City of Redmond Code Rewrite Commission

October 11, 2010 - Meeting Summary Redmond City Hall - Council Chambers

15670 NE 85th Street, Redmond, Washington

<u>Code Rewrite Commissioners present</u>: Vice Chair Sue Stewart, Robert Pantley, Canaan Bontadelli, Vibhas Chandorkar, Nancy McCormick, Robert Fitzmaurice

Code Rewrite Commissioners excused: Steve Nolen

Staff in attendance: Lynda Aparicio, Steven Fischer, Thara Johnson

Business conducted: The meeting was called to order at 6:00pm.

Approval of Agenda: The agenda was approved without changes.

<u>CRC Reports:</u> Commissioner Pantley asked whether staff was working on a Consent agenda. Staff indicated that perhaps such an agenda could be prepared for the Final Development Standards Package.

Design Standards

Mr. Fischer stated that he would like to complete issue resolution for the outstanding items for which the Commission identified from previous meetings. He described that he had also prepared a resolution, at the Commission's request, concerning Design Standards, and would like feedback on that particular item. Mr. Fischer stated there were nine remaining items on the issue table and he would also like to address the resolution prior to preparing the transmittal report. The following items were discussed by the Commission:

- Commissioner McCormick expressed acceptance of the resolution, but requested that some of the background and rationale be provided within the resolution, with particular emphasis on trying to lessen the sameness of developments. She also requested that this resolution stand out as its own document, so that it does not get lost in the package. Staff concurred that this could be accommodated. Other Commissioners concurred with this approach.
- Commissioner McCormick suggested items 10, 13 and 14 could be closed.
 Commissioners were in agreement
- Item #1 was closed, no further discussion ensued
- Commissioners discussed item #3, relating to covered entries near bus stop locations, and how flexible the provision should be written. Staff agreed to modify the intent statement to reflect that the provision is intended to encourage the use of transit via orientation, distance and sheltering, and insert the word "consider" to the provision.

- For item #9, staff agreed to include such a provision provided minimum dimensions were in place. The Commission agreed that 50 square feet with a minimum 5 foot width would be acceptable.
- Regarding item #11, joined parking lots, staff recommended that this be addressed in the landscape code. Staff agreed to take a look at the code to see what administrative provisions there might be to allow flexibility of joining adjacent parking lots
- Regarding item #12, staff proposes to delete the provision altogether, and clarified that the provision would still be in the code, but in a different location, perhaps the Parking code. Additionally staff indicated the provision might be easier to administer with a simplified sliding scale.
- Regarding item #15, staff noted that the draft resolution requesting that Council add the rewriting of the design standards to a future work program would address this issue. This item was closed.

Motion by Mr. Pantley to recommend approval of the package subject to resolution of the remaining items and direct staff to prepare the transmittal report. Motion carried unanimously.

Development Standards 3 Package:

Ms. Johnson provided an overview of what the package includes and proposed schedule for issue identification and issue resolution. She indicated that issue identification for all topics with the exception of signs would occur tonight.

External Effects of Uses

- Commissioners agreed that there should be at a minimum a cross reference for these items to direct users to the municipal code.
- Commissioners agreed that the section of light and glare should remain in the zoning code.
- Commissioners agreed that the noise section should perhaps be moved to the municipal code as well.

Hazardous Liquid Pipelines

- Mr. Pantley wanted to clarify the intent of the reasonable use provisions in that are we trying to prevent all reasonable use of property or good use of property.
- Ms. Stewart questioned the provision under application submittal requirements and wondered if an expansion occurs that does not involve clearing or excavating would trigger these requirements. She indicated that if the Fire Department is ok with this provision she would be comfortable.
- Ms. McCormick asked whether this provision applies to transmission lines only or to distribution lines. Staff clarified that it applies to transmission lines only.

- Mr. Pantley suggested that the code should include a provision for emergency repair by the pipeline operator without having to wait. Staff concurred that such a provision could be included.
- Mr. Fitzmaurice questioned the provision for open easements and was concerned that reduction of the setback from the corridor should not be allowed where a pipeline can be located anywhere within the easement. Staff agreed to look at the wording.
- Mr. Pantley stated there should be a higher threshold to allow smaller forms of land disturbance, such as gardening.
- Ms. Stewart suggested that staff review the PHMSA guidelines and ensure that the current code addresses these regulations. Staff agreed to review the regulations.
- Ms. McCormick recommended that staff consult the City's emergency preparedness department and consult them regarding compliance with emergency preparedness requirements. Staff agreed to consult with the City's emergency preparedness department.
- Mr. Fitzmaurice questioned the ability of staff to provide an educational outreach program to properties in proximity to the pipeline corridor. Staff agreed to look into outreach program and also indicated that disclosing exact location of pipeline could be an issue.

Open Space and Recreation

- Mr. Fitzmaurice suggested providing a clear distinction for open spaces
 that relate to conservation open space versus recreational open space. He
 also indicated that open space section should address open space design in
 urban settings since the current code appears to promote only conservation
 types of open space. Staff agreed to review the regulations and provide a
 clear distinction where feasible.
- Ms. McCormick questioned whether the regulation requiring design of surface storm drainage systems to have a natural appearance should be located in the Stormwater code. Staff responded that since the regulation related to design of surface storm drainage systems, the recommendation was to have the regulation remain in the zoning code.
- Mr. Fitzmaurice suggested that the regulation relating to design of surface storm drainage systems having a natural appearance conflicted with the design of stormwater systems. Staff indincated that the intent of this regulation was to ensure that stormwater systems were designed to serve a dual function of stormwater conveyance as well as an open space amenity.

Outdoor Storage

- Ms. McCormick and Mr. Bontadelli suggested revising the purpose statement to include verbiage from the existing code relating to restriction of the amount of outdoor storage allowed within the City. Staff agreed to revise the purpose statement and incorporate verbiage from the existing code.
- Ms. McCormick questioned the proposed change in the requirement for bulk storage to be amended from a maximum of 3 days and review by the Technical Committee to a limit not being imposed. Staff indicated that this requirement is currently not enforced unless a complaint has been filed and is not aware of any such complaints. Also, the Technical Committee has not reviewed any proposals for bulk storage in the last few years
- Mr. Fitzmaurice questioned the requirement for screening of bulk storage in MP and I zones and indicated that he was aware of several instances of locations where screening of bulk storage does not occur. Staff indicated that they would explore this issue.
- Ms. McCormick and Mr. Fitzmaurice questioned the change in regulation proposed by staff for outdoor retail display from 10 percent of the storefront to 50 percent of the storefront? Mr. Fitzmaurice indicated that this amounted to a "policy" change. Staff concurred with Mr. Fitzmaurice and indicated that the reasoning behind this change was to bring the requirement in line with use of outdoor display within existing retail uses in the City.
- Ms. McCormick questioned the deletion of regulation relating to architectural detail for garbage and recycling enclosures and regulation relating to signage for enclosures. Staff indicated that upon conferring with the City's Natural Resources Division; this requirement was not enforced and is also not a requirement from the City's contracted waste hauler.

Staff Reports and Scheduling

Ms. Aparicio stated that for next week, the Commission is scheduled to resolve some remaining items within the Development Standards 2 package and receive a recommendation on that package. Additionally, staff requests continuation of issue identification for the Development Standards 3 package, including landscaping and signs. Lastly, staff is preparing a draft of the code test drive concept to present to the Commission.

Adjourn: The meeting was adjourned at approximately 8:34 p.m.

Summary Approved On: 1008, 2010

Code Rewrite Commission Chair:

5