in the Comprehensive Plan review. He had submitted written testimony about the neighborhood associations in Bend, Oregon, because that community is similar in many regards to Redmond. Mr. Yoder was concerned about the number of people who come into Redmond each day as employees. He felt that such a high number took a lot of focus away from the people who actually live in Redmond.

Mr. Yoder understood that under the Neighborhood element revisions, each neighborhood plan would undergo an annual review process, then more robust 6 and 12 year reviews. He wanted to create a neighborhood association like in Bend, so that each neighborhood group has a forum to discuss ongoing issues with other neighborhood associations instead of simply having yearly reviews. He read portions of the Bend neighborhood association application which featured the following:

- 1) Ongoing neighborhood association forum
- Individual neighborhood association offices and websites, hosted by the Bend city government
- 3) Individual association membership for any resident in any neighborhood

Mr. Yoder was interested in the Bend model because that format seemed to encourage more twoway communication between the city government and not only the neighborhood groups but also inter-neighborhood-scale partnerships such as block watches, land-use groups, and art groups. That ongoing, multi-level organization encourages a much richer interaction among all the intercity groups and various city government agencies. He encouraged the Planning Commission and the City Council to review this model during their consideration of the Education Hill pilot program.

Chair Hinman thanked him for his oral and written testimony, and said that the Commission would discuss this as part of the current meeting's agenda Item #6. He asked if any of the Commission members had any immediate questions. No one had questions. Chair Hinman added that Kirkland may have a similar organization which they could look to as a model, and an office specifically for neighborhood associations, which would require additional staff.

# PUBLIC HEARING AND STUDY SESSION, Gateway Design District Comprehensive Plan and Development Guide Amendment, presented by Eric McConaghy, Redmond City Planner

Chair Hinman opened the public hearing then invited Mr. McConaghy to begin his presentation. Mr. McConaghy gave a Powerpoint presentation explaining the Gateway Design District amendments. The district is bounded by Union Hill Road and Redmond Way to the north and south and by SR-520 and 180<sup>th</sup> to the east and west. The area includes large retailers as well as other mixed uses. Current uses include:

- 1) Large retail/wholesale uses greater than 75,000 square feet of gross floor area (gfa)
- 2) General, professional and mixed offices
- 3) Business parks
- 4) Hotels/motels
- 5) Corporate headquarters offices
- 6) Support services

The amendment would expand the types of businesses allowed to locate within the district. Instead of featuring only single, large regional retail/wholesale uses, the district would also allow retail businesses with less than 75,000 square feet gfa which met the following conditions:

- 1) That retail use is located in conjunction with regional retail use
- 2) The incoming businesses optimized or complemented the developments already in place
- 3) They shared parking with existing businesses

The amendment had the following advantages:

- 1) The new uses already shared much of the parking needs with current uses
- 2) The new uses would not be appropriate in other retail areas such as Downtown or Overlake, yet would bring in more business to the Gateway District
- 3) Some of these smaller retailers are too big for the smaller strip malls and storefronts otherwise available

This amendment would obligate the City to:

- 1) Resolve a conflict with the general GDD policy calling for small retail to be located either Downtown or in other established areas
- 2) Minimize or avoid permitting strip centers or independent retail uses in that district
- 3) Codify the shared parking requirement

- 4) Prevent or minimize addition of driveways into these sites
- 5) Prevent the enlargement of existing regional retail/wholesale uses simply to add smaller retail uses, since the goal is to optimize existing sites.

Potential new businesses would ideally range from 4,000 to 10,000 square feet gfa. Suitable businesses include:

- 1) Paint stores
- 2) Auto parts
- 3) Party stores
- 4) Pet stores
- 5) Sporting goods

Chair Hinman opened the meeting for comment or questions. Don Marcy of 524 - 2<sup>nd</sup> Avenue in Seattle represented the Madison Development Group, who was in favor of the amendment. He urged the Planning Commission to move this amendment forward to City Council for approval. Mr. Marcy's client believed this amendment offered a number of opportunities and benefits:

- 1) Add more retail and more retail tax which the City needs
- 2) This amendment preserved the original spirit of the Gateway District while optimizing existing developments and urban areas

Mr. Macy's client felt this was a win/win scenario.

Tom Lee of Madison Development, 10510 NE Northup Way, Suite 100, Kirkland, Washington, wanted to echo Mr. Marcy's earlier comments. The whole purpose of this amendment is to make better use of an existing but under-utilized shopping area. More specifically, this amendment would allow for retail uses with parking needs which would preclude their location in Downtown. However, those same uses would dovetail very well with what is already in the Gateway District. Those businesses would also benefit from each others' presence to bring in more traffic. Furthermore, this would be a way to increase the amount of retail without impacting any of City infrastructure. It was a very good way to maximize the usefulness of the area, and Mr. Lee hoped that the Planning Commission approved the amendment.

Commissioner Flynn asked what the typical size of these new shops would be. Mr. Lee replied that these would typically be 4,000 to 10,000 square feet businesses with a need for their own buildings, but they can certainly share parking. The building his group planned would be 7,000 square feet. There were no other questions, so Chair Hinman closed the oral portion of the public hearing. He opened the study session and asked if there were any questions about Issue #1 from the issues matrix. There were no additional questions and that issue was closed.

Chair Hinman asked if anyone had questions about the second issue, regarding design requirements for the parking district. He had originally raised that question and he was satisfied with staff's response. Commissioner Flynn asked how much parking would be lost by the addition of a 7,000 square foot building within that parking area. Mr. McConaghy replied that the amount of parking lost would depend on the actual building location, but the plan called for the loss of 20-25 spaces. Chair Hinman reminded the Commission of Mr. Lee's statement that the major retailers had cross-parking agreements so that added flexibility as well. Commissioner Flynn asked if that site would still have sufficient parking after the addition of that building. Mr.

McConaghy said the existing lot could easily accommodate the new building, the loss of those parking spaces and the new parking requirements. Commissioner Bontadelli pointed out that the new building would need to be strategically located to ensure that the remaining parking would still be evenly distributed. Chair Hinman pointed out on the map where the new building was slated to go and that the remaining parking would still be relatively well distributed. No one else had questions and Issue #2 was closed.

Chair Hinman asked if anyone had remaining questions about Issue #3, related to smaller retail uses. Commissioner Bontadelli said the staff response answered his original question, and there were no additional questions. Issue #3 was closed, and Chair Hinman asked if anyone had questions about Issue #4, regarding how much retail area would be added as a result of the amendment's development implications. Commissioner Biethan originally raised the question and he was not present, but Chair Hinman said that it had become clear that approximately 7,000 square feet would be added. Commissioner Bontadelli asked whether the amendment would only allow that one extra building, or if it opened the doors for a number of extra buildings. Chair Hinman replied that the amendment limited additions to only one extra building per existing established businesses. The district has only four established businesses there so only four additional businesses could come in. Commissioner Bontadelli pointed out that even only four new businesses could impact nearby traffic congestion.

Mr. McConaghy explained that even though traffic issues were not explicitly included in the amendment text, the City's existing traffic policies and code would govern any new development. Additionally, the amendment did specifically prohibit new driveways and the reliance upon existing parking in that district, which both indirectly limit any potential congestion issues. He offered to explore these impacts more deeply if needed. Chair Hinman asked whether the intent of the amendment was not to add to the number of cars per se, but to offer more retail services to those shoppers already in that area. Mr. McConaghy confirmed that was the intent. He added that existing code still allowed for further development which could actually increase traffic from businesses such as restaurants and hotels. The amendment would simply include businesses which would be patronized by the shoppers already there.

Vice-Chair Gregory pointed out that all the other Redmond building codes would still apply. Commissioner Julinsey clarified that the amendment would not change the numbers of businesses or parking spaces that can be in that area, only the types of businesses that can be in that area. Mr. McConaghy confirmed that was the case, and added that the amendment would apply not only to this Gateway District but in the other City Gateway District (Performance Area #2).

Commissioner Bontadelli replied that he just wanted everyone to be clear that even with these limitations, any additional business in that area will in some way increase the traffic in that area and worsen existing congestion. Chair Hinman replied that trend was already underway and that they would soon be hearing a presentation on that traffic issue. He asked if Commissioner Bontadelli wanted to formally enter objections or concerns into the record, or propose changes to the amendment to reflect those concerns. Mr. McConaghy added that even under the new amendment, any new business would have to show that existing parking in that area is sufficient and meet other existing code, or the development would not be permitted. If a new development

would result in non-compliance, it would not be allowed. Commissioner Bontadelli said that satisfied his concerns. Issue #4 was closed.

Chair Hinman asked if anyone had any further questions or discussion regarding Issue #5, strip mall commercial development. No one had additional questions. Chair Hinman closed Issue #5 and then asked whether anyone had any additional items or issues to be discussed. Commissioner Flynn asked if one of the existing businesses could opt for a larger scale development, for instance up to 20,000 square feet gfa, if it still did not bring in more traffic than the existing lot could accommodate. Mr. McConaghy replied yes that could conceivably occur. Commissioner Julinsey asked what types of businesses were immediately around the Gateway District which could possibly park within the district. For instance, she has noticed that sometimes people at Gold's Gym will park in the Kohl's lot. Mr. McConaghy replied that the district is surrounded by a mix of zoning, from forested areas to industrial. Ms. Stiteler added that most of the area around the district is either Manufacturing Park or Business Park.

Chair Hinman asked the Commission to reference Exhibit A, in the amendment package, page 13-74, Item #NSE 53. This section is where regional wholesale/retail uses were added, along with the text with or without complementary uses. He understood the intent for complementary uses, but he asked whether that term had actually been defined in code. Chair Hinman requested that term either be explicitly defined in code, or another previously defined term be used instead. Mr. McConaghy replied that the term compatible was explicitly defined elsewhere in code and they could use that term. He added that this particular section of text was intended to be consistent with other changes happening within the Comprehensive Development Guide, so the desire for consistency was in keeping with that overall goal. Chair Hinman asked if there were any further comments or questions, and there were none. He said approval of this amendment would need to reflect that further amendment.

Chair Hinman pointed out that the phrase *regional retail/wholesale uses* had been used three times in the amendment, and he asked whether that term was necessary and whether it had been defined. Mr. McConaghy suggested they modify the text for section 53, because that section talked about land uses. The other two references talk more generally about the reasons for the amendment. Chair Hinman asked Vice Chair Gregory's opinion. Vice Chair Gregory suggested they go ahead and change complementary to compatible, and reference regional retail/wholesale units just once

.

Chair Hinman asked if there were any further questions; there were none. He invited a motion to approve the amendment. Vice Chair Gregory moved that the Planning Commission recommend adoption of the amendment, as amended to substitute the term compatible for the term complementary. The motion was seconded and it passed unanimously. Chair Hinman closed the written portion of the testimony.

### PUBLIC HEARING AND STUDY SESSION, 2010-2011 Comprehensive Plan Update: Annexation Element, presented by Eric McConaghy, Redmond City Planner

Chair Hinman opened the public hearing. Mr. McConaghy began by saying that the Annexation element update was just one chapter in the overall Comprehensive Plan update process. He laid out the timeline and scope for that overall process. The update goals include:

- 1) Extending the planning horizon from 2022 to 2030
- 2) Updating the Comprehensive Plan based on a variety of new or changed state and regional-level requirements made since the previous update in 2004
- 3) Updating the Comprehensive Plan to incorporate current City Council direction and recommendations based on recent or ongoing studies

The Comprehensive Plan update process is expected to be finished by December 2011. The Planning Commission will review each Comprehensive Plan element in turn, and the first of these pertains to the Annexation and Regional Planning element.

Overall, the Annexation element has stood up well to use and scrutiny. However, this update cycle provided a good opportunity to emphasize sustainability in the element. The element itself is composed of three sections:

- 1) Regional planning policy and strategy
- 2) Annexation guidelines and practices, as defined not only by the City but also in cooperation with county and state policy and goals
- 3) Urban growth areas, to support preservation of nearby Urban Growth Areas, in collaboration with King County and other nearby cities.

Sustainability is one of the new concepts being formally incorporated into all the Comprehensive Plan elements. The Annexation element did not need new policies to address sustainability per se. However, the proposed changes would clarify how sustainability should be incorporated into this element.

Staff has recommended that the portion of policy A-20 regarding maintaining and establishing an equestrian district be removed . This removal would not weaken the City's commitment to equestrian uses and rural uses outside the GMA's boundary. Other changes include:

- 1) Updating various Annexation element maps and tables to reflect current conditions, and to reflect the planning horizon shift from 2022 to 2030
- 2) Emphasizing the City's goal for being a sustainable community
- 3) Clarifying portions of the text and making the document easier to read

Mr. McConaghy concluded by asking if anyone had any questions. Chair Hinman opened the public hearing. Since there were no members of the public wanting to speak, he closed the oral portion of the public hearing and invited the Commission members to present their questions or comments.

Vice Chair Gregory reviewed existing issues. For Issue #1, Commissioner Julinsey had previously asked staff to clarify the statement that Redmond supported Puget Sound regional agencies. Commissioner Julinsey replied that she was satisfied with staff's response. Issue #1

was closed. Regarding Issue #2, Chair Hinman had asked about the financial implications of annexation, specifically regarding bonded indebtedness. Staff responded that newly annexed areas would carry the financial burden associated with annexation. Chair Hinman replied that he was satisfied with the response.

Commissioner Flynn pointed out that the current language specified that the residents of an area proposed for annexation must accept the new taxes. He asked what would happen if they did not accept those new taxes. Mr. McConaghy said that the annexation process begins with a petition for annexation by residents, who by making the petition also agree to their proportionate share of the resulting taxes. If the resident does not agree with that, then they would not sign the petition. So far this has not been an issue because residents typically want urban services and therefore are already prepared to pay for them. To his knowledge, that particular issue has not yet been a problem. Chair Hinman asked if all the affected property owners need to approve of the annexation before the annexation can proceed. Mr. McConaghy replied that only a 60% majority needed to approve. Vice Chair Gregory asked if there were any other questions; there were none. Issue #2 was closed. Vice Chair Gregory motioned to recommend adoption of the Annexation amendments. The motion was seconded and it passed unanimously. Chair Hinman closed the public hearing.

## PUBLIC HEARING AND STUDY SESSION, 2010-2011 Comprehensive Plan Update: Neighborhoods Introduction, presented by Kim Dietz, Redmond City Planner

Chair Hinman reminded the Commission that the written testimony had been held open from the previous meeting's public hearing on this item. They had already heard comments earlier in the evening. He then invited Vice Chair Gregory to go over the issues list. Vice Chair Gregory thanked Ms. Dietz for the updated issues table with staff comments. Issues #1, #2 and #3 have already been closed. Issue #4 regarding Commissioner Flynn's request for more information about how the Planning Commission would stay informed of various neighborhood issues was still open. Commissioner Flynn replied that he was satisfied with the staff comments. There were no other questions and Issue #4 was closed.

Vice Chair Gregory asked if this would be a good time to discuss the comments made earlier in the evening about neighborhood associations. Chair Hinman said this would be a very good time for that discussion, and he invited staff to comment on the points raised by Mr. Yoder earlier in the evening. Vice Chair Gregory asked to make a few comments first. He pointed out that Redmond already has Citizen Advisory Committees, the Neighborhood Network, Planning Commissioners and Parks & Recreation Commissioners. He would support and promote neighborhood associations but he believed those associations should be composed of the neighbors themselves. There is nothing in the code that prevents a neighborhood from forming an association if it so chose. Vice Chair Gregory did, however, object to the idea of a city office for neighborhood associations, which would add another layer of staffing and it subdivides the process further. Vice Chair Gregory believed that the citizens are best served when they form such associations themselves. The City should certainly continue to seek input but other than that the citizens should form and manage their own associations.

Ms. Dietz confirmed that some neighboring cities do utilize the neighborhood association model, and Redmond City staff has discussed that approach in the past. However, the City has chosen to use the Neighborhood Network pilot program this year, and will serve many of the same functions as that neighborhood association framework would accomplish. One key point of the Neighborhood Network is that it not only functions on the neighborhood scale but it brings all the neighborhoods into thinking about the entire Redmond community as a whole. Ms. Dietz suggested that they see how this pilot program works.

Chair Hinman said that both Kirkland and Seattle either currently have, or have had in the past, a neighborhood association such as mentioned by Mr. Yoder. Those programs were fairly formal and carried considerable staffing requirements. He was intrigued with the idea of the neighborhood-scale websites, and asked if the current Redmond Neighborhood Network would feature such a website. Ms. Dietz replied yes, each neighborhood either already has or would soon get a dedicated website, all of which would be connected with the Neighborhood Network.

Chair Hinman asked if anyone had any other questions. Commissioner Flynn thanked Mr. Yoder for his comments. The neighborhood association issue was closed. There were no further questions or comments. Chair Hinman closed the written comments. Commissioner Bontadelli motioned to recommend approval of the Neighborhoods Element. The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.

### **BREAK**

STUDY SESSION, Proposed Development Guide Amendments for the Manufacturing Park (MP) and Industrial (I) zones including access for religious facilities and Eating/Drinking Establishment seating capacity, presented by Pete Sullivan, Redmond City Planner

Chair Hinman invited Mr. Sullivan to begin his presentation. Mr. Sullivan explained that this study session focused on two different amendments for the Development Guide, not the Comprehensive Plan. The amendment affects two zones – Manufacturing Park and Industrial zones.

These proposed changes would:

- 1) Increase regulatory flexibility
- 2) Provide additional clarity in the code, and
- 3) Increase economic opportunity

The first proposal affects religious institutions and would amend the location requirements for such institutions within a manufacturing park zone. The current requirements require that facilities with 1-750 seats be zoned as a special use within the MP zone, while those facilities with greater than 750 seats must be zoned as conditional uses with the MP zone. Furthermore, if the facility contains 500-7500 seats, the parcel must be adjacent to an arterial street.

These issues came up because an application came in to convert a manufacturing building to a church. While the property was five acres in size, it was not adjacent to an arterial. Since then the

applicant has reduced the size to 499 seats to comply with current code. When the application came in, traffic studies indicated a larger facility would not have caused negative impacts. Yet the code restricted that size to less than 500 seats. The proposed amendment would allow larger religious facilities on parcels which are not adjacent to arterials, if traffic studies indicated no negative impact.

Vice Chair Gregory asked if this amended change was using level-of-service criteria or if it had adopted the more current mobility unit criteria for congestion assessment. Mr. Sullivan replied that he would check into that. Chair Hinman added Mr. Terry Marpert, Principal Planner, would be instrumental in helping to translate old level-of-service terms into the newer mobility unit terms.

Mr. Sullivan continued by showing a map of the City areas which would be impacted by the change. He also had a map showing Redmond arterials, how they serve the existing MP zones, and how many existing religious facilities would be impacted by the change. In conclusion, Mr. Sullivan stated the proposed change would:

- 1) Increase code flexibility
- 2) Include traffic mitigation analysis and control
- 3) Apply equally across the MP zone instead of being a parcel-by-parcel consideration
- 4) Create consistent expectations for applicants
- 5) Provide appropriate level of analysis

Letters have been sent to MP zone property owners so that they are aware of the proposed change. The City has already issued a SEPA Determination of Non-Significance. Relative to the Code Rewrite Commission, this would be reconciled with changes they have already made.

Commissioner Flynn asked Mr. Sullivan to elaborate on whether the Technical Committee would be able to scale back a development if traffic problems were found. Mr. Sullivan confirmed that the Technical Committee would have to be satisfied that traffic would not be negatively impacted, via either a traffic study or comparable documentation. Commissioner Flynn asked whether the applicant or the City would pay for that traffic study. Mr. Sullivan confirmed the study would be paid for by the applicant. Chair Hinman asked how a church school or daycare might affect traffic in addition to the traffic flow from church worship services. Ms. Stiteler replied that both daycare and vocational schools are already allowed within an MP zone, up to certain capacity, as a special use. She said staff would review whether a faith-based school would be permitted in an MP zone and how that might impact peak time traffic.

Mr. Sullivan continued with the second proposed amendment regarding eating establishments associated with either wineries or breweries, in either Manufacturing Park or Industrial zones. The proposed changes would eliminate the seating limitation but preserve the size limitations.

Currently within the MP zone either a winery or brewery is classified as food production, which is why those businesses are permitted in a manufacturing park and conditionally permitted in the Industrial zone. Eating and drinking areas are also allowed in both MP and I zones. The reason this amendment does not affect Business Park zones is because the parent operation – winery or brewery – is not allowed in a business park.

One of Redmond's current breweries recently reconfigured their interior space, and discovered not one but two caps on how they could use that space. They had a 100-seat limit for their drinking area, but they also could devote no more than 25% of their total area to eating and drinking space. Whichever cap is smaller is the limit used. The owners requested a clarification of the code. The proposal would eliminate the 100-seat cap, and preserve the 25% limit. The seating capacity would then be whatever the fire code stated is the maximum occupancy load for that amount of space.

Vice Chair Gregory said that so far they had only spoken about wineries and breweries, but manufacturing parks could conceivably include bakeries, cheese making or soda pop manufacturers. He asked if those types of businesses would be included in this amendment. Mr. Sullivan replied that this would be limited to beverages. Vice Chair Gregory asked if a cider mill would then fall under this amendment. Mr. Sullivan said a cider mill would be allowed in the manufacturing park but it would not be a part of this proposal. He asked whether this question warranted inclusion on the issues table. Chair Hinman said no, the clarification was sufficient. Mr. Sullivan then showed a map of the impacted zones.

The City sent a letter to all MP and I property owners with the proposed amendments, and received a request from an Industrial zone parcel owner to remove the Industrial zone from the proposal, because drinking establishments were not appropriate for heavy industrial zones and there were no current such businesses there anyway. Staff considered that request and has decided to honor that request, such that Industrial zones would henceforth not be included in the amendment. That change will be reflected in future drafts.

Mr. Sullivan showed maps of the impacted areas and graphics for how the 25% cap on floor space and occupancy loads would be calculated. He noted that while the addition of an eating or drinking area within a brewery or winery would impact the number of parking spaces required, nothing in this amendment changed those existing parking requirements. Additional stalls can certainly be requested as part of a site application. A transportation master plan would be required for either a new business or improvements to an existing business. That concluded Mr. Sullivan's presentation.

Chair Hinman asked if there were any questions or comments. Commissioner Bontadelli was concerned that they were referring to lifting the seating capacity on businesses that sell alcoholic beverages and as such there might be reason to consider the risks of increased drunk driving. Commissioner Flynn added breweries often have special events that draw a much heavier amount of traffic than normal business. Vice Chair Gregory asked whether the City generally required anything like a public safety assessment when a brewery either opens or expands a drinking area. He would like staff to check into that. Commissioner Bontadelli added that breweries and wineries in MP and I zones may not feature taxicab service for patrons who have had too much to drink. Vice Chair Gregory asked Mr. Sullivan to ask how the Washington State Liquor Control Board evaluated these issues while considering applications. Commissioner Flynn also asked how traffic patterns would be impacted. Commissioner Bontadelli added a request to find out how breweries and wineries currently handle special events with greater

anticipated traffic. Mr. Sullivan said he would get more information on all these questions for the Commission.

Mr. Sullivan summarized his presentation by listing the proposed amendment's goals:

- 1) Improve land-use flexibility and building performance
- 2) Clarify the development regulations
- 3) Promote economic opportunity for the City's breweries and wineries
- 4) Avoid drawing services away from Downtown and Overlake, while enabling those businesses that do not fit in Downtown and Overlake

The City has already issued a SEPA Determination of Non-Significance, and this amendment if approved would be incorporated into the Redmond Community Development Guide reconciliation list.

Chair Hinman asked if there were any additional questions or concerns. Commissioner Flynn said this measure could boost City tourism. Commissioner Bontadelli wanted to emphasize that his concerns were not meant to handcuff those businesses, but rather wanted to ensure that those businesses could expand in safe ways.

### **REPORTS**

Chair Hinman attended an all-day workshop on electric vehicle infrastructure. The workshop was attended by a variety of representatives from multiple cities, as well as county and state personnel. Seattle is one of the test markets for EV's. He also recently attended an Open House for the Bear Creek neighborhood.

### SCHEDULING/TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING(S)

The Commission discussed the issues to be addressed in upcoming meetings.

#### **ADJOURN**

Chair Hinman adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:20 p.m.

Minutes Approved On: Planning Commission Chair