Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
1. UC-1: consider adding concept of "economically viable" (Biethan)	Staff Comment/Recommendation The purpose of this policy is to identify mixed-use developments as one strategy for reducing air pollution and greenhouse gas emissions. Staff believes that the economic dimension of land use is sufficiently addressed in the Economic Vitality element. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
2. DT-3: What does "small and independently owned" mean? (Biethan)	Staff Comment/Recommendation 2/23: Upon reflection, staff would appreciate additional feedback from Commissioners. Do Commissioners believe that encouraging small and independently-owned (in the non-chain sense) would not have a) a beneficial community character impact, b) a beneficial economic impact, c) that it is not the role of the City to distinguish between chain and non-chain small businesses? Other insights on that are also appreciated. 2/9: "Small and independently owned" does not mean independently owned national franchise. When this policy was adopted, there was a desire to especially encourage the success of locally-owned and operated boutique-type businesses, as opposed to national chain stores. Public Comment PC Comments 2/16: Commissioners recommended eliminating "and independently owned" so as to not make a distinction between franchise and non-franchise small businesses. The Commission also asked that similar language be used in N-OV-54.	Opened 2/9 ~~Closed 2/16~~ (staff requests additional discussion)
3. DT-8: what does "honor" mean? (Biethan)	Staff Comment/Recommendation The original language specified that elements (artifacts) of the railroad should be included as part of the trail improvements. The proposed language is broader so as to give designers and the community more flexibility in proceeding with implementation of the Connector while retaining the idea of incorporating Redmond's history into the project. Public Comment	Opened 2/9

	PC Comments	
4. DT-8: how do we avoid collisions between vehicles and bicycles where multi-use trails cross streets in Downtown? (Biethan)	Staff Comment/Recommendation Staff believes this is a project design issue that does not need to be addressed in policy. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
5. DT-10: "face" vs. "integrate" with respect to how buildings interact with Redmond Central Connector (Biethan)	Staff Comment/Recommendation "Integrate/interact with" the corridor might be better word selections. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
6. DT-13: what does "exceptional" mean? (Biethan)	Staff Comment/Recommendation To implement this policy, the implementing regulations allow up to 8 stories, as a bonus, when a minimum of 20% of the site area is provided as open space available to the public in the form of plazas/arcades. No change is recommended. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
7. *DT-32: consider "parking management and development plan" (Biethan)	Staff Comment/Recommendation 2/9: The words "development and" were inadvertently deleted. Staff recommends keeping them in the policy. Public Comment PC Comments 2/16: Commission concurs.	Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16

8. *OV-42: parking – in what format would it be provided? (Biethan)	Staff Comment/Recommendation See Transportation Element issue matrix for further discussion In 2009 the City completed the Overlake Parking Management Plan. The Plan evaluated a number of future parking strategies, including reduced parking requirements, public-private parking facilities, public parking facilities, and a combination of the above. The Plan is online at www.redmond.gov/cms/One.aspx?portalId=169&pageId=1216. To achieve urban form objectives, the zoning code already prohibits new surface parking lots in Overlake Village. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
9. Overall element structure – consider common policies, then DT, then OV (see Ed Hill, Willows neighborhood plans for examples) (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation 2/23: Staff will provide a complete response and recommendation at the March 2 meeting. 2/9: Staff will evaluate this and bring back a recommendation to the Planning Commission. Public Comment PC Comments 2/16: Commissioner Hinman explained the intent of his recommendation and referred to an outline that he sent to staff and other Commissioners on the morning of February 16.	Opened 2/9
10. Page 5, bullet 1: which 18 hours? Note conflicts in Belltown (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation 2/23: Staff concurs. 2/9: This is a figure of speech to express that businesses in Downtown are envisioned to be open well into the evening, but that the City is not anticipating 24-hour activity. Staff recommends no change. Public Comment PC Comments 2/16: Commissioners recommend ending the sentence before the "18-hour Downtown"	Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16

	language.	
11. DT-1, bullet 3: reduce need for lengthy trips for whom? (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation The sentiment of this policy is that the convenience commercial centers are located at the outer edges of Downtown, closer to the residential neighborhoods, so that those residents need not travel through Downtown, for basic goods and services. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
12. DT-7: would like better link between trails and transportation (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation Staff will evaluate this and bring back a recommendation to the Planning Commission. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
13. DT-10: consider also the south side of the rail corridor as well. Can we do more there? (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation 2/23: Staff concurs. 2/9: Staff suggests "on either side" instead of "adjoining" to address Commissioner Miller's concern. Public Comment PC Comments 2/16: Commissioner Miller recommended "on both sides" instead of "on either side".	Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16
14. DT-13: Over the long-term, can we expect more than 5-6 stories? (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation Previous Planning Commissions and City Councils have embraced this policy as integral to the vision for allowed building heights in the Downtown. Staff is not proposing changes to the vision for Downtown or the City as a whole. Public Comment	Opened 2/9

	PC Comments	
15. DT-29: preserve and defend midblock linkage system (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation 2/9: Staff recommends adding "preserving" after "Completing". Public Comment PC Comments 2/16: Commissioners were satisfied with the staff response.	Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16
16. DT-34: why constrain conversion of couplet until after 161st and 164th links are complete? What is the relationship? (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation Staff will consult with Transportation and bring back a recommendation to the Planning Commission. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
17. Page 29: why specify "under" SR 520 for link to Marymoor? (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation 2/9: Going "under" means under 520, as it rises, not going underground. The concepts currently envision the connections at the east and west ends of Marymoor Park. Staff recommends using "across" instead of "under". Public Comment PC Comments 2/16: Commissioners indicated a desire to have more conversation about this at a future study session.	Opened 2/9
18. Page 37: there is a disconnect between honoring existing bungalows and redevelopment to	Staff Comment/Recommendation 2/9: The intent of the district is stated in the first paragraph of page 37, which is that the area is envisioned to be redeveloped over time. However the word "honor" is probably not a good word to use here. Staff recommends changing the end of the sentence to "… in developments that reflect the characteristics of the existing houses, with similar roof and architectural styles.	Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16

multi-story condos (Miller)	Public Comment PC Comments 2/16: Commissioners were satisfied with the staff response.	
19. OV-13: what is this policy trying to say? (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation 2/9: The purpose of this policy is to reinforce that, though Downtown and Overlake are both urban centers in Redmond, they are now and are envisioned to be in the future distinct in terms of design and character. Alternative language could be: *"Use neighborhood-specific design standards and other design techniques to help create a character for Overlake that is distinct from the Downtown."* Public Comment PC Comments 2/16: Commissioners were satisfied with the staff response.	Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16
20. OV-21.1: 51st overpass of SR 520 very pedestrian unfriendly, and yet it is called-out as a public "vantage point" (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation The NE 51st overpass was identified as a public vantage point by neighborhood stakeholders. Staff recommends keeping the policy even though the area may not be pedestrian friendly. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
21. OV-34: Good policy. Need clearer definition of what facilities are meant (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation Staff believes the current policy provides sufficient direction. It identifies "pedestrian and bicycle standards" as the performance criteria for the multi-use pathway. The City's pedestrian and bicycle standards are found in the Transportation Master Plan. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9

22. OV-37: "adjoining" is unclear (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation 2/9: Staff recommends replacing "adjoining" with "at". The station in question is the one that will be at the Overlake Transit Center. Public Comment PC Comments 2/16: Commissioners were satisfied with the staff response.	Opened 2/9
23. Generally, some policies are very specific and others are more general. Try to operate at same level throughout (e.g., OV-17 is specific) (Julinsey)	Staff Comment/Recommendation 2/9: Staff agrees with the observation and will look to see if there are policies that are overly broad or specific that could be brought closer into line with the rest of the policies. Public Comment PC Comments 2/16: Commissioner Julinsey asked that staff and Commissioners keep this in mind as the various plan elements are updated throughout the year.	Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16
24. DT-8, bullet 1: appears to preclude trolleys and trolley feasibility study is not yet complete (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation Staff will consult with the Parks and Transportation Departments and bring a recommendation to the Planning Commission. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9
25. OV-9, DT-35: these say the same thing. Should address impacts to streets, ramps (vs. 520 mainline) (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation Staff will consult Transportation and others and bring back a recommendation to the Planning Commission. Public Comment PC Comments	Opened 2/9

26. Use consistent transit terminology (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation 2/9: Staff will review the element with this in mind. Public Comment PC Comments 2/16: Commissioner Hinman asked staff and Commissioners to keep this idea in mind as elements are reviewed.	Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16
27. Consider duplicating PARCC and TR-1 maps for clarity (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation 2/9: Staff recommends against duplicating these maps as it is difficult to ensure that the duplicate maps are updated when the original maps are updated, especially because these maps are maintained by departments other than Planning. Public Comment PC Comments 2/16: Commissioner Hinman was satisfied with the staff response, and recommended some kind of reference or other wayfinding to help users find the maps that they need.	Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16
28. 152nd cross section: does analysis show that 3 lanes is preferable to 2 given land-use and character objectives? (Miller)	Staff Comment/Recommendation 2/9: At the outset of the 152nd Ave NE Corridor Study, the Overlake Neighborhood Plan identified it as a three-lane street. As part of the traffic analysis for the 152nd Ave NE Corridor Study, the City analyzed traffic conditions assuming that 152nd Ave NE would have no turn lanes (i.e., a two-lane street). The analysis concludes that gridlock condition would not develop, but that queues could extend beyond two blocks on 152nd Ave NE. The guiding principles of the 152nd study speak to creating a lively people place, supporting existing business and new development, having an active streetscape on 152nd, and overall having people who visit say "Wow!" Guided by the principles above, staff recommends a three-lane section for 152nd Ave NE. City staff believes the queue lengths projected for the two-lane scenario would be unacceptable. Staff believes that the scenario with left-turn lanes meets neighborhood plan goals of creating a	Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16

	pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly corridor that will also be an active retail street. Public Comment PC Comments 2/16: Commissioners were satisfied with the staff response.	
29. What does note 5 mean on cross section table? (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation 2/9: The indication for note 5 should be deleted. It is leftover from the "old" code. It indicates that medians/two-way left-turn lanes are evaluated on a project-by-project basis based on volumes, etc. Because the code ("old" and "new") gives the Technical Committee authority to amend the cross section based on project-specific conditions, this note is not necessary. Public Comment PC Comments 2/16: Commissioners were satisfied with the staff response.	Opened 2/9
30. Where are BRT stops on 152nd? (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation 2/9: A BRT stop is planned near the existing Park & Ride. When light rail opens, that station could shift, but that decision has not been made. Public Comment PC Comments 2/16: Commissioners were satisfied with the staff response.	Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16
31. Provide information about rain gardens in street/pathway cross sections (Hinman)	Staff Comment/Recommendation 2/23: At the 2/16 meeting, Don Cairns described how stormwater would be handled on the north-south and east-west streets, as well as under the urban pathway. 2/9: Information about how rain gardens would be used can be found on pages 46, 50, 51, and 56 of the Street Requirements document provided in your February 9, 2011 packet. On 151st Ave NE, for example, low impact development features run alongside and underneath the urban pathway.	Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16

	Public Comment PC Comments 2/16: Commissioners were satisfied with the staff response on 2/16.	
32. OV-5.5: clarify employee targets (public testimony)	Staff Comment/Recommendation 2/23: The confusion probably stems from the fact that the urban center boundary does not cover the entire Overlake Business and Advanced Technology zone. There are thousands of employees in Overlake that are not captured in the urban center employment target. Staff recommends clarifying this by adding explanatory language in the paragraph before OV-3 (page 43). Staff will provide this in the packet for March 2. Public Comment 2/16: Don Marcy, representing Microsoft, noted that it appeared that the employee target for 2030 is lower than the number of employees today. He asked for clarification. PC Comments	Opened 2/16
33. OV-37: concern about minimizing parking at the interim terminus of light rail in Overlake (public testimony)	Staff Comment/Recommendation 2/23: The "minimize parking" language applies to the Overlake Village station (at the north end of 152nd Avenue NE), which will not be a terminus of East Link. The language does not apply to the Overlake Transit Center station, where Sound Transit is planning to build a parking garage. In addition, staff refers Commissioners to policies TR-8 and TR-10. These policies incorporate the concepts formerly found in OV-38, which addresses intercepting regional trips in Southeast Redmond, rather than in Overlake. Sound Transit has evaluated each East Link station as both a terminus and a through station to better understand the demand and potential users at each location. The agency has agreements in place with other jurisdictions along the Link light rail line (such as Tukwila) to monitor the parking conditions on a regular basis. These agreements establish triggers that can result in additional enforcement, the addition of parking spaces, or the addition of transit service. Public Comment 2/16: Don Marcy testified that Microsoft had concerns about minimizing parking at the potential	Opened 2/16

	terminus of East Link Light Rail at the Overlake Transit Center. He testified that the station would draw commuters from places like Sammamish, and that there would be a substantial parking need. <u>PC Comments</u>	
34. OV-14, 72, and preamble to OV-77 characterize the Employment Area as "mid-rise", "campus-like", "moderate-intensity" and that buildings should respect treelines. Microsoft has concerns about how this might affect long-term growth plans on its campus (public testimony)	<u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> <u>Public Comment</u> <u>PC Comments</u>	Opened 2/16
35. Overlake Urban Center map boundaries (public testimony)	<u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/23: In 2004, Redmond initiated an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan to change the type and extent of the center designation for Overlake from a Manufacturing/Industrial Center to an Urban Center. Staff's initial proposal included property on the west side of SR 520. The City of Bellevue expressed significant concern about this change, including concern about the size of the proposed urban center. Redmond revised the proposed boundary to reduce the area of the Overlake Urban Center and during 2004-05 worked to address Bellevue's concerns. For the Planning Commission 2006 public hearing, the City of Bellevue expressed continued concern that the Overlake Urban Center is contiguous to Bellevue on three sides, expressed concern about Overlake's transportation impacts, and raised questions regarding whether the proposed change in type and extent of center designation would enable more growth in Overlake and if yes, the impacts of the proposed change for Bellevue. The current boundary has resulted in some confusion, since significant portions of Overlake are	Opened 2/16

	on the west side of SR 520. If the Planning Commission believes that a change to the boundary should be considered, staff suggests that the Commission request that this topic be placed on the Planning Department's work plan to allow for communication and coordination with the City of Bellevue. <u>Public Comment</u> Overlake Urban Center map should include properties west of SR-520 that are currently owned/operated by Microsoft and Nintendo. (Don Marcy, representing Microsoft Corporation) <u>PC Comments</u>	

N:\PLANNING\Comp Plan Update Periodic 2010-11\Urban Centers Element\2011-02-23 Issues Matrix.docx