2010 – 2011 Comprehensive Plan Update – GOALS/VISION/FRAMEWORK ELEMENT

An asterisk* denotes crossover issue – pertains to other Elements

| Issue/Commissioner | Discussion Notes | Issue Status |
|---|---|---|
| 1. * What is the parking strategy of the City – does it include public parking facilities?<br><br>(Biethan) | Staff Comment/Recommendation:<br><br>**2/16 -** Please refer to Transportation Element issues matrix.<br><br>Public Comment:<br><br>None<br><br>PC Comments:<br><br>**2/16** – The Commission determined that this issue should be considered within the Transportation Element.<br><br>**2/9 -** Planning Commission questioned if policies sufficiently address the need for adequate parking in commercial areas to be provided through various means. | Opened 2/9/11<br><br>**Closed 2/16/11** |
| 2. FW-29 speaks to making sure that the cost of capital facility improvements are borne in proportion to the benefit received; it further states, "Allocate the cost of facilities that are generated by and that benefit growth to those generating that growth."<br><br>Issue – is this equitable and fair to developers?<br><br>(Biethan) | Staff Comment/Recommendation:<br><br>**2/16:** Decision makers have wrestled with the overall question of who should bear the costs of growth, with a great deal of consideration given to the fairness and equity issues. The idea that new growth should pay for itself is one which has been debated at length – with the resultant establishment of a financial plan where impact fees fund a percentage of growth-serving capital facilities as follows:<br>▪ Fire impact fees - 75% of the $3.2 million (2006) fire capital program;<br>▪ Park impact fees – 80% of the $30.1 million (2006) park capital program;<br>▪ Transportation impact fees – 38% of the $396 million (2006) capital program. An additional 15% of program funding is provided by developers through street frontage dedications and improvements, bringing total developer funding to 53% of the transportation capital program.<br><br>The City collects school impact fees from residential development on behalf of the Lake Washington School District. School impact fees charged to single-family and multi-family residences represent 15% and 5%, respectively, of the cost of school facilities needed to serve growth (2010). | Opened 2/9/11<br><br>**Closed 2/16/11** |

An asterisk* denotes crossover issue – pertains to other Elements

| Issue/Commissioner | Discussion Notes | Issue Status |
|---|---|---|
| | Public Comment:<br><br>None<br><br>PC Comment<br>**2/16** – The Commission felt that this explanation sufficiently addressed the issue. | |
| 3. The vision of two urban centers is very strong in the G/V/F Element and others. Does the strength of that vision diminish that of other areas of the City? E.g., does it marginalize neighborhoods?<br><br>(Miller) | Staff Comment/Recommendation:<br><br>**2/16 -** While the vision for the Urban Centers is strong, it is not intended to diminish the importance of neighborhoods within the overall fabric of the City. Staff will look for opportunities in text and policies to describe the role of neighborhoods in a sustainable community; embracing diversity in architecture and cultures, with access to services and amenities by a variety of travel options.<br><br>Public Comment:<br><br>None<br><br>PC Comments:<br>**2/16** – The Commission felt that the explanation above sufficiently addressed the issue. Further, Commissioners and staff will continue to be aware of how this issue is presented throughout the document as the update progresses. | Opened 2/9/11<br><br>**Closed 2/16/11** |
| 4. Old Town should be described as an area within Downtown, not on par with or as a neighborhood (e.g., Overlake, for example).<br><br>(Hinman) | Staff Comment/Recommendation:<br><br>**2/23 -** The bold text describing Old Town in the Vision Statement (p. 4 of G/V/F Element) will be in regular text (not bold). Staff will look for other graphic opportunities as well as description in text to make sure that there is no emphasis for Old Town as a neighborhood separate from Downtown, except as the historic area.<br><br>**2/16 -** As noted by the Commission, text and policies that imply that the historic area of the Downtown neighborhood is a neighborhood unto itself could be a remnant from an earlier draft. Staff will review to make the distinction more clear.<br><br>Public Comment:<br><br>None | Opened 2/9/11<br><br>**Closed 2/16/11** |

An asterisk* denotes crossover issue – pertains to other Elements

| Issue/Commissioner | Discussion Notes | Issue Status |
|---|---|---|
| | PC Comments:<br>**2/16** – Commissioners were in agreement with this recommendation. | |
| 5. * Comprehensive Plan needs to be reviewed to make it more accessible for the reader with consistency in terminology and graphics (e.g., paragraph headings) that provide better "wayfinding" through the document. | Staff Comment/Recommendation:<br>**2/16 -** So noted. Staff will work to confirm terminology and make consistent throughout document. Other methods for graphic improvements will be incorporated as drafts progress.<br>Public Comment:<br>None<br>PC Comments:<br>**2/16 -** Commissioners noted that this is an issue that pertains to the whole document. | Opened 2/9/11<br>**Closed 2/16/11**<br>**Reconciliation List** |
| 6. pp. 10-11 speak to both the vision of a green community and preserving elements of the natural environment.<br>Do we need to make distinction more clear?<br>(Hinman) | Staff Comment/Recommendation:<br>**2/16 -** The vision of Redmond having a green character is accomplished in a variety of ways. The text on p. 10 speaks to protecting/enhancing the natural features that the City enjoys, such as the Sammamish River, Lake Sammamish, Bear Creek, forested hillsides, and the open space/rural character north and east of the City, for example.<br>In addition, the text on p. 11 seems to address more the preservation of natural features in the development context. This also is an important aspect of helping to contribute to the vision of Redmond's continued green character.<br>Public Comment:<br>None<br>PC Comments:<br>**2/16 -** Commissioners were satisfied with the text as it currently reads. | Opened 2/9/11<br>**Closed 2/16/11** |
| 7. * Should the City be explicit about mode split goals in policies? | Staff Comment/Recommendation:<br>**2/16 -** Please refer to Transportation Element issues matrix. | Opened 2/9/11 |

An asterisk* denotes crossover issue – pertains to other Elements

| Issue/Commissioner | Discussion Notes | Issue Status |
|---|---|---|
| FW 32.5 states, "Use performance measures to measure progress towards Redmond's planned transportation system."<br><br>Should the target be included in the policy?<br><br>(Hinman) | Further, our practice is generally to not put policies, particularly framework policies - in quantifiable or regulatory terms, but use functional plans or regulatory documents for that purpose.<br><br><u>Public Comment</u>:<br><br>None<br><br><u>PC Comments:</u><br><br>**2/16** – The Commission agreed that this issue should be discussed in the Transportation Element | **Closed 2/16/11** |
| 8. * What is the relationship between agriculture and recreation: are they always compatible and if not, how do we accommodate both uses?<br><br>(Miller) | <u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u><br><br>(See also Land Use Element).<br><br>**2/16 -** Through GMA, the 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 and UR zoning permit agriculture – as well as other uses, such as ball fields.<br><br><u>Public Comment</u>:<br><br>None<br><br><u>PC Comments:</u><br><br>**2/16 -** The Commission determined that this issue should be discussed within the Land Use Element. | Opened 2/9/11<br><br>**Closed 2/16/11** |
| 9. *Are there examples of implementation that could help illuminate the redevelopment of underutilized properties – second bullet of FW- | <u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u><br><br>**2/23** – The Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code currently include a variety of programs and opportunities that support implementation of policy FW-10 and related policies such as LU-5, including small lot short plats, cottage housing, multiplex structures, innovative housing, affordable housing, and transfer of development rights. The regulations governing a | Opened 2/16/11<br><br>Moved from Land Use Element |

An asterisk* denotes crossover issue – pertains to other Elements

| Issue/Commissioner | Discussion Notes | Issue Status |
|---|---|---|
| 10?<br>(Biethan)<br><br>FW-10: Ensure that the land use pattern in Redmond meets the following objectives:<br>….<br>• Encourages redevelopment of properties that are underutilized or inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan designation | particular site, including neighborhood criteria, determine the applicability of the various implementation measures.<br><br>Other examples of properties that are underutilized or inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan designation may be in commercial areas such as the Downtown where some properties contain uses that have been there for a long time and are grandfathered under the current land use designation and zoning – but that ultimately will likely develop to a greater intensity. Staff recommends maintaining the policy as is for consistency with the style and level of detail of the other framework policies.<br><br><u>Public Comment:</u><br><br>None<br><br><u>PC Comments:</u><br><br>**3/2 –** Commission determined that the examples provided in the policy are adequate.<br><br>**2/16 –** Commissioners determined that this issue (issue # 1, LU Element) should be addressed within the context of the G/V/F, since it addresses a framework policy, FW-10.<br><br>**2/9** – Commissioner 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. | **Closed 3/2** |
| 10. Should there be a goal added in the G/V/F Element that directs the City to prepare for climate change following a model similar to that outlined in a specific document? (see written comments for specific reference.) | <u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u><br><br>**3/9 –** Please refer to proposed revisions to policy FW-7.5 that include the concept of mitigating the impacts of greenhouse gas emissions.<br><br>**3/2** – Staff agrees that we should add policy language that speaks to mitigating the impacts of climate change. This could be accomplished by including language in FW-7.5 which speaks to the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. New proposed policy language will be included in the PC packet mailed on 3/4/11 subject to PC recommendation.<br><br>**2/23 -** Staff recommendation to be provided.<br><br><u>Public Comment:</u><br><br>**2/16 –** Cindy Jayne with Sustainable Redmond proposed that there should be a goal in the | Opened 2/16/11<br><br>**Closed 3/9** |

An asterisk* denotes crossover issue – pertains to other Elements

| Issue/Commissioner | Discussion Notes | Issue Status |
|---|---|---|
| | Comprehensive Plan regarding climate change. She also commented that FW-7.5 speaks to reducing the severity of climate change by reducing greenhouse gas emissions, but should also address how to mitigate the impacts of climate change.<br><br><u>PC Comments:</u><br><br>**3/9 –** Planning Commission approved the language.<br><br>**3/2 –** Planning Commission supported staff's recommended approach and closed the issue pending review of the policy. | |
| 11. Should Redmond include a policy that requires the integration of gray water systems in new construction, encourages retrofits for existing construction and also for City water usage for appropriate applications such as landscaping? | <u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u><br><br>**3/2** – Staff concurs that policy language encouraging the use of reclaimed water should be considered. Since this is a fairly specific concept, staff recommends locating such a policy(ies) within the Utilities or Natural Environment Elements.<br><br>**2/23 –** Staff recommendation to be provided.<br><br><u>Public Comment:</u><br><br>**2/16 –** Cindy Jayne with Sustainable Redmond proposed that Redmond include a policy that requires the integration of gray water systems in new construction, encourages retrofits for existing construction and also for City water usage for appropriate applications such as landscaping. She stated that FW-8 shows intent in this area:<br><br>*Emphasize Redmond's role as an environmental steward by conducting City business in a manner that:*<br><br>*-increases community understanding of the natural environment through education and involvement programs to promote active participation in addressing environmental challenges and solutions.*<br><br>*-Promotes sustainable land use patterns and low-impact development practices; and*<br><br>*-Leads by example in the conservation of natural resources such as energy, water and trees, and avoidance of adverse environmental impacts.*<br><br><u>PC Comments:</u><br><br>**3/2 -** Commission agreed that policy should be included in Natural Environment or Utilities | Opened 2/16/11<br><br>**Closed 3/2**<br><br>**Reconciliation List or Natural Environment or Utilities Element** |

An asterisk* denotes crossover issue – pertains to other Elements

| Issue/Commissioner | Discussion Notes | Issue Status |
|---|---|---|
| | Element and closed this issue. | |
| 12. 2030 Challenge<br><br>Should the City adopt the targets for green building as established by the Architecture Challenge 2030? | Staff Comment/Recommendation<br><br>**3/9 –** Staff acknowledges the comment by Mr. Castro and believes that the changes to the G/V/F text and framework policies as proposed support green building techniques.<br><br>The City is involved in many programs now and anticipates further development of programs to encourage/require green building techniques. The adoption of the specific program as outlined by the Architecture Challenge 2030 is an *additional* means of implementing Comprehensive Plan policies which would occur following further staff analysis, recommendation and subsequent review/adoption by City Council.<br><br>Public Comment<br><br>Pedro Castro submitted a written comment that asked if the Planning Commission was aware of the Architecture Challenge 2030 program, and if it was going to be incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan Update.<br><br>PC Comments<br><br>**3/9 –** The Planning Commission anticipates further work by the City on regulating green building techniques. Staff noted that there will be follow up in June, 2011 for the Planning Commission's consideration of new requirements.<br><br>**3/2 -** The Planning Commission concurred with staff that the City is very supportive of methods to increase sustainability through green building practices. At this time, the City has a variety of both incentive and regulatory programs to encourage this, and will be in the process of creating more programs this year and by the end of 2012. The Planning Commission agreed that the City's existing and proposed Comprehensive Plan policies in the G/V/F element are strong in their support of implementing green building techniques, and will provide the policy basis for specific programs and implementation as they are subsequently identified and approved by the City Council. | Open 3/2<br><br>**Closed 3/9** |