

**REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

November 10, 2010

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Commissioners Gregory, Flynn, O'Hara, Biethan, Julinsey, and Miller

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED: Chairman Hinman

COMMISSIONERS CURRENTLY SERVING ON THE CODE REWRITE COMMISSION: Canaan Bontadelli, Vibhas Chandorkar

STAFF PRESENT: Sarah Stiteler, Jeff Churchill, Redmond Planning Department; Tricia Thomson, Redmond Public Works Department

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

CALL TO ORDER

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

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

No changes to the agenda.

ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Randy Bannecker of 820 - 4th Avenue, Suite 407, Seattle, spoke on behalf of Sears. Sears is very appreciative of the City's support for moving the Sound Transit Overlake transit station north and adjacent to SR520. They are concerned, however, about new stormwater facilities. While the proposed stormwater vault would not be their first choice, they understand the City's preference for that location. Sears looks forward to discussing the implementation of that vault, and the trigger points which would initiate park development. Sears also appreciates the City's clarity that a major park would be coordinated with development. Mr. Bannecker asked the Planning Commission to please consider providing similar clarity for the proposed streets and urban pathways depicted on the sub-area map listed as Exhibit E, Page 2. The text may have already been adequately clarified, but the map still needs to be updated. Mr. Bannecker asked that the City coordinate the development with parcel re-development. The Commissioners had no questions or comments.

Mr. Todd Woosley, of Hal Woosley Properties, representing PS Business Parks in the Overlake Business Center, commented on the 152nd Avenue Corridor Study. A variety of land-use experts have informed him that a successful retail corridor would have an average traffic flow of roughly 12,000 trips per day, which is the current volume on 152nd. However, Mr. Woosley believes nearby near-term development would boost the traffic. When each of those projects opens or completes, traffic volumes on 152nd will be much too high for the kinds of pedestrian and bicycle traffic being proposed. Mr. Woosley suggested that perhaps 151st Avenue NE would be more

appropriate. He proposed that the City allow 152nd Avenue to carry this additional traffic, but shift the pedestrian and bicycle traffic to 151st so that they have two north-south multi-modal corridors through that area. The Commissioners had no questions. There were no additional comments from the audience.

REPORT APPROVAL, 2010/2011 Comprehensive Plan Update, Annexation and Regional Planning Element.

Vice-Chair Gregory reminded the Commission that they had already recommended approval of this element. This was the transmittal report from the Planning Commission to City Council. He asked for a motion to approve the report. Commissioner O'Hara motioned, and it was seconded. There was no discussion, and the motion was passed unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING AND STUDY SESSION, Bear Creek Neighborhood Plan Update, presented by Jeff Churchill, Redmond City Planner.

Vice-Chair Gregory first recognized one member of the Bear Creek Neighborhood Citizen Advisory Committee, Steve Thomson, and Vibhas Chandorkar, who participated in the plan update as a member of the Planning Commission. Vice-Chair Gregory then turned the presentation over to Mr. Churchill. Mr. Churchill started by saying that the Planning Department has not received any written testimony prior to the current meeting on this topic. Mr. Churchill also wanted to mention that he had intended to include the amendments to the Build-Out Transportation Plan in the meeting packet's issues matrix. However, those amendments were accidentally left out. Mr. Churchill could summarize them and they could discuss them later in the meeting if needed. The near-term improvements on that build-out transportation plan include:

- 1) Extension of 196th Ave NE on the east side of the neighborhood from NE 95th Street to Novelty Hill Road, and
- 2) Completion of the Hwy 520 flyover of Redmond Way.

The long-term improvements from the master plan include:

- 1) NE 95th Street realignment to smooth traffic flow through a misaligned intersection.
- 2) Creating a new connection to provide signalized access from residential areas east of Avondale Road to that road via the signal at 180th Avenue NE.
- 3) Providing u-turn opportunities along Avondale Road.
- 4) Providing a new connection between Avondale Road and Novelty Hill Road north of the existing intersection.

Those were the items not attached to the issues matrix that Mr. Churchill can discuss with the Planning Commission if needed.

The neighborhood plan's key policy topics and concepts are:

- 1) Neighborhood character, particularly given the neighborhood's mixed urban/rural nature.
- 2) Natural environment, with an emphasis on education as a tool for preserving the environment.
- 3) Land use, with an emphasis on clustering development outside the flood plain.
- 4) Transportation and circulation, with an emphasis on making Avondale Road work for both commuters and residents, and improving multi-modal connections.
- 5) Housing, emphasizing variety and affordability.

- 6) Parks and Recreation, with emphasis on keeping the Bear Creek and Evans Creek valley open, and having some kind of indoor community gathering space, easily accessible by pedestrians.
- 7) The Citizen Advisory Committee has recommended changing the neighborhood boundary. The proposal has been discussed previously by the Planning Commission. The proposed boundary change would claim some areas currently included in the Education Hill neighborhood, west of Avondale Road, and move areas south of Bear/Evans Creek to the SE Redmond neighborhood.

Mr. Churchill added that the regulations that accompanied the neighborhood policies are consistent with regulations already reviewed by City Council. With that, he concluded his presentation. Vice-Chair Gregory opened the public hearing. Seeing no one present to testify, he closed the oral portion of the public hearing, but kept the written portion open until the Commission's next meeting on November 17th 2010.

Vice-Chair Gregory opened the issues matrix, and suggested that they defer Issue #1 until specific transportation issues come up later. He believed this issue was created as a placeholder for any additional transportation issues that came up during discussion.

On Issue #2, Vice-Chair Gregory asked Commissioner Biethan if the staff reply answered his question. Commissioner Biethan replied yes, but he wanted to ask whether proposed Avondale changes would provide some congestion relief on that road, and what that congestion would look like in five to ten years. Mr. Churchill replied that u-turns, new road connections in that same area, and improved transit options are all tools that can improve congestion. However, he was not sure what that specific street was forecast to look like in five to ten years so he could not specifically answer the question. Some of the answer depends on land use in the area. Mr. Churchill did not believe there would be a lot of development along that corridor. Commissioner Biethan said that answer was probably as good as anyone was capable of providing. Vice-Chair Gregory added that the greater SE Redmond Transportation Study does list long-term improvements intended to address the circulation, connectivity and congestion issues along Avondale, but that study does not provide specifics. Mr. Churchill added that there are a number of ideas for how to address those issues. For instance, the Avondale and Union Hill Road intersection is a major bottleneck. As part of that study, a number of alternatives were explored for that intersection. There was no single best solution since the choices all have advantages and disadvantages. Vice-Chair Gregory asked if Commissioner Biethan was satisfied and if the Commissioners were ready to close the issue. The issue was closed.

Vice-Chair Gregory asked if Commissioner Miller had any further comments on Issue #3, emphasizing system capacity versus personal travel choices. Commissioner Miller said he had hoped for some clarification for what the City was specifically trying to accomplish on Avondale. Maximizing the number of people is very different from maximizing the number of vehicles through that corridor. Vice-Chair Gregory also saw conflicts between this policy and policies regarding transit capacity. Mr. Churchill replied that Mr. Miller's comments and desire for clarity were consistent with the neighborhood's Citizen Action Committee intentions. He read off Policy 25 and asked if perhaps they could merely replace the word *capacity* with *personal mobility* or *movement of people*. Commissioner Miller agreed that either would be an improvement over the generic term *capacity*. Commissioner O'Hara liked the use of the phrase

personal mobility instead of *capacity*. Vice-Chair Gregory closed the issue, pending that revision.

Vice-Chair Gregory opened Issue #4, regarding use of special pavement treatment in bicycle lanes to discourage speeding. Commissioner Miller asked if the City had a documented problem with bicyclists speeding in their bike lanes, thus a need for speed control. Mr. Churchill explained the pavement treatment is meant to visually narrow the roadway and in that way reduce automobile speeds. Commissioner Miller replied that national bicycle lane standards use colors for very different purposes, namely to define conflict areas. He also preferred to reference the actual methods instead of just making generalized statements about speed control. Commissioner Miller suggested that instead of merely naming one treatment, the language allow a variety of techniques or methods to control speed. Mr. Churchill offered to develop revised text. Vice-Chair Gregory asked if the Commission was otherwise willing to close the issue. The issue was closed.

Vice-Chair Gregory opened Issue #5, regarding bus pullouts. Mr. Churchill confirmed that the staff response was geared directly to a Citizen Advisory Committee recommendation. Vice-Chair Gregory asked if there was a conflict between the desires of the neighborhood to provide pullouts and Metro's preferences, and what the best practice was for that scenario. Mr. Churchill did not know the answer, but he confirmed that the CAC's intent was that any future safety studies include the topic of pullouts. Mr. Thomson of the Bear Creek CAC explained that the main reason the CAC wanted pullouts was that school buses block both directions of traffic when they stop along Avondale, causing considerable delays. The CAC felt that a coordinated assessment of that ongoing issue should be included in any future traffic study. Mr. Thomson suspected Metro did not like the pullouts because drivers will not let the buses merge back into traffic.

Commissioner O'Hara pointed out that the proposed policy called for pullouts to be studied during future Avondale corridor studies. As written, there was nothing that needed to be discussed at this time. Commissioner Miller added that while the policy stipulated both school bus and public transit pullouts, this seemed to be strictly a school bus issue. If that is the case, this policy should focus specifically on school bus usage along Avondale. Mr. Thomson added that the CAC collectively felt that they did not know enough about the topic to comfortably rule out one or the other. They wrote the language to allow for a discussion of both. Vice-Chair Gregory agreed that the evaluation process should consider both. He understood that Metro had very strong feelings about bus pullouts and probably for good reason. Commissioner Miller asked Mr. Churchill for the current design standards for bus pullouts. Mr. Churchill replied that he would make that information available. Commissioner Miller asked whether a neighborhood planning process could potentially turn over a City-wide design policy. He was willing to let the issue close for the time being with the provision that his existing questions be answered by staff. Vice-Chair Gregory added that he would like to hear more about Metro's position against pullouts. He kept the issue open until their next meeting.

Vice-Chair Gregory opened Issue #6, regarding the stipulation for community gathering spaces in Policy #21 and #22. It was not clear whether the trigger for that was the redevelopment of anything more than two-and-one-half acres. Staff had indicated that Policy #50 provided more information about the community gathering space concept, which could possibly be incorporated into the other two policies. Mr. Churchill read off Policy #50, which among other things allowed

the community center to be a facility such as a restaurant. Commissioner Biethan wanted to verify that the existing text did not require the creation of a new community gathering place with every redevelopment of a parcel larger than 2.5 acres. Commissioner Flynn asked if there were any existing parcels on Avondale that would trigger that requirement. Mr. Churchill said only a very few, particularly since the CAC established additional criteria for these policies:

- 1) The parcel development involves a rezone.
- 2) The entire parcel being developed is larger than 2.5 acres.
- 3) The parcel has bidirectional access to a principal arterial.
- 4) Outside the 100-year floodplain.

Those criteria limit the parcels to being those along the west side of Avondale since Avondale is the only major arterial going through that neighborhood, and the part of the east side that is outside the 100-year floodplain. Most of the candidate parcels had already been developed or were otherwise unlikely to be developed. Vice-Chair Gregory asked if there were any further questions. There were none and he closed the issue.

Vice-Chair Gregory opened Issue #7 regarding agriculture and asked Commissioner Miller if his questions had been answered. Commissioner Miller replied that his first concern about open space had been adequately answered by the staff response. His other question regarded the GMA boundaries and conservation of productive agricultural lands. He felt the policies seemed to do more to constrain agricultural use than protect that land. If the goal was to declare that the area is not rural anymore, that could have been accomplished with a lot less text. In this case, if the intent is actually to preserve productive agricultural soils, then they should actually say that. The proposed language was consistent with that goal but did not ever actually come out and say it. If the CAC wants to preserve working agricultural lands, then the text should say something to the effect that yes, working agriculture is still a part of the neighborhood and is to be protected. Policy #14 provided all sorts of constraints, but never actually encouraged preservation of the resource.

Mr. Churchill replied that the introduction to the neighborhood plan included a statement that the neighborhood continue to have a rural/agricultural feel. He felt the CAC consistently expressed a desire for continued use of productive agricultural lands. He believed the CAC recognized that the valley soils were amongst the most productive in the Puget Sound region. Finally, Mr. Churchill believed the CAC understood that agriculture could and should continue there as long as it is conducted in a way that protected water quality. Commissioner Miller clarified that he felt Policy #14 was solid and he was not advocating a change. Rather, he asked whether there was a statement anywhere that said agriculture was in fact an appropriate land use in a floodplain. Mr. Churchill replied that Policy #16 stipulated that remaining undeveloped lands within the floodplain should be used for only two things – habitat enhancement and/or aquifer friendly agriculture. Commissioner Miller said that answered his question.

Mr. Thomson added that they struggled with that phrasing. Everyone on the CAC was excited that agriculture still occurred in their neighborhood. However, the CAC also was not sure what the future held for agriculture in that area. Mr. Thomson remembered when it was a dairy farm, and how it was abandoned for a time, then plowed up again and planted to squash simply to control the weeds. He would love to see farming continue but was not sure how to include that desire in the policies. Commissioner Miller added that citizens across Redmond were more and more discussing small-scale agriculture and even micro-agriculture, because that was all that was

still possible. Yet that desire to preserve what was left was driven by a growing desire for healthy foods. Mr. Thomson wanted to find a way to preserve access to fresh food even in their increasingly urban environment. They could do that if they made it a priority, and that is why he initially felt the language was weak.

Vice-Chair Gregory closed the issue. He reminded everyone that written testimony could still be submitted until next week, and that they had one more study session scheduled.

BREAK

STUDY SESSION, 152 Avenue Corridor Study, presented by Jeff Churchill, Redmond City Planner, and Tricia Thomson, Redmond City Engineer.

Mr. Churchill started their presentation by explaining that the 152nd Avenue Corridor Study and the Phase III Overlake Amendments are closely related so it made sense to discuss them at the same meeting. He will discuss what they wish to accomplish with the two presentations, and Ms. Thomson will discuss the particulars. Mr. Churchill continued with a list of briefing objectives:

- 1) 152nd Avenue NE corridor study briefing
 - a. Report on open house.
 - b. Input on cross-sections prior to study completion.
- 2) Overlake Phase III
 - a. Introduce package.
 - b. Begin discussion in preparation for public hearing.
- 3) Identify next steps

Ms. Thomson spoke about Item #1a, the Open House at Audubon Elementary on October 26, 2010. The purpose was to:

- 1) Share information about the grid network.
- 2) Seek feedback on urban pathway east-west alignment alternatives.
- 3) Seed feedback on streetscape themes.

Public comment from the Open House included:

- 1) General approval of the concepts and direction for the 152nd Avenue NE Corridor.
- 2) People generally favored streetscape A, which was a European-inspired theme.
- 3) The City continued to seek input.
- 4) People generally preferred an urban pathway on NE 26th Street rather than NE 24th.

That Open House included displays showing the different street types:

- 1) 152nd as a retail street featuring lively activity and retail storefronts.
- 2) 151st as a park street, with ground-floor retail or residential; the urban pathway would come along this type of corridor.
- 3) Nearby, quieter access streets featuring driveways and loading areas.

During the Open House, the City featured a variety of graphical representations of streetscapes:

- 1) The 152nd streetscape featured a 100 foot right-of-way, and the removal of trees from the easternmost tree zone to be replaced by shorter landscaping and/or furniture.
- 2) The 151st streetscape featured an 82 foot right-of-way, sharrows in travel lanes, no separate bikeway, an 8 foot landscaping zone on the east side for low-impact development (LID), and furniture/landscaping zone on the far east side.

- 3) The east/west access streets featured a 64 foot right-of-way, a wider pedestrian zone and narrower furniture zone. One recommendation was to separate the landscaping from the parking areas, contrary to what was shown in the graphic.

Ms. Thomson explained that the next steps for the 152nd Study included:

- 1) Gathering feedback from the Planning Commission.
- 2) Providing final direction to the consultant in November to complete the design manual.
- 3) Bring the final cross-sections to the Commission for incorporation into zoning code in February.

Mr. Churchill specifically asked the Planning Commission to comment on the following items:

- 1) How is the project progressing relative to following project principles:
 - a. Lively people place.
 - b. Heart of the village is proximate to light rail.
 - c. Infrastructure supports redevelopment.
 - d. HCT/light rail looks local, works regionally.
 - e. Integrated stormwater/park facilities and urban pathway.
 - f. 152nd Avenue NE is an active streetscape.
 - g. Vision unfolds prior to light rail arriving.
 - h. Transportation improvements support land-use vision.
 - i. When it is done, people say Wow!

Ms. Thomson added that the Planning Department has put a survey on the City website to solicit more comment. The survey will be available until November 19, 2010.

Vice-Chair Gregory began the study session by asking Commissioner Biethan to comment on the above questions. Commissioner Biethan liked the three-street layout. He did not have many questions because most of the street designs made sense to him. However, he did wonder whether planners had considered traffic counts coming in from nearby outside areas. Mr. Churchill asked if his question was in regard to the public comment from the first part of the meeting where nearby land use would put too much traffic on 152nd for these planned uses to be practical. Commissioner Biethan confirmed that was his concern. Ms. Thomson said that as part of this corridor study the planners were doing a traffic analysis, and they were taking into account all of the related aspects. Their planning horizon is 2030, and their traffic volumes are based on area development by then. The projection is based not only on land-use expectations but also on bike ridership, transit ridership and mode splits over that period of time. Therefore planners expect the overall trips on 152nd will stay fairly uniform over the passage of time given all those different considerations. Ms. Thomson did acknowledge that it was a balancing act.

Commissioner Flynn asked why the plan for 151st Avenue NE would include both the sharrows and a bikeway. Ms. Thomson reminded the Commission that this particular graphic needed to be updated to show that there would be no separate bikeway. The sharrows would be the only biking component. Commissioner Flynn asked what 151st Avenue NE and the access roads would look like adjacent to the new park, since there would not be buildings along that block. Ms. Thomson said the cross section would stay largely the same, and be open instead of having buildings along that side. She added that the sidewalks along the park edge may meander into the park but that portion of the plan had not yet been discussed in detail.

Commissioner O'Hara would like to know how the consultants are approaching the issue of 152nd Avenue N.E. being a retail storefront corridor, while traffic volumes are expected to go up. He was skeptical that bikes and transit usage would go up that much that quickly to offset the increased traffic along 152nd. Commissioner O'Hara said he did not need to discuss it per se, but he wanted more information during the next presentation about how those concerns are going to be addressed. Ms. Thomson added that the grid system graphics did not include information about the new planned off-ramp from the freeway, which would present vehicles with new transit options through that area. Drivers, who want to go around this area rather than through it, will have several options for doing so. Commissioner Biethan added that they are being shown the grids and layouts, but perhaps more detailed information would be helpful. For instance, what roads and uses specifically feed into that particular street, and what purposes will the streets serve. Mr. Churchill said that more information that might be helpful included:

- 1) Both sides of 152nd are slated for redevelopment.
- 2) The planners are aware of significant traffic generators north of this area where cars currently use 148th, go down to 24th, turn left and then turn left again to go back up 152nd. That traffic pattern creates some slowdown which the traffic revisions would alleviate.

Commissioner Biethan asked if there was some graphic that could show where the traffic is coming from and how it moves. Commissioner O'Hara pointed out that even if the planners generated a graphic like that to show current usage, the whole nature of that corridor would change with these new developments. It will be so significantly different that any current graphic would be rendered obsolete. He felt they did not have a sufficient picture of the future corridor. Mr. Churchill asked the Commissioners what kind of graphic they wanted and he would prepare it. Commissioner Biethan replied that he did not want to hold up the process, since they were not even scheduled to discuss 152nd at the current meeting. However, the Commission is being asked to decide on different versions of some future streetscape without a clear understanding of the related usages that will shape how that street is used.

Commissioner Julinsey added that one of her concerns was that 152nd was still a relatively quaint road, with almost no traffic. She wondered if all this development would turn it into another West Lake Sammamish Parkway. She asked whether the aim was to turn 152nd into the heart and soul of this village. If so, she questioned the appropriateness of people lingering along the sidewalks, while cars come zooming off SR-520 via the new onramp. Ms. Thomson confirmed that 152nd was intended to be the main road for the village. Given that, it would have both a relatively high traffic density as well as a relatively high pedestrian density, given its centerpiece function. The grid system was the City's way to balance the traffic needs with the pedestrian experience. The graphics they have shown are the best balance ideas they have come up with to meet all the divergent needs. Mr. Churchill added that the proposed designs both reflect and allow for the expected traffic in 2030. What the planners hoped to hear at the current meeting was feedback on whether these plans support the project's stated goals as listed above.

Commissioner O'Hara felt that the proposed project met those principles. He still wanted to see an additional grid showing the new off ramp and how that would interact with the nearby streets. For instance, where would the off ramp actually terminate, and how would Microsoft employees get to and from work through this area after these changes are made. Mr. Churchill explained that four of the largest intersections would be controlled so traffic would not be able to speed through. Ms. Thomson added that only 25% of the anticipated traffic coming off the off ramp would go through that area in general, let alone 152nd in particular.

Commissioner Biethan said he was satisfied so far with the illustrations, but he wanted more information about how the City planned to meet these other traffic pressures. The explanations given so far are a nice addition but he wanted to see graphical representation of that traffic movement to go with the graphics he had seen so far.

Commissioner Miller said he attended and enjoyed the public meeting and he was glad that the City had posted the survey. He pointed out that if traffic really killed retail streets, then the world's major cities would have closed their streets to traffic many years ago. He felt it was the opposite – that retail brought more life to any given corridor. Commissioner Miller would like the grid aspect to provide for traffic, pedestrian and support activities via separate but adjacent roads. He wondered if those intersections would even need signals to accomplish what is being portrayed. Traffic may successfully be distributed via choice, rather than control. Commissioner Miller also wanted to see more numbers because those would be helpful. He encouraged the planners to consider a dedicated bike lane rather than sharrows for 151st. He would love to see some consistency between Redmond and Bellevue and other regional cities to create uniform bike facilities. Commissioner Miller questioned the need for the left-turn lanes. He would rather see extra width given to mass transit instead of left-turn pockets. Finally, if they overbuild 152nd to take advantage of this proximity, they might interfere with the pedestrian movement they hope to stimulate. He encouraged the City to explore some alternative traffic options, including those to slow down traffic.

Vice-Chair Gregory said he did not have very many additional comments. He liked the general direction of the project; however, he shared the other Commissioners' concerns about the current vagueness of how some of these issues will be addressed. He agreed with Commissioner Miller that traffic per se is not an impediment to the retail atmosphere. With that, Vice-Chair Gregory suggested they begin their next agenda item.

STUDY SESSION, Overlake Amendments Phase III, presented by Jeff Churchill, Redmond City Planner.

Vice-Chair Gregory introduced Commissioner Biethan as the chair for this particular meeting segment. Commissioner Biethan invited Mr. Churchill and Ms. Thomson to make their presentation. Mr. Churchill began by describing the first two phases of this project to better explain the context for Phase III:

- 1) Phase I: 2005 – 2007
 - a. Began as an update to the Overlake Neighborhood Plan.
 - b. Completed the Master Plan and Implementation Strategy.
 - c. SEIS with 2030 time horizon.
 - d. Commitment for Phase II
- 2) Phase II: 2008 – 2009
 - a. Parking Management Study.
 - b. Wayfinding study.
 - c. NE 40th Street corridor study.
 - d. 152nd Avenue NE corridor study.
 - e. Storm/park implementation study.
 - f. Miscellaneous minor updates.
 - g. Planned action update.
 - h. Single-family area plan update.

- 3) What's in Phase III?
 - a. Transportation updates
 - i. Cross sections per NE 40th Street corridor study
 1. Several different cross-sections along that corridor.
 2. Several of those sections would require right-of-way expansion for bike ways and other features.
 3. This corridor has one of the highest pedestrian volumes anywhere in the City.
 - ii. Grid network per 152nd Avenue study.
 - iii. Update location of light rail per Council, Sound Transit Board.
 - b. Stormwater and Parks updates
 - i. Location for collocated facilities per implementation plan.
 - ii. Urban pathway locations per storm/park study.

Commissioner Miller requested plans for how the new bike lanes will be integrated with intersections, particularly left-turn lanes and other vehicle movement patterns.

Mr. Churchill showed a map for the Overlake Village grid network and how multi-modal transit would move through the area. He presented a schedule for the remaining work to be done in Phase III:

- 1) November 10th Planning Commission begins review.
- 2) November 17th Public Hearing.
- 3) December 1st Continued review.
- 4) January 4, 2011 City Council begins review.
- 5) February 2011 Cross sections come forward as part of the Urban Centers Element update.

This concluded Mr. Churchill's presentation. Commissioner Biethan suggested they go through the various exhibits in the meeting packet. Exhibit A, the Transportation Element involves updating the language and maps to reflect the current preferred locations for the light rail station. Commissioner Biethan pointed out that most of the issues involved with this exhibit have already come before the Planning Commission in the recent past. The Exhibit text and maps are a reflection of those recent actions, studies and discussions. Commissioner Biethan asked if there were any additional questions or feedback on this particular exhibit. Vice-Chair Gregory referenced the language in TR-29, specifically the statement about high-occupancy transit as being competitive with single-occupancy vehicles. He asked staff to clarify the word *competitive*. Mr. Churchill replied that the intent was to offer people a choice of transit options that show competitive costs, time and ease of use. Travel time is a big part, so any alternative transit options would have to match or nearly match vehicular speeds from one point to another. For instance, if it took two hours for someone in Redmond to reach downtown Seattle via alternative transit, that alternative would not be used very often.

Commissioner Flynn asked what sorts of planning had gone into parking facilities for the light rail station. Mr. Churchill said that parking at the Overlake Transit Center was covered in and funded by the Phase II portion Sound Transit's plan. There will be a combination of parking options both at and near Overlake Village light rail station. Additionally, redevelopment of properties around the station will open up additional shared-parking resources. However, the City did not plan a large parking area near the Overlake Village station since most ridership

going through that station will either work or live immediately nearby. The location with the largest parking structure is the SE Redmond light-rail station, which will have over 1,000 spaces. Commissioner Flynn asked how long it would be between approval of the SE Redmond facility, and actually getting funding for it. Mr. Churchill said that was a good question and he did not have a specific answer. He said that funding would come from different sources, not just from the City, and other parts of the plan had to be completed first. Commissioner Flynn commented that one of his frustrations with the Seattle light rail plan is the lack of parking near those stations. His use of a similar system in the Atlanta metro area was possible because it was easy to get parking at a nearby park and ride. Commissioner Miller pointed out that Atlanta's system had its own drawbacks. For instance the system did not take advantage of transit-oriented development opportunities but instead opted for the cost of building all that new parking space, which essentially required that the system become a park and ride system.

Commissioner Biethan asked whether this would be a good time to create an issues matrix. Vice-Chair Gregory confirmed that Commissioner Flynn's concerns would certainly be suitable as an issue, and he suggested that it be framed in terms of TR-30 and how to guarantee adequate parking at the Overlake Transit Center. Commissioner Biethan asked the other Commissioners for their opinions. Commissioner O'Hara felt the logical terminus would be the NE 40th street station so that is where the most parking should be available. He would hate to overload Overlake Village with too much parking infrastructure. Commissioner Biethan reminded the Commission that this particular discussion needed to stay focused on the Phase III Overlake Amendments. Mr. Churchill asked what sort of additional information the Commission wanted on this issue. Vice-Chair Gregory wanted an explanation of the term *competitive* which he has already received. There were no other requests of staff.

Commissioner Biethan opened discussion of Exhibit B, regarding projects for both 152nd and NE 40th. Both those projects were proposed to be amended to reflect the various study findings, particularly given the re-alignment of light rail such that it will not run down 152nd anymore. Commissioner Biethan asked if the Commissioners wanted to keep open the issue of whether turn lanes are really necessary on 152nd. Vice-Chair Gregory agreed that the word "necessary" could simply be replaced with "if needed". They could certainly keep that issue open. Mr. Churchill added that the cross-sections are not changing. Rather, the planners wanted input on what the Commission thought of the existing cross-sections so that they could give direction to the consultant, who then could finish up the project and put together the final proposal. Vice-Chair Gregory asked how the proposed changes to the Transportation Master Plan fit into this process, when the project description for 152nd included something that apparently has not yet been described. Mr. Churchill replied that such language left the door open for that possibility, yet did not commit the City to taking that particular action. Commissioner Miller clarified that he wanted more information for what led to the suggestion for turn lanes. He did not want to redesign the cross section at the moment, but rather wanted to know why the current cross-section had those elements in it. They are talking about changes that fundamentally affect the overall village concept, and he wanted to know what had motivated such a large change. There were no further questions on this exhibit.

Commissioner Biethan moved on to Exhibit C, which were amendments to the Urban Center Element. Planners proposed to delete Policy #36 because the work is done, and modify Policy #37 with more specific language about the light rail station location. There was no comment on Exhibit C. Commissioner Biethan closed discussion and moved on to Exhibit D regarding

proposed amendments to the Overlake Business and Advanced Technology Zone. Mr. Churchill explained that the only changes are to the NE 40th Street cross-sections on the page 2 map. Those changes reflect the study findings and are described on page 3. There were no comments.

Exhibit E reflected proposed amendments to the Overlake Village zone and subarea map, which came about via the work of the Code Rewrite Commission. Planners wanted the Planning Commission to have access to the language as it would exist after those changes were approved. Specifically, the changes have narrowed down the preferred location for collocated stormwater/park facilities. Mr. Churchill listed all of the changes on the map and the various administrative or labeling changes between the old map and the revised map. The Commissioners had no comments or questions.

Vice-Chair Gregory repeated the upcoming schedule on this set of amendments with at least one more opportunity for discussion and a decision by December 1st, if not sooner. Vice-Chair Gregory closed the study session.

REPORTS

Vice-Chair Gregory reported on the recent Livable Redmond event. It was a good event and well attended. He invited Ms. Stiteler to give additional information. Ms. Stiteler reported that attendance was approximately 90 participants. The keynote speaker, Andy Wappler, gave a very interesting opening presentation. The eight facilitated groups were all well attended; staff is in the process of compiling those comments. The City will be compiling a report and making it available online. Additional comments can still be made online on the City's homepage, where a link is available for information. Comment is open until November 19th. Footage is available from RCTV.

SCHEDULING/TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING(S)

Vice-Chair Gregory said another upcoming event would provide similar opportunities for input. He invited Ms. Stiteler to discuss that event as well. Ms. Stiteler explained that the upcoming Redmond Central Connector on November 15th was for the purpose of looking at developing the Redmond Central Connector master plan. More information is available about that event on the City's website.

ADJOURN

Vice-Chair Gregory adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:20 p.m.

Minutes Approved On:

Planning Commission Chair