

Attachment A

Summary of Original and Revised Principles

A. Principles Pertaining to Regulations. These principles promote predictability of permit review and project quality, and regulations that reflect desired outcomes as expressed through public policy.

| Original draft principle | Summary of comments received | Staff proposed modifications |
|--|---|--|
| 1. Carry out the Comprehensive Plan with a clear connection to adopted policies | Majority agreed that this is obvious and a “given”. | None |
| 2. Convey expectations of quality clearly and succinctly with illustrations and examples. | The majority of respondents felt the word “quality” could be subjective. Additionally, illustrations can be very helpful, but should demonstrate clearly what the City is looking for. | None |
| 3. Infuse regulations with objectives of sustainability. | The majority of respondents felt that sustainability should be an important goal for the City, but that perhaps goals of sustainability should first be strengthened in the Comprehensive Plan. Others felt that sustainability should be incentive-driven, rather than required. | Infuse regulations with objectives of sustainability. <u>Identify opportunities to promote sustainable development practices.</u> |
| 4. Provide flexibility within defined parameters as a method of meeting the intent of regulations. | The majority of respondents were concerned about defining a balance between flexibility and predictability, suggesting that this principle could be further refined by describing what “defined parameters” means. | Provide flexibility within defined parameters-limits as a method of meeting the intent of regulations. |
| 5. Use easily-understood language, with defined legal and technical terms where useful. Avoid multiple definitions of terms. | In general, respondents felt that this principle was important and that the code could use much improvement with respect to incorporating easily-understood language. | None |
| 6. Clearly convey maximum development yields. | In general, respondents supported this principle, both from the development community and citizen perspective. Suggestions were made to perhaps use the term “potential” or “capacity” in lieu of “yields” | Clearly convey maximum development yields <u>potential</u> . |

Summary of voting results when asked: Which principles are the most important when considering changes to the RCDG?

| Votes | Principles |
|-------|--|
| 17 | 1. Carry out the Comprehensive Plan with a clear connection to adopted policies |
| 15 | 2. Convey expectations of quality clearly and succinctly with illustrations and examples. |
| 7 | 3. Infuse regulations with objectives of sustainability. |
| 24 | 4. Provide flexibility within defined parameters as a method of meeting the intent of regulations. |
| 21 | 5. Use easily-understood language, with defined legal and technical terms where useful. Avoid multiple definitions of terms. |
| 12 | 6. Clearly convey maximum development yields. |

B. Principles Pertaining to Organization: These principles provide guidance for how the zoning code should be structured, the location and consolidation of important information, the relationships between key components, and how the needs of stakeholders should be reflected in the organization of the document.

| Original draft principle | Summary of comments received | Staff proposed modifications |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Group regulations in a simple, logical, and efficient structure, and provide clear references to relevant code sections when they are separated from core information. | In general there was support for this principle and a desire to consider how different users will navigate the future code. | Group <u>and consolidate</u> regulations in a simple, logical, and efficient structure, and provide clear references to relevant code sections when they are separated from core information. |
| 2. Provide visual aids to guide the user and explain important regulations. | There was general consensus that visual aids would be helpful, particularly if there was a consistent formatting, style and layout with respect to how visual aids are presented. Caution was expressed that examples can result in designs that simply follow the illustrations provided in the code. This comment was made specifically in reference to illustrations | Provide visual aids to guide the user and <u>to explain the relationship between various sections of the document important regulations.</u> |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | for building design guidelines, however the intent of this principle is to provide visual aids to guide navigation through the code. | |
| 3. Place basic regulations in obvious locations, outside of footnotes and other easy-to-miss places. | There was general agreement with the concepts presented in this principle. | None |
| 4. Separate definitions, procedures, and regulations. | There was general agreement that this principle is valid. | None |
| 5. Eliminate redundant regulations. Combine similar sets of regulations, and clearly identify when regulations apply. | There was a general consensus that there should be a balance between eliminating redundancy and providing greater ease of use, where redundancy may help the user find relevant information in one location. | Eliminate redundant regulations. Combine similar sets of regulations, and clearly <u>Clearly identify when City-wide regulations apply; and when unique regulations apply.</u> |
| 6. Reduce complexity and eliminate excessive detail to reduce code size | Comments centered around the idea that there needs to be a balance between providing information in one location and reducing the volume of the document to achieve the basic goal of allowing one to navigate the code more efficiently. Respondents also suggested placing certain sections into different documents to allow users to pull only the information needed for their particular proposal. General comments included a desire to have a very strong table of contents and indexing system for a printed version of the code. Additionally, many respondents felt that the code should be provided in an easily searchable electronic format. | Reduce complexity and eliminate excessive detail to reduce code size to <u>make the code easier to use and navigate. Consider web-based formats.</u> |

Summary of voting results when asked: Which principles are the most important when considering changes to the RCDG?

| Votes | Principles |
|-------|---|
| 26 | 1. Group regulations in a simple, logical, and efficient structure, and provide clear references to relevant code sections when they are separated from core information. |
| 12 | 2. Provide visual aids to guide the user and explain important regulations. |
| 5 | 3. Place basic regulations in obvious locations, outside of footnotes and other easy-to-miss places. |
| 14 | 4. Separate definitions, procedures, and regulations. |
| 18 | 5. Eliminate redundant regulations. Combine similar sets of regulations, and clearly identify when regulations apply. |
| 18 | 6. Reduce complexity and eliminate excessive detail to reduce code size. |

C. Principles Pertaining to ProcessProcedural Regulations: These principles ensure timely and legally defensible land use decisions, and ensure that decision-making is predictable, transparent and consistent with adopted standards and policy.

| Original draft principle | Summary of comments received | Staff proposed modifications |
|---|--|---|
| 1. Incorporate legal review into the early stages of code revision. | Generally, respondents felt this principle was valid. There was some confusion as to whether this principle related to the rewrite itself or to all amendments proposed now and in the future. Some expressed concern over the cost of additional legal review. | None, other than to revise the name of this category of principles. |
| 2. Provide early notice, and opportunities for timely input corresponding to the action proposed. | Some respondents felt that this principle should be clarified to reflect that it pertains to notices provided in relation to development actions and land use plan changes, rather than the code rewrite effort. Some also suggested that the City could broaden our communication techniques to better reach the community, and that noticing needs to be ongoing, understandable | Provide early notice, and opportunities for timely input corresponding to the <u>land use</u> action proposed |

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | and meaningful to the public. | |
| 3. Ensure that decision-making timelines meet or are quicker than statutory requirements. | Some respondents suggested Redmond should have a “gold standard” for quicker turnaround timelines for application review, while others expressed concern that this may not be of benefit to the residents who wish to have additional time to understand and comment on development proposed in their neighborhoods. Others suggested that this principle be clarified to define whether the intent is to decrease noticing timelines vs. decreasing overall review timelines. | <u>Ensure that decision-making timelines meet or are quicker than statutory requirements, without compromising opportunities for public input.</u> |
| 4. Choose a decision-maker and review process based on level of discretion appropriate for the proposed action. | Respondents felt that perhaps this principle could be modified to be clearer with respect to conveying the goal that some permit types could perhaps be moved to a lower process type. Particularly where the development proposed is relatively minor and in keeping with a select set of approval criteria in the code. | <u>Use and administrative review process for certain permits where there are clear approval criteria that ensure the City’s goals and visions are being met.</u> Choose a decision-maker and review process based on level of discretion appropriate for the proposed action. |
| 5. Describe the code's procedures clearly and succinctly. Use brochures and online information to help users understand the review processes. | Respondents were in agreement that this principle was valid. There were no overarching suggestions to modify this principle. | None |
| 6. Improve transparency by consolidating processes for related development actions. | Respondents concurred that this was a valid principle, particularly for the residential community to understand development review processes. Overall there was some confusion as to whether this set of principles deals with the rewrite effort itself, or to the actual code. The purpose of this principle must be better defined. | Improve transparency by consolidating processes for related development actions. <u>Consolidate multiple permits, related to a proposal to make the process more understandable and accessible.</u> |

Summary of voting results when asked: Which principles are the most important when considering changes to the RCDG?

| Votes | Principles |
|-------|---|
| 7 | 1. Incorporate legal review into the early stages of code revision. |
| 15 | 2. Provide early notice, and opportunities for timely input corresponding to the action proposed |
| 17 | 3. Ensure that decision-making time lines meet or are quicker than statutory requirements. |
| 17 | 4. Choose a decision-maker and review process based on level of discretion appropriate for the proposed action. |
| 20 | 5. Describe the code procedures clearly and succinctly. Use brochures and online information to help users understand the review processes. |
| 13 | 6. Improve transparency by consolidating processes for related development actions. |
| 4 | 7. <i>Clearly define hierarchy of the process</i> |
| 1 | 8. <i>Simplify citizen appeal process</i> |

D. Principles Protocol for 2009-2011 Zoning Code Development/Review and Adoption Update and Adoption These principles guide the rewriting of the code to ensure the rewrite is conducted in a transparent and inclusive manner by encouraging and assisting citizens, stakeholders, and interested parties to understand and participate in the crafting of a new zoning code.

| Original draft principle | Summary of comments received | Staff proposed modifications |
|---|--|--|
| 1. Seek input from user groups and the larger community | Respondents generally felt that this principle was very important and that perhaps principles #1 and #2 could be combined. Suggestions included the City taking extraordinary measures to reach the community, such as creating a list serve, or other technical, web-based methods of allowing input. | Seek input from user groups and the larger community <u>by ensuring clear communication, open conversation, and providing a variety of public involvement opportunities and formats.</u> |
| 2. Ensure clear communication, open conversation, and a variety of public involvement opportunities | Respondents again, thought that this principle was important, but that it could be combined with #1. | Delete altogether and combine with #1 as proposed above. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| and formats. | Additionally, many respondents thought this principle related to development proposals, rather than the rewrite effort, indicating a need to clarify the intent of the principle. | |
| 3. Document public involvement and findings as decisions are made to provide transparency and accountability. | Respondent felt this principle was important and that the City should go beyond our standard noticing procedures. Residents in particular wanted to ensure the process provided for early input focused toward the residential neighborhoods. Again, there was some confusion as to whether this principle pertains to the rewrite, or to development proposals | None, other than to modify the name of this category of principles. |
| 4. Ensure a clear understanding of the project scope as being limited to code rewrites that are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. | There was general consensus that the scope of the rewrite effort should not include revisions to the Comprehensive Plan. | None |
| 5. Group formal consideration of regulations into similar subjects to allow interested parties to participate in the changes most relevant to them. | In general, there were no overarching recommendations to change this principle. | None |
| 6. Commit to a process for code development, public review and decision-making that will enable the City Council to adopt the zoning code rewrite during the first quarter of 2011. | There were fewer comments generated from this principle, however those responding, primarily conveyed the idea that the quality of the end product is more important than the timeline. | None |

Summary of voting results when asked: Which principles are the most important when considering changes to the RCDG?

| Votes | Principles |
|-------|---|
| 23 | 1. Proactively seek input from • user groups and the larger community |
| 27 | 2. Ensure clear communication, open conversation, and a variety of public involvement opportunities and formats. |
| 7 | 3. Document public involvement and findings as decisions are made to provide transparency and accountability. |
| 16 | 4. Ensure a clear understanding of the project scope as being limited to code rewrites that are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. |
| 18 | 5. Group formal consideration of regulations into similar subjects to allow interested parties to participate in the changes most relevant to them. |
| 5 | 6. Commit to a process for code development, public review and decision-making that will enable the City Council to adopt the zoning code rewrite during the first quarter of 2011. |