

\*Denotes a cross-over item

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p>1. Are there examples of implementation that could help illuminate the redevelopment of underutilized properties, second bullet of FW-10? <i>(Biethan, Miller)</i></p> <p>Policy as initially proposed: <i>FW-10 Ensure that the land use pattern in Redmond meets the following objectives:</i></p> <p>...</p> <p>- <i>Encourages redevelopment of properties that are underutilized or inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan designation.</i></p> <p>...</p>	<p><b><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></b>                      2/23: This issue to be handled as part of Goals, Vision, Framework discussion. See the discussion in issue #3 of this matrix.</p> <p>2/16: Staff recommends reserving modifications to this policy which reflects citywide goals, vision, and framework. An associated discussion will occur as part of the Commission’s concurrent review of the Goals, Vision, and Framework Element.</p> <p><b><u>Public Comment:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>PC Comments:</u></b>                      2/16: Planning Commission approved closing this issue while holding open issue #3 because the discussion of issue #3 satisfies this issue.</p> <p>2/9: Commissioner Biethan and Miller requested additional information, such as examples, to help clarify the intent of this bullet in encouraging redevelopment of properties that are underutilized or inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan designation.</p>	<p><b>Closed</b>  <b>2/16/11</b></p>
<p>2. *- What is the relationship between agricultural and rural uses and recreation? <i>(Biethan, Miller, Hinman)</i></p>	<p><b><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></b>                      3/2: Based on clarification provided by Commissioner Miller, staff recommends drafting policy language that summarizes Redmond’s protection and encouragement of agricultural uses, inside and adjacent to Redmond, during the reconciliation phase of the Comprehensive Plan Update.</p> <p>This would allow for the draft policy language to be consistent with the change in zoning that is scheduled to occur on April 5th when City Council is expected to act on the proposed change of Agricultural zoning to Urban Recreation zoning.</p> <p>2/23: Staff is currently working with Commissioner Miller to further explore the issue and</p>	<p><b>Opened</b>  <b>2/9/11</b></p>

\*Denotes a cross-over item

	<p>identify a potential resolution.</p> <p>2/16: Staff provided information relevant to agricultural uses during the study session, such as: Redmond’s policies related to the urban growth boundary, preservation of rural land outside the urban growth boundary, agricultural uses allowed and protected by Urban Recreation zoning.</p> <p>Through GMA, cities accommodate and promote urban activities within their boundaries and within the Urban Growth Areas as defined by King County and agreed to by cities in the County. Cities may be allowed under GMA to have land designated for agricultural uses within their jurisdictions, but Redmond has chosen not to have an “Agriculture” designation in its Comprehensive Plan. The Urban Recreation land use designation (LU-60) and UR zoning permit agriculture – as well as other uses, such as ball fields.</p> <p><b><u>Public Comment:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>PC Comments:</u></b></p> <p>2/16: Commissioner Gregory noted that the Urban Recreation policy, LU-60, might be the most suitable place to address this issue. Commissioner Hinman suggested that this issue most closely relates to LU-20. Commission Miller expressed interest in exploring this issue more completely and agreed to work with staff toward resolution.</p>	
<p>3. As above, are there examples of implementation that could illuminate LU-5 that encourages infill development? Does this policy impact possible innovative approaches to design and/or development? (Biethan, Miller)</p> <p>Policy as stated in update: <i>LU-5 Encourage infill development on suitable</i></p>	<p><b><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></b></p> <p>2/23: This issue is held open for the review of Commissioner Biethan.</p> <p>2/16: The Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code currently include a variety of programs and opportunities that support implementation of policy LU-5, such as: small lot short plats, cottage housing, multiplex structures, innovative housing, and affordable housing, and transfer of development rights. The regulations governing a particular site, including neighborhood criteria, determine the applicability of the various implementation measures.</p> <p>Looking to one part of the City in particular, the North Redmond neighborhood “wedge” subarea, several of these programs, combined with a special overlay zone, permit an increased density of dwellings in balance with preserving critical areas and associated buffers.</p>	<p><b>Opened 2/9/11</b></p>

\*Denotes a cross-over item

<p><i>vacant parcels and redevelopment of underutilized parcels. Ensure that the height, bulk, and design of infill and redevelopment projects are compatible with their surroundings.</i></p>	<p>Design is often subjective and flexibility over a long-term permits innovations and emerging trends. Policy LU-5 provides flexibility by calling for infill and redevelopment projects to be compatible with their surroundings, rather than a particular type of development.</p> <p><b><u>Public Comment:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>PC Comments:</u></b>                  2/16: Planning Commission was satisfied with staff response but held on closing the issue to provide an opportunity for Commissioner Biethan to review.</p> <p>2/9: Commissioners Biethan and Miller requested additional definition or examples along with a determination whether the encouragement of infill development is implemented by way of a policy or procedure. Commissioner Miller added his concern whether this policy discourages creative or innovative approaches to design and development.</p>	
<p>4. Are all uses treated the same regarding access to services, this is related to Neighborhood Commercial (NC) changes currently in progress, see LU-36? How does the City ensure that residential neighborhoods remain stable and a balance is achieved regarding denser commercial uses in the Urban Centers, page 30?  <i>(Biethan, Miller)</i></p> <p>Policy as initially proposed:  <i>LU-36 Maintain and enhance a well-distributed</i></p>	<p><b><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></b>                  2/16: The following images include zoning designations in the vicinity of BP, MP, and I zones. Adjacent to the clusters of these zones, a variety of zoning designations supplement the currently permitted uses within the BP, MP, and I zones.</p> <p>Willows/Rose Hill and Sammamish Valley vicinity:</p>	<p><b>Opened</b>  <b>2/9/11</b></p>





\*Denotes a cross-over item

	<table border="1" data-bbox="632 233 1745 493"> <tr> <td data-bbox="632 233 1192 310"></td> <td data-bbox="1192 233 1745 310">                     restaurants                      Bar or drinking place                 </td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="632 310 1192 493">Industrial zones</td> <td data-bbox="1192 310 1745 493">                     Automobile sales, service, or rental                      Professional services                      Full-service, cafeteria, or limited-service restaurants                      Caterers                 </td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="632 570 869 602"><b><u>Public Comment:</u></b></p> <p data-bbox="632 643 837 675"><b><u>PC Comments:</u></b>                  2/9: Commissioners Biethan and Miller asked whether this policy intends to maintain neighborhood character and existing land uses in the context of supporting denser commercial development in the City’s two urban centers. They requested additional information to help determine whether small commercial nodes, neighborhood commercial centers, or a more general distribution of commercial uses is preferred by way of policy LU-36. Commissioner Miller added his concern regarding a citywide support of commercial uses, particularly in Business Park, Industrial, and Manufacturing Park zones in support of access to services during the work day.</p>		restaurants Bar or drinking place	Industrial zones	Automobile sales, service, or rental Professional services Full-service, cafeteria, or limited-service restaurants Caterers	
	restaurants Bar or drinking place					
Industrial zones	Automobile sales, service, or rental Professional services Full-service, cafeteria, or limited-service restaurants Caterers					
5. * - What is the City’s parking strategy and does it include public parking facilities? (Biethan)	<p data-bbox="632 1013 1094 1045"><b><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></b>                  2/23: Please refer to the issue matrix for the Transportation Element.</p> <p data-bbox="632 1122 869 1154"><b><u>Public Comment:</u></b></p> <p data-bbox="632 1195 837 1227"><b><u>PC Comments:</u></b>                  2/16: Planning Commission closed this issue noting that it is represented for discussion and resolution in the issue matrix for the Transportation Element.</p>	<p data-bbox="1835 1013 1934 1078"><b>Closed 2/16/11</b></p>				
6. Should policy address healthy food, LU-6? Does the definition of “healthy food” differ from person to	<p data-bbox="632 1346 1094 1378"><b><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></b>                  2/16: Staff recommends maintaining this policy noting that it does not preclude access to other foods and beverages. County and regional planning policies also recommend including support for such opportunities. Staff also recommends establishing an associated</p>	<p data-bbox="1835 1346 1934 1411"><b>Opened 2/9/11</b></p>				

\*Denotes a cross-over item

<p>person?                  (Gregory)</p> <p>Policy as initially proposed:  <i>LU-6 Provide opportunities for shops, services, recreation, and access to healthy food sources within walking or bicycling distance of homes, work places, and other gathering places.</i></p>	<p>definition later this year through the Comprehensive Plan update process.</p> <p>The City’s current effort in carrying out the <i>Communities Putting Prevention to Work, Healthy Eating/Active Living</i> grant includes defining this term. King County offers a suggestion of “un-processed foods, fruit, vegetables, whole grains, low fat dairy, etc.” as a definition of healthy food. Additionally, the USDA adopted the “Dietary Guidelines for Americans, 2010” on January 31, 2011. The guidelines refer to “nutrient dense foods and beverages” and define them as follows:  <i>“nutrient dense—Nutrient-dense foods and beverages provide vitamins, minerals, and other sub-stances that may have positive health effects, with relatively few calories. The term “nutrient dense” indicates the nutrients and other beneficial sub-stances in a food have not been “diluted” by the addition of calories from added solid fats, added sugars, or added refined starches, or by the solid fats naturally present in the food. Nutrient-dense foods and beverages are lean or low in solid fats, and minimize or exclude added solid fats, sugars, starches, and sodium. Ideally, they also are in forms that retain naturally occurring components, such as dietary fiber. All vegetables, fruits, whole grains, seafood, eggs, beans and peas, unsalted nuts and seeds, fat-free and low-fat milk and milk products, and lean meats and poultry—when prepared without solid fats or added sugars—are nutrient-dense foods.”</i> Source:  <a href="http://www.cnpp.usda.gov/Publications/DietaryGuidelines/2010/PolicyDoc/Appendices.pdf">http://www.cnpp.usda.gov/Publications/DietaryGuidelines/2010/PolicyDoc/Appendices.pdf</a>, pg 94</p> <p>Puget Sound Regional Council <i>“VISION 2040 recognizes the important relationship between a healthy environment – both the natural and built environment – and healthy people. As a result, health issues, including environmental health, pollution exposure, and transportation’s impact on health, are addressed throughout VISION 2040.”</i> Source:  <a href="http://www.psrc.org/assets/4543/Appendix_E_Complete.pdf">http://www.psrc.org/assets/4543/Appendix_E_Complete.pdf</a>, pg E1-14</p> <p><b><u>Public Comment:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>PC Comments:</u></b>                  2/9: Commissioner Gregory noted his concern whether policy should address healthy food. He added that the term “healthy” when applied to food, in particular, can indicate a different meaning to different people.</p>	
---	---	--

\*Denotes a cross-over item

<p>7. Should policy address physical activity in LU-17.1 in a manner that helps establish opportunities? (<i>Gregory</i>)</p> <p>Policy as initially proposed: <i>Incorporate health into local decision-making by locating, designing, and operating public facilities and services in a manner that:</i></p> <p>...</p> <p><i>- Provides tool such as educational and demonstration programs that help foster a healthy environment, physical activity and well being, and public safety.</i></p>	<p><b><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></b>                  2/16: Staff plans to address Commissioner Gregory’s concern in combination with the Parks, Arts, Recreation, Culture, and Conservation Element and to provide additional recommendation at the Commission’s February 16<sup>th</sup> meeting. Associated modifications will be reserved for the Comprehensive Plan amendment reconciliation.</p> <p><b><u>Public Comment:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>PC Comments:</u></b>                  2/9: Commissioner Gregory asked how the City would implement the tools described in policy LU-17.1 and suggested addressing the intent as providing opportunities for physical activity and well-being along with examples of such.</p>	<p><b>Opened 2/9/11</b></p>
<p>8. What is the definition of diversity, as reference in the narrative of the residential section? Should diversity address lifestyles and sustainability more so than housing type? (<i>Miller</i>)</p>	<p><b><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></b>                  3/2: Based Commissioner Miller’s suggestion, staff recommends substituting the word, “variety,” for the word, “diversity” in order to remove unnecessary confusion from the policies, LU-33 and LU-34.</p> <p>2/23: Staff seeks clarification from Commissioner Miller regarding the definition of lifestyle.</p> <p>2/16: Staff supports this refinement and will carry out modifications prior to the Planning Commission’s approval of amendments to the Land Use Element.</p> <p><b><u>Public Comment:</u></b></p>	<p><b>Opened 2/9/11</b></p>

\*Denotes a cross-over item

	<p><b><u>PC Comments:</u></b>                  2/9: Commissioner Miller requested using the term “neighborhood diversity” to indicate other varieties of lifestyle and the way in which each neighborhood implements aspects of sustainability.</p>	
<p>9. * - Consistency in terminology – neighborhoods, subareas, zones, districts, and others.                  (Hinman)</p>	<p><b><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></b>                  2/16: Staff has noted this request and plans to address during Comprehensive Plan amendment reconciliation.</p> <p><b><u>Public Comment:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>PC Comments:</u></b></p>	<p><b>Opened                  2/9/11</b></p>
<p>10. Ensure consistency between Land Use and Urban Planning Elements, particularly regarding the single-family residential portion of the Overlake neighborhood plan.                  (Hinman)</p>	<p><b><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></b>                  2/16: Staff plans to address this item during the Commission’s concurrent review of the Urban Center’s Element, reflecting subsequent amendments, as necessary, in the Land Use and Neighborhoods Elements.</p> <p><b><u>Public Comment:</u></b></p> <p><b><u>PC Comments:</u></b>                  2/9: Commissioner Hinman requested addressing the Overlake neighborhood regarding references to the urban center portion, the three sub-areas, and the northern single-family, residential portion to help ensure consistency throughout the Comprehensive Plan.</p>	<p><b>Opened                  2/9/11</b></p>
<p>11. How can the proposed new policy, LU 17.1, be modified to ensure that every citizen has easy biking and walking access to a community garden?</p>	<p><b><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></b>                  2/23: A governing principle of the Comprehensive Plan update is to create policy that can be implemented in a predictable and measurable manner. The location of community gardens, pea patches, and corporate gardens, and the like will evolve as a function of private and public effort and investment. The establishment of these gardens is likely to result in a random distribution throughout Redmond.</p>	<p><b>Opened                  2/16/11</b></p>

\*Denotes a cross-over item

<p>The proposed LU 17.1 reads:</p> <p>Incorporate health into local decision-making by locating, designing and operating public facilities and services in a manner that</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses sustainable building and development practices;</li> <li>• Encourages walking and bicycling access to public facilities;</li> <li>• Supports creation of community gardens such as pea patches on public open space; and</li> <li>• Provides tools such as educational and demonstration programs that help foster a healthy environment, physical activity and well being, and public safety.</li> </ul> <p>(Cindy Jayne, Sustainable Redmond)</p>	<p>The recommended policy <i>supports</i> a distribution of gardens, rather than <i>ensures</i> an equal distribution. Also, multiple policies of the proposed Comprehensive Plan update call for equitable access to goods and services including community gardens, via multiple modes of transportation.</p> <p>Staff recommends the following amendment to policy LU-17.1 (previously recommended as an addition to the Land Use Element, new language underlined):</p> <p><b>LU 17.1</b> Incorporate health into local decision-making by locating, designing and operating public facilities and services in a manner that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Uses sustainable building and development practices;</li> <li>• Encourages walking and bicycling access to public facilities;</li> <li>• Supports creation of community gardens such as pea patches on public open space in <u>accessible locations throughout Redmond</u>; and</li> <li>• Provides tools such as educational and demonstration programs that help foster a healthy environment, physical activity and well being, and public safety.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Public Comment:</u></b>                  2/16: Cindy Jayne, representing Sustainable Redmond shared the group’s interest in ensuring that “every citizen has easy biking and walking access to” community gardens.</p> <p><b><u>PC Comments:</u></b></p>	
<p>12. Are the new growth target numbers for 2030 supported by an analysis of what the natural resources of Redmond can sustainably support? (Cindy Jayne,</p>	<p><b><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></b>                  2/23: The growth target numbers for 2030 assume no change to the current zoning for Redmond, that is, no change in allowed density of residential or commercial development. The growth target numbers are less than the capacity for growth allowed by current zoning.</p> <p>The current zoning for Redmond was approved incrementally through many, separate</p>	<p><b>Opened 2/16/11</b></p>

\*Denotes a cross-over item

<p>Sustainable Redmond)</p>	<p>legislative processes. When considering changes to zoning and updates to growth targets, Redmond takes into account multiple factors, including the potential general impacts to the natural environment, such as impacts to critical areas and other natural resources and the potential general impacts to the capacity of public facilities and services.</p> <p>Redmond’s Planning Commission and City Council apply this information when approving zoning changes. Yes, in this manner, the growth targets for 2030 are supported by consideration of Redmond’s natural resources.</p> <p><b><u>Public Comment:</u></b>                  2/16: In written comments, Ms. Jayne offered this example: “...if Las Vegas was to plan to grow significantly, one might argue that the lack of water in the area would make that an unsustainable place.”</p> <p><b><u>PC Comments:</u></b></p>	
<p>13. Do the proposed, updated Comprehensive Plan policies encourage the creation of farm lands, protect the new and existing farm lands from any environmental damage or loss of productivity due to development of surrounding areas, and encourage, foster and facilitate the food processing and delivery from farms to the local farmers markets and other local outlets accessible by residents? (Cindy Jayne, Sustainable Redmond)</p>	<p><b><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></b>                  2/23: The policies of the proposed, updated Comprehensive Plan do not directly encourage the creation of farm lands. The policies do support the preservation of existing farm land and encourage small-scale farming in the form of community gardens, pea patches, etc... Agriculture is an allowed use in the Urban Recreation, Open Space, and Semi-Rural designations of the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>Staff recommends maintaining existing policy that offers various levels of support and encouragement regarding food systems such as community gardens. Additional consideration of food systems will also occur along with later amendments as part of the 2010-2011 periodic review of the Comprehensive Plan. However, staff recommends considering a process such as advisory opportunities as a component of the CPPW HEAL grant for considering applicability and implementation of Ms. Jayne’s request. For example, policy LU-20 includes “Encouraging businesses, programs, and other uses that support agricultural uses as part of Redmond’s local economy, such as local farmer markets, community supported agriculture, and other local produce programs” and may help establish the foundation for additional approaches akin to Ms. Jayne’s recommendation.</p>	<p><b>Opened 2/16/11</b></p>

\*Denotes a cross-over item

	<p><b><u>Public Comment:</u></b>                  2/16: Cindy Jayne, representing Sustainable Redmond requested greater encouragement for the creation and preservation of farmlands. Specifically, she noted the group’s interest in policy that addresses creating farm lands, protecting the new and existing farm lands for any environmental damage or loss in productivity due to the development of surrounding areas, and encouraging, fostering, and facilitating the food processing and delivery from these farms to the local farmers markets and other local outlets accessible by residents.</p> <p><b><u>PC Comments:</u></b></p>									
<p>14. LU-1 table – does this table provide for sufficient amount of commercial square footage, as projected to 2030, in anticipation of Overlake high-tech development? (Don Marcy, representing Microsoft Corporation)</p>	<p><b><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></b>                  2/23: The proposed growth targets are consistent with the employment growth forecasted for Redmond by the Puget Sound Regional Council and are higher than the City’s commitment through the King County Countywide Planning Policies. Staff estimates that approximately two-thirds of the new commercial floor area will be developed in Overlake and Downtown, and of that, the majority will occur in Overlake.</p> <p>The targets also reflect the amount of new commercial development planned for Overlake through the 2007 neighborhood plan update and the amount analyzed in the associated Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement. In total, this is an increase of 4.5 million square feet of commercial space above the previous plan.</p> <p>Finally, staff would like to note that we track progress in achieving the growth targets and report annually through the Community Indicators program. This provides an opportunity for ongoing review of the adequacy of the City’s growth targets. Staff recommends maintaining policy LU-1 as proposed:</p> <p>Table LU-1                  Redmond Development                  2010 Actual and 2030 Growth Target</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="625 1315 1812 1472"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>2010</th> <th>Increase</th> <th>2030 Growth Target</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Dwelling Units</td> <td>25,000</td> <td>12,000</td> <td>36,500</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		2010	Increase	2030 Growth Target	Dwelling Units	25,000	12,000	36,500	<p><b>Opened 2/16/11</b></p>
	2010	Increase	2030 Growth Target							
Dwelling Units	25,000	12,000	36,500							

\*Denotes a cross-over item

	<table border="1" data-bbox="632 237 1808 331"> <tr> <td data-bbox="632 237 1052 331">Commercial Space (Million GFA)</td> <td data-bbox="1052 237 1304 331">29.0</td> <td data-bbox="1304 237 1514 331">11.2</td> <td data-bbox="1514 237 1808 331">40.2</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="632 370 1671 440">Please refer to item #12 of the Planning Commission’s issue matrix for additional description of Redmond’s growth target.</p> <p data-bbox="632 483 1803 662"><b><u>Public Comment:</u></b>                  2/16: Don Marcy, representing Microsoft Corporation noted his concern that the table contained in policy LU-1 may not reflect the long-term commercial development interest of Redmond’s high-tech companies such as Microsoft and Nintendo, particularly in the Overlake neighborhood.</p> <p data-bbox="632 703 1759 808"><b><u>PC Comments:</u></b>                  2/16: Commissioner Gregory requested that staff double-check that the proposed growth targets take into account the concerns of business for future commercial space.</p>	Commercial Space (Million GFA)	29.0	11.2	40.2	
Commercial Space (Million GFA)	29.0	11.2	40.2			
<p data-bbox="191 850 600 1175">15. LU-3 map – should this map expand to include properties west of SR-520 that are currently owned/operated by Microsoft and Nintendo, for example? (Don Marcy, representing Microsoft Corporation)</p>	<p data-bbox="632 850 1803 992"><b><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></b>                  2/23: Staff notes that this map is recommended to move to the Urban Centers Element and should be addressed as part of that element’s discussion. See issue 35 on the Urban Centers matrix.</p> <p data-bbox="632 1032 1776 1211"><b><u>Public Comment:</u></b>                  2/16: Don Marcy, representing Microsoft Corporation requested that map LU-3 <i>Overlake Urban Center</i> also include those lands owned and operated by Overlake neighborhood’s high-tech companies including Microsoft and Nintendo. The parcels of interest lay to the west of SR-520.</p> <p data-bbox="632 1252 837 1284"><b><u>PC Comments:</u></b></p>	<p data-bbox="1837 850 1944 915"><b>Opened 2/16/11</b></p>				

\\redmond.man\FS\PCComm\PLANNING\Comp Plan Update Periodic 2010-11\Land Use Element\Planning Commission\IssuesMatrix\_LandUseElement\_Draft\_March2.docx