

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p>1. UC-1: consider adding concept of “economically viable” (Biethan)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/16: 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.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 3/2: Commissioners satisfied with staff response.</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 3/2</p> <p>Recheck after Economic Vitality Element work.</p>
<p>2. DT-3: What does “small and independently owned” mean? (Biethan)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 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.</p> <p>2/16: “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.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 3/2: Commissioners indicated that an important consideration was that business owners have a stake in the local community. Commissioners supported using “small and locally-owned” rather than “small and independently-owned”. Commissioners indicated that local franchisees should be considered owners of local businesses.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 3/2</p>

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
3. DT-8: what does “honor” mean? (Biethan)	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/16: 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.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 3/2: Commissioners satisfied with staff response.</p>	Opened 2/9 Closed 3/2
4. DT-8: how do we avoid collisions between vehicles and bicycles where multi-use trails cross streets in Downtown? (Biethan)	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/16: Staff believes this is a project design issue that does not need to be addressed in policy.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 3/2: Commissioners satisfied with staff response.</p>	Opened 2/9 Closed 3/2
5. DT-10: “face” vs. “integrate” with respect to how buildings interact with Redmond Central Connector (Biethan)	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/16: “Integrate/interact with” the corridor might be better word selections.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 3/2: Commissioners supported the use of the word “integrate”.</p>	Opened 2/9 Closed 3/2
6. DT-13: what does “exceptional” mean? (Biethan)	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/16: 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.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	Opened 2/9 Closed 3/2

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<u>PC Comments</u> 3/2: Commissioners satisfied with staff response.	
7. *DT-32: consider “parking management <u>and development plan</u> ” (Biethan)	<u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/16: The words “development and” were inadvertently deleted. Staff recommends keeping them in the policy. <u>Public Comment</u> <u>PC Comments</u> 2/16: Commission concurs.	Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16
8. *OV-42: parking – in what format would it be provided? (Biethan)	<u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/16: 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. <u>Public Comment</u> <u>PC Comments</u> 3/2: Commissioners satisfied with staff response.	Opened 2/9 Closed 3/2
9. Overall element structure – consider common policies, then DT, then OV (see Ed Hill, Willows neighborhood plans for examples)	<u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 3/16: Staff believes that UC-14 and UC-15, and UC-16 and 17 address different ideas and so should remain separate. Staff believes DT-25, OV-16 and OV-17 are too specific to consolidate. 3/9: Staff has provided a revised and copy of the Urban Centers for the March 9 meeting. This version addresses the issue of element organization. 3/2: Staff concurs with Commissioner Hinman that there are similar policies in the Downtown	Opened 2/9 Closed 3/9, but see 3/9 PC comments. See also Land Use Issue # 9

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
(Hinman)	<p>and Overlake sections of the Urban Centers element that could be consolidated. The result would be a three-part element: common policies, Downtown policies, and Overlake policies. The number of Downtown and Overlake policies would be significantly reduced, streamlining the element overall.</p> <p>Staff refers Commissioners to Commission Hinman’s outline for the element dated February 15, 2011. Staff generally supports the outline that Commissioner Hinman is proposing, but would recommend not creating an “Urban Center Districts” section (see second page of outline, about halfway down). The nature of the different zones in Downtown and Overlake are different enough that staff doesn’t believe those kinds of policies should be consolidated.</p> <p>Staff is preparing a new draft of the Urban Centers element generally according to Commissioner Hinman’s proposal. Staff plans to provide the draft to the Planning Commission in the March 4 packet (for the March 9 meeting). This timing allows the Commission to complete discussion and resolution of all Urban Centers-related issues on March 2, for staff to complete changes in the element draft according to the Commission’s direction, and for Commission to complete review of the updated draft for your March 9 meeting.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 3/9: Commissioner Hinman asked staff to review UC-14 through 17, DT-25, OV-16, and OV-17 for possible consolidation.</p> <p>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.</p>	
10. Page 5, bullet 1: which 18 hours? Note conflicts in Belltown (Miller)	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/23: Staff concurs.</p> <p>2/16: 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.</p>	Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 2/16: Commissioners recommend ending the sentence before the “18-hour Downtown” language.</p>	
<p>11. DT-1, bullet 3: reduce need for lengthy trips for whom? (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/16: 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.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 3/2: Commissioners discussed whether this policy would reduce the ability to develop neighborhood commercial centers. In the end, Commissioners decided not to change the language of the policy.</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 3/2</p>
<p>12. *DT-7: would like better link between trails and transportation (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 3/2: This is a general policy to encourage planning and implementation of infrastructure and improvements as needed and desired. More detailed policies regarding trail connectivity are provided elsewhere in the Comprehensive Plan, such as TR-12, 15 and 16. Staff recommends no change.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 3/2: Commissioners decided to address this as part of the Transportation Element.</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 3/2</p>
<p>13. DT-10: consider also the south side of the rail corridor as well. Can we do more there? (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/23: Staff concurs.</p> <p>2/16: Staff suggests “on either side” instead of “adjoining” to address Commissioner Miller’s concern.</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16</p>

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 2/16: Commissioner Miller recommended “on both sides” instead of “on either side”.</p>	
<p>14. DT-13: Over the long-term, can we expect more than 5-6 stories? (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/16: 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.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 3/2: Commissioners satisfied with staff response.</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 3/2</p>
<p>15. DT-29: preserve and defend midblock linkage system (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/16: Staff recommends adding “preserving” after “Completing”.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 2/16: Commissioners were satisfied with the staff response.</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16</p>
<p>16. DT-34: why constrain conversion of couplet until after 161st and 164th links are complete? What is the relationship? (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 3/2: The extension of 161st and 164th Avenue improvements across the former BNSF ROW are integral to enhancing the grid system to ensure that level of service of the system will not be significantly degraded when the conversion takes place. Converting to a two-way system will be less efficient in terms of through-put in comparison to the one-way system. As such, these improvements are needed to ensure that the two-way conversion will not significantly degrade through-put. Both are anticipated to be completed by 2012. Staff recommends no change.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 3/2</p>

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p><u>PC Comments</u> 3/2: Commissioners satisfied with staff response.</p>	
<p>17. Page 29: why specify “under” SR 520 for link to Marymoor? (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/16: 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”.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 3/2: Commissioners supported using “across” in the policy language.</p> <p>2/16: Commissioners indicated a desire to have more conversation about this at a future study session.</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 3/2</p>
<p>18. Page 37: there is a disconnect between honoring existing bungalows and redevelopment to multi-story condos (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/16: The intent of the zone 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.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 2/16: Commissioners were satisfied with the staff response.</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16</p>
<p>19. OV-13: what is this policy trying to say? (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/16: 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.</p> <p>Alternative language could be: <i>“Use neighborhood-specific design standards and other design techniques to help create a character for Overlake that is distinct from the Downtown.”</i></p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16</p>

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 2/16: Commissioners were satisfied with the staff response.</p>	
<p>20. OV-21.1: 51st overpass of SR 520 very pedestrian unfriendly, and yet it is called-out as a public “vantage point” (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/16: 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.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 3/2: Commissioners discussed the value and challenges of having a public vantage point that was not easily accessible to the public because of a lack of pedestrian amenities. Ultimately, Commissioners decided to leave the policy language as is, and noted that the fact that the location is highlighted could help accelerate future improvements.</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 3/2</p>
<p>21. OV-34: Good policy. Need clearer definition of what facilities are meant (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/16: 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.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 3/2: Commissioners satisfied with staff response.</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 3/2</p>
<p>22. OV-37: “adjoining” is unclear (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/16: Staff recommends replacing “adjoining” with “at”. The station in question is the one that will be <u>at</u> the Overlake Transit Center.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16</p>

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<u>PC Comments</u> 2/16: Commissioners were satisfied with the staff response.	
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)	<u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/16: 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. <u>Public Comment</u> <u>PC Comments</u> 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 Review as part of rest of updates
24. DT-8, bullet 1: appears to preclude trolleys and trolley feasibility study is not yet complete (Hinman)	<u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 3/2: Work is currently underway to complete the trolley feasibility study and Council will hold a study session on the study specifically on March 22, 2011. Since there is not enough information at this point to know that a trolley is feasible, staff does not recommend adding “trolley” to the policy now. Staff does recommend that the staff and the Planning Commission revisit this policy during the reconciliation phase of the Comprehensive Plan Update in August 2011 after the trolley study is complete. <u>Public Comment</u> <u>PC Comments</u> 3/9: Commissioners were satisfied with staff’s response and asked that this be added to the reconciliation list so that Commissioners could return to the topic later this year.	Opened 2/9 Closed 3/9 Reconciliation list
25. OV-39, DT-35: these say the same thing. Should address impacts to streets, ramps (vs. 520 mainline) (Hinman)	<u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 3/2: Staff is addressing this issue as part of the reorganization of the Urban Centers Element (see issue 9). Staff believes that one common Urban Center policy could address the issue of how SR 520 integrates with City arterials and other facilities. <u>Public Comment</u>	Opened 2/9 Closed 3/9

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p><u>PC Comments</u> 3/9: The consolidated policy is UC-26. Commissioners were satisfied with staff’s response.</p>	
<p>26. Use consistent transit terminology (Hinman)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/16: Staff will review the element with this in mind.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 2/16: Commissioner Hinman asked staff and Commissioners to keep this idea in mind as elements are reviewed.</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16</p> <p>Review as part of rest of updates</p>
<p>27. Consider duplicating PARCC and TR-1 maps for clarity (Hinman)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/16: 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.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 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.</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16</p> <p>Include map reference in reconciliation throughout</p>
<p>28. 152nd cross section: does analysis show that 3 lanes is preferable to 2 given land-use and character objectives? (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/16: 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.</p> <p>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!”</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16</p>

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p>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 pedestrian- and bicycle-friendly corridor that will also be an active retail street.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 2/16: Commissioners were satisfied with the staff response.</p>	
<p>29. What does note 5 mean on cross section table? (Hinman)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/16: 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.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 2/16: Commissioners were satisfied with the staff response.</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16</p>
<p>30. Where are BRT stops on 152nd? (Hinman)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 2/16: 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.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 2/16: Commissioners were satisfied with the staff response.</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16</p>
<p>31. Provide information about rain gardens in street/pathway cross sections (Hinman)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 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.</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 2/16</p>

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p>2/16: 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.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 2/16: Commissioners were satisfied with the staff response on 2/16.</p>	
<p>32. OV-5.5: clarify employee targets (public testimony)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 3/2: Staff proposes the following language for inclusion in the paragraph preceding policy OV-3:</p> <p><i>In 2010, there were approximately 3,000 residences in Overlake (including single-family areas) and an estimated 49,000 jobs. By 2030, Overlake is expected to grow to about 8,000 residences and about 74,000 jobs.</i></p> <p>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).</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> 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.</p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 3/2: Commissioners satisfied with staff response.</p>	<p>Opened 2/16 Closed 3/2</p>
<p>33. OV-37: concern about minimizing parking at the interim terminus of</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 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</p>	<p>Opened 2/16 Closed 3/2</p>

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p>light rail in Overlake (public testimony)</p>	<p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>To reduce traffic impacts associated with either an interim or permanent terminus for East Link at the Overlake Transit Center, the City supports: a) Development of a parking structure in Southeast Redmond by Sound Transit in order to capture trips from east King County and Sammamish, and b) Operation of a transit route connecting the Southeast Redmond parking facility to the Overlake Transit Center. The City has expressed its concern about interim station impacts to Sound Transit in a February 25, 2009 letter, commenting on the East Link Project Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS). Sound Transit is expected to respond to the comments in the Final EIS due Summer 2011.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> 2/16: Don Marcy testified that Microsoft had concerns about minimizing parking at the potential 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.</p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 3/2: Commissioners satisfied with staff response.</p>	<p>Recheck after FEIS complete</p>
<p>34. OV-14, 72, and preamble to OV-77 characterize the Employment Area as “mid-rise”, “campus-like”,</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation</u> 3/16: At the Commission’s request, staff is providing policy and regulatory information about how trees, treelines, and building height are handled in Redmond’s planning documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Character Element (introduction). <i>Landscaping regulations have ensured preservation of special natural areas and significant trees that define the character of the City.</i> 	<p>Opened 2/16 Closed 3/16</p>

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p>“moderate-intensity” and that buildings should respect tree lines. Microsoft has concerns about how this might affect long-term growth plans on its campus (public testimony)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LU-5 (portion). <i>Ensure that the height, bulk, and design of infill and redevelopment projects are compatible with their surroundings.</i> • Land Use Element (existing introduction). <i>The City is framed within a beautiful natural setting, with open spaces and an abundance of trees continuing to define Redmond’s physical appearance.</i> • Urban Centers Element (existing introduction). <i>While intensively and efficiently developed, the [Overlake] employment areas retain their campus-like feel due to attractive landscaping and the protection of significant trees and other important natural features.</i> • UC-13 (portion). <i>Soften the appearance of buildings, service areas, and parking facilities through landscaping, use of architectural screens, and retention of healthy trees.</i> • DT-13. <i>Ensure that building heights in the Downtown respect views of treelines and adjacent hillsides, and contribute to the development of an urban place that feels comfortable for pedestrians. Achieve this by limiting building heights to five and six stories in general...</i> • OV-21. <i>Strive to retain significant concentrations of trees in such areas as wooded ravines, steep slopes along wooded slopes and terraces, and trees located along highways and streets that have the potential to buffer or screen transportation facilities, and commercial and employment areas from residential uses.</i> • OV-58. <i>Encourage master planning of the Group Health site to foster opportunities to live, shop, work and recreate in a mixed-use setting. Integrate the goals of creating compact transit-supportive development, employing environmentally sustainable development practices, and preserving stands of healthy trees where feasible.</i> • OV-62. <i>Allow building heights up to five stories for mixed-use developments throughout Overlake Village. Consider allowing additional height and/or floor area as an incentive for provision of features that implement neighborhood goals for public amenities, housing and environmental sustainability. Encourage taller buildings to be designed so as to avoid creating a “canyon effect” and to provide transit-supportive densities.</i> • OV-77. <i>Encourage street trees, trees on site, landscaping, open space, and recreational areas to provide a sense of openness for the site and the neighborhood.</i> • Town Square design standards. <i>Density and building height are increased in the Town Square zone nearest the center of Downtown to encourage development of structures of larger scale and size.</i> • Town Center design standards. <i>Encourage alignment of all streets to minimize the removal of all existing significant, healthy trees...Encourage alignment of new sidewalks to minimize</i> 	

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p><i>the removal of all existing significant, healthy trees...Preserve 100 percent of all trees within the 44 acres of public access open space as identified in the Public Access Open Space Area Plan within the Redmond Town Center Master Plan and Design Guidelines.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • River Bend design standards. <i>Setbacks from Leary Way should be adequate to preserve significant stands of trees on the west side of the road to preserve the “green gateway” image.</i> • Perrigo’s Plat Subarea design standards. <i>The intent of this section is to retain the quaint and inviting character of this subarea, which includes a variety of building styles and features, generous front yards, sense of quiet and peacefulness, large trees along the street</i> • Overlake Village design standards. <i>Intent. To maintain light and views, reduce the bulk of taller buildings, reinforce pedestrian scale on street frontages, and promote variety in building height.</i> • Tree Protection regulations (as supported by Council through code rewrite process). <i>In all new developments, including additions to existing non-single family buildings and parking areas, a minimum of 35 percent of all significant trees shall be retained...[An] exception [to the 35% retention standard] shall not be granted unless...strict compliance with the [35% retention] provisions of this code would be in conflict with the increased density of urban centers and result in development that would be inconsistent with the adopted vision for the neighborhood.</i> <p>Staff believes the following themes emerge from this body of policy and regulation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trees are an essential element of Redmond’s identity as a community; • The City is committed to accommodating urban densities in its urban centers, with building heights ranging from two to twelve stories; and, • The relationship between buildings and trees varies around the City. <p>Policy OV-14 as written (“Building heights respect views of treelines”) is problematic because it is not clear how the policy should be applied. The alternative (“Developments space buildings to maintain interspersed views of treelines”) is clearer. In addition, staff believes it can be applied in a way that acknowledges the urban character or urban centers, and the community’s longstanding commitment to retaining trees and views of trees.</p> <p>3/9: Staff has suggested revised language for OV-14, 28, 72, and the preamble to OV-77 in response to testimony by Microsoft. The changes should be considered the staff</p>	

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p>recommendation, subject to discussion by the Planning Commission on March 9.</p> <p>3/2: The language contained in the policies and text cited by Mr. Marcy is intended to accommodate anticipated growth through 2030. In Overlake today there is a little more than 15 million square feet of non-residential development built or committed through development agreements. By 2030, that number is expected to grow by 30% to 19.9 million square feet.</p> <p>In 2007 the City completed a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the Overlake Neighborhood Plan that includes the growth targets stated above. Any upward adjustments to the growth targets would require additional environmental analysis, as well as reconsideration of the infrastructure network required to support the additional growth. For that reason, staff does not recommend making changes to the growth target figures at this time. Growth targets are periodically revisited and certainly will be revisited long before total commercial development nears 19.9 million square feet in Overlake.</p> <p>The City is committed to working with Microsoft to ensure that, as the company grows, it is able to and desires to grow in Redmond consistent with the community’s vision. As part of this Comprehensive Plan update (but later in 2011), that could include reconsidering regulations for height limits for the Employment Area to support expected growth within the 19.9 million square-foot total. Regarding the policies, staff continues to believe that the overall development intensity of the Employment Area is appropriately characterized as “moderate intensity,” and that respecting views of tree lines is important. However, these qualities are not necessarily incompatible with potentially greater height in the Employment Area. Staff recommends clarifying preamble and policy language in the Urban Centers element so as to more clearly provide for consideration of increased height while maintaining character elements, such as views of tree lines. If the Commission concurs with this direction, staff will propose language as part of the updates for the Commission’s March 9 meeting.</p> <p>Per the Commission’s request, Microsoft’s April 2010 letter regarding the Comprehensive Plan update is included with this packet.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p>2/16: Don Marcy testified that language in some parts of the Urban Centers element, such as OV-14, OV-72, and the preamble to OV-77, describe the Employment Area in terms that may</p>	

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p>not allow for the kind of growth that could take place over the next twenty years.</p> <p><u>PC Comments</u> 3/16: The Commissioners were satisfied with the information staff provided regarding how tree lines are treated and closed the issue. They also agreed to further review City’s policies regarding tree preservation as part of review of the Natural Environment Element later this year.</p> <p>3/9: Commissioners were satisfied with the revision to OV-72, OV-77, and the paragraph before OV-77. Commissioner Miller requested that staff provide additional information about how tree lines are treated in Redmond throughout the City, and over time.</p>	
<p>35. Overlake Urban Center map boundaries (public testimony)</p>	<p><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.</p> <p>The current boundary has resulted in some confusion, since significant portions of Overlake are 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.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> 2/16: 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)</p> <p><u>PC Comments</u></p>	<p>Opened 2/16 Closed 3/9</p> <p>Include in Staff Work Plan</p>

Planning Commission Issues Matrix, *March 30, 2011*
 Comprehensive Plan Update – Urban Centers Element (L100259)
 *Denotes cross over issue

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	3/9: Commissioners asked that this issue be considered outside this update to the Comprehensive Plan, and together with Bellevue, other stakeholders, and the community.	

N:\PLANNING\Comp Plan Update Periodic 2010-11\Urban Centers Element\2011-03-30 Issues Matrix.docx