

**REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION
MINUTES**

June 9, 2010

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chair Hinman, Commissioners Gregory, Biethan, O'Hara and Miller

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED: Commissioners Bontadelli and Julinsey

COMMISSIONERS CURRENTLY SERVING ON THE CODE REWRITE COMMISSION: Thom Youngblood, Vibhas Chandorkar

STAFF PRESENT: Kim Dietz, Lynda Aparicio, Jeff Churchill, Terry Marpert, Steven Fischer, Dennis Lisk, Gary Lee, Planning Department; Tim Cox, Steve Hitch, Public Works Department

RECORDING SECRETARY: Kathryn Kerby

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chair Hinman in the Council Chambers at City Hall.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA:

No changes were made to the agenda.

ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Randy Bannecker, speaking on behalf of Sears Holdings, 333 Beverly Road, Hoffman Estates, IL, wanted to submit written testimony regarding the Overlake Stormwater/Parks Implementation Plan being presented later this evening. Sears has been very pleased to work with City staff on this Plan. Mr. Bannecker explained that Sears values their Overlake location, and is not thrilled with incorporating stormwater vault on that site, but is willing to work with the City regardless. He hoped that the City would work hard to minimize the size of that vault, and maximize their flexibility regarding its location.

Sears would like to preserve that location's strong retail presence and has no plans to redevelop the site. Sears is dedicated to making the most of that site and store management has contemplated temporary structures for use over the vault. Finally, Mr. Bannecker said it was frustrating to see maps and drawings of trails and roads going through the current store location. Sears understands the planning function such drawings provide, but wanted to emphasize that Sears is committed to making that retail outlet as strong as possible.

Commissioner Miller asked what percentage of that property would be rated as impervious. Mr. Bannecker did not have the specific percentage. Commissioner Miller asked how often the store's parking lot is at capacity. Mr. Bannecker said Sears really valued the lot's capacity during the busy holiday season, while during the rest of the year it is not used as much. However, that convenience is one of the store's strengths. Commissioner Biethan asked if Mr. Bannecker

happened to remember the parking ratio in relation to the building size. Mr. Bannecker did not recall except that the ratio exceeded the City's requirements. Chair Hinman asked what the next steps were after submitting the letter. Mr. Bannecker replied that Sears expected to work with the Stormwater/Parks team regarding the specific location and dimensions of the facility. Also, the Sound Transit move was very important for Sears, and one that they appreciate. Chair Hinman pointed out that the letter was dated May 20, 2010, and asked when it had actually been delivered to City offices. Mr. Bannecker believed it was sent via regular post and electronically, either on or very soon after that date. Chair Hinman said he would have had more questions for Mr. Bannecker had he seen the letter earlier.

APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARIES AND MEETING MINUTES:

Chair Hinman asked if anyone had any comments on the meeting summaries from the March 10th or March 17th meetings. No one had any questions. Both those meeting summaries were approved. Chair Hinman said that the meeting minutes are more important since they summarize public hearings and as such, the language must be precise. Towards that end he had several comments about the April 21st minutes:

- 1) On page 1 in the paragraph that starts *Ms. Hope introduced.....*, the last line's reference to *master* should refer to *master plan*.
- 2) On page 2 in the last paragraph, the reference to 25% of the City's employees could mean municipal employees. It should instead refer to the employee population of Redmond.
- 3) On page 3 in the third paragraph, the reference to *...the parcel from the bank going north...*, that would seem to indicate that the bank is a financial institution. It is actually the bank of Bear Creek.
- 4) On page 3 in the fourth paragraph's last sentence, the section *...the City's attempts at due diligence was a critical part of that process...* should read *...the City's due diligence methodology is a critical part....*
- 5) On Page 7 in the second paragraph from the bottom, final sentence, he asked Ms. Dietz how best to clarify the reference to eliminating the requirement for remodels. She looked through the paragraph and said she recalled that conversation. She would rework the sentence to clarify her intent.

With those corrections, the April 21st meeting minutes were approved unanimously.

PUBLIC HEARING AND STUDY SESSION, Overlake Single-Family Area Policy and Regulatory Updates, presented by Kimberly Dietz, Senior Planner.

Chair Hinman opened the public hearing and asked if any members of the audience wished to comment. No one came forward, so Chair Hinman closed the oral testimony but left open the hearing for written testimony. Ms. Dietz had both a general overview presentation as well as a more focused presentation covering the issues list. She noted that the general overview presentation was available on the City's website. Chair Hinman asked if they could go ahead and cover the general presentation just to provide opportunity for comment. Ms. Dietz went through the presentation of the Overlake Neighborhood. She explained that they are in Phase II of the three-phase planning process. Ms. Dietz also described how the Overlake neighborhood could be broken down into three sub-areas: Overlake Village, the employment area, and the residential

area. The residential area plan update process began with the formation of a Citizen Advisory Committee (CAC,) which then began the task of creating concepts which became either policies or regulations pertaining to the residential sub-area. Those regulations would be sent to the Code Rewrite Committee for consideration. Ms. Dietz reminded the Commission that while those policies and regulations formed a large body of code which touched on various aspects of both the larger Neighborhood Plan and the Community Development Guide, she would only be reviewing where the CAC has proposed changes or revisions, rather than reviewing the entire plan.

Proposed Amendments include:

1. Housing changes:
 - a. Multiplex structures
 - i. maintain at least 80% single-family detached unit count
 - b. Mixture of housing types and choices
 - c. Cottage housing
 - d. Backyard homes
 - e. Affordable housing
2. Vegetation:
 - a. Street Trees
 - i. Fast and slow growing
 - ii. Along significant corridors
 - b. Landscape places
 - i. Accessible green space on public land
 - ii. Neighborhood entryways
 - iii. Common open space
 - iv. Privately owned, new developments
3. Parks
 - a. Lighting
 - i. Coordinate possible future improvements with area residents
 - ii. Issues of light trespass
 - b. Non-motorized connections
 - i. Between developments
 - ii. To transit nodes
 - iii. For increased commute alternatives
 - c. Neighborhood landmark designation for mature cedar trees in Westside Neighborhood Park
4. Transportation
 - a. NE 51st Street – a complete street
 - i. Sidewalks
 - ii. Bike lanes
 - iii. Transit amenities
 - iv. Landscaping
 - b. Desirable Street treatments
 - i. Buffer and absorb traffic noise
 - ii. Vegetation
 - iii. Other treatments

5. Character

- a. Preserve public views of the Cascade Mountain Range
 - i. From public vantage points
 - ii. In public places
- b. Entryway treatments
 - i. Transition between Employment Area and Residential Area
 - ii. Collaboration between City and neighborhood citizens

Ms. Dietz concluded the presentation by providing her contact information and encouraging anyone with questions to call or email her.

Chair Hinman asked if anyone had questions about Ms. Dietz's presentation. There were none. He then opened the study session. Ms. Dietz launched her presentation regarding the issues table, which was provided on pages 17 and 18 of the Commissioners' meeting packet. The issues table covered three general categories:

1. Housing
2. Trails
3. Street Trees and public views

Chair Hinman suggested that they go through each item sequentially, rather than doing an overview of all three, and then going back to the specific issues.

Ms. Dietz displayed a map of the current land use showing the areas of single-family and multi-family properties. She then showed a map of the same areas, categorized by the year those properties were built and/or permitted. Chair Hinman asked if anyone had any questions about either map. Ms. Dietz showed a similar map showing the different zoning, along with a colored gradation by lot size. She indicated that the neighborhood featured a wide range of older and newer homes, and various home sizes.

Chair Hinman began discussion on Issue #1 from the issues table, regarding the preservation of the neighborhood's existing single-family character, given recent interest in cottage housing. Chair Hinman asked Commissioner Gregory if he was satisfied with this overview and with the existing preservation policies. Commissioner Gregory replied that the existing 80/20 ratio satisfied his concerns. Chair Hinman asked if there were any other housing issues to be discussed. No one had additional discussion. Chair Hinman closed Issue #1.

Ms. Dietz opened discussion of Issue #2 with an explanation of the numerous possible trail connections. The general question was how those possible connections would be implemented. She explained that the Neighborhood Plan did not intend to provide specific trail alignment information or implementation other than what is already in place. She specified that the remodeling of a single home would not trigger these trail improvements. Redevelopment of several connected parcels would. Additionally, the PARCC and CIP Plans have prioritized trails which will partially determine when any given trail would be developed. Ms. Dietz also showed maps of both land-based hazard areas and water hazard areas. By specifying only the beginning and terminus of each trail at this stage, any further development of that particular trail could

navigate through and around those hazard areas as needed, if and when that trail is developed. Ms. Dietz showed a map of existing trails overlaid with various critical areas to show examples of how those trails navigated the hazards.

Commissioner Biethan asked Ms. Dietz to further elaborate on how trails would be incorporated into new developments. Ms. Dietz replied that the City had an existing process where new trail development was automatically triggered by certain types of development activity, such as creation of single-family home developments. The City would include requirements for those trail connections in the housing development project. The Overlake Neighborhood Plan, in comparison, lays out the priorities for those trails in that neighborhood. The developer would therefore have both the City and neighborhood trail development goals in hand during that housing development process. If that particular development occurred in an area without existing trail goals, then the development would feature connections out to the existing sidewalk and between developments. Commissioner Biethan pointed out that the Code Rewrite Commission was working really hard to eliminate ambiguity in City code, but that this particular topic seemed to introduce more ambiguity. Ms. Dietz said the City actually had extensive information, such as traffic studies and school access data, to ensure that those requirements were very clear. Commissioner Biethan emphasized that he wanted to ensure that their changes resulted in the clearest, most concise code possible.

Chair Hinman added that many of these concepts for the Overlake neighborhood are very similar to what the Idylwood neighborhood came up with for their particular plan. He also pointed out that it was not too late to add issues to the Issues Table if needed. Chair Hinman then closed Issue #2 and opened Issue #3 regarding street tree canopy and public view issues. Ms. Dietz explained that the only current proposal was for a single new viewshed in West Neighborhood Park. She showed a map of the park itself and the existing versus proposed viewsheds. Issue #3 regarded how street views varied given single versus multi-story housing, and low-growing versus tall-growing tree canopy variations. Ms. Dietz displayed a mockup of those varieties using a hypothetical based on a street such as 51st, with appropriate setbacks, house heights and street right-of-way widths. She also displayed some photos showing actual Cascade views through various tree canopies. Ms. Dietz pointed out that the views are also seasonal given that any deciduous trees would have lost their leaves and opened up the views. Ms. Dietz concluded with the statement that removal of trees to preserve or create views was not the goal; rather, to work with the existing vegetation to maintain and preserve the view.

Chair Hinman asked if there were any additional questions. There were none. He tentatively closed the issue, with the caveat that they could open discussions again if Commissioner Bontadelli had questions when he returned. Chair Hinman mentioned that they would be continuing these discussions on June 16th, and asked Ms. Dietz what would be the next step. She explained that the next meeting would allow more comments from the public but she had not received many comments, and she had no open issues at this time. Chair Hinman encouraged the Commissioners to review the proposed changes to see if anyone had further questions. Ms. Dietz added some action items from the CAC to be included in the meeting records, as previously requested by Chair Hinman.

Chair Hinman asked Ms. Dietz to speak briefly about stormwater runoff in the area. Ms. Dietz replied that the neighborhoods did have some runoff and ponding problems. When the CAC met with the Natural Resources staff, the residents were encouraged to contact the NR staff during those events to record those problems and then propose cost-effective solutions. Chair Hinman asked whether a joint meeting could be scheduled between the Overlake and Idylwood CACs regarding traffic. Ms. Dietz replied that traffic would probably be one of the top priorities, in part because it was already a high priority for the Idylwood Neighborhood Plan and it was one of the priorities for the Overlake Neighborhood Plan. Ms. Dietz will have further discussion with the CACs.

BRIEFING, Proposed Overlake Stormwater/Parks Implementation Plan, presented by Steve Hitch, Stormwater Engineer and Tim Cox, Parks Planning Manager

Mr. Cox presented a portion of the Implementation Plan. The Overlake Stormwater Study Area covered 323 acres, including residential and commercial areas. The Implementation Plan covered four separate policies and goals:

- 1) Implementing stormwater options in the Urban Center
- 2) Integrating Parks with stormwater facilities
- 3) Encouraging low-impact development
- 4) Developing regional stormwater treatment options

Some of the affected Overlake Neighborhood Policies include:

- 1) N-OV-2: Initiate and encourage community involvement
- 2) OV-19: Develop regional stormwater treatment facilities, integrated with parks and open space
- 3) OV-20: Reduce the negative impact of stormwater runoff on water quality
- 4) OV-66: Development of parks in conjunction with stormwater facilities

Mr. Cox explained that the project is nearing completion having already completed the data gathering, feasibility analysis, concept development and selection of preferred alternatives. Three separate community meetings have also occurred. The project is in the finalization phase. Next steps include continued coordination with other public structures being proposed in the area, such as the Eastlink light rail system and realignment of 152nd. The finalized Implementation Plan will define how the City will move forward with these projects. The final Plan is scheduled to go to City Council in July 2010.

Mr. Hitch explained what they have done since last appearing before the Planning Commission. They appeared before City Council with a preferred alternative that was adopted by the Council. He displayed maps showing those various alternatives for stormwater management based on geographic issues, neighborhood preferences and economic impact. Cornerstone sites were identified with certain optimized characteristics for all the overlapping interests. One new concept coming out of that process was to co-locate stormwater management with urban pathway corridors. For example, infiltration galleries under urban pathway corridors would allow adjacent building runoff to infiltrate directly yet provide needed multi-mode transit. Green spaces in the same pathway would serve both functional and aesthetic purposes. Mr. Hitch displayed several maps of the City's preferred alternative layout, but the northern area still offers

some flexibility. The southern portion of the area has less flexibility due to existing buildings and features.

This is a 20-year plan with three general phases and completion dates:

- 1) The first phase, to be completed in the next five years, would put a detention vault under a parking lot, which is slated for the SW portion of the area. While the neighborhood's stormwater issues need near-term resolution, the parks aspect of the plan is slated to be completed later in the process. This schedule reflects the higher existing need for stormwater handling rather than additional parks in that area.
- 2) The second phase features the start of soil studies, to begin within two to five years. As Sound Transit builds facilities in the area, the City can coordinate with those efforts to introduce additional elements of the plan concurrently with that construction.
- 3) The third phase will include rain gardens and roof infiltration included in new street and urban pathway development. Redevelopment efforts will give an opportunity to include onsite stormwater treatment, with overflow to either City infiltration or detention facilities.

The focus on onsite stormwater treatment helps improve water quality at the source, rather than trying to treat or improve water quality right before discharge into regional streams.

City staff is currently working on all of these details and the Planning Commission may see elements of this plan return to them for consideration in the fall. For instance, the urban pathway concept will probably be included in the Community Development Guide at some point in the future.

Mr. Cox explained that the parks envisioned in this process all have certain key elements:

- 1) Park Plaza, Park Greens and/or Park Refuge layouts
- 2) Accessible edges
- 3) Visibility
- 4) Connections to active uses
- 5) Proximity to residential or employment areas
- 6) Development capacity (i.e., useable portions of the site)
- 7) Improved connectivity
- 8) Proximity to village core
- 9) Proximity to existing and future transit
- 10) Frontage to potential development

City staff has already started to review the northern and southern (Upper Site and Lower Site) study areas to see how these options could work in those areas, particularly in conjunction with the planned transit station in the Upper Site and retail outlets in the Lower Site.

The next steps include:

- 1) City Council action on July 20th
- 2) Policy adjustments in the September 2010 to April 2011 timeframe
- 3) Property study conducted during 2011 and 2012
- 4) Design details in 2012-2013
- 5) Construction phase 1 in 2014 – 2015

Mr. Hitch concluded by saying that they hoped the Planning Commission would give their support to this project as it moves to City Council review. Chair Hinman asked if any of the Commissioners had any questions. There were none. Chair Hinman asked whether they could summarize the most recent conversations with various property owners regarding the project. Mr. Cox replied that they had their most recent community meeting on May 22nd. One of the retail property owners, Limited Edition, had been very vocal in the process and has indicated their continued interest and involvement even though they are no longer considered one of the alternative sites. Chair Hinman asked if their interest was more geared towards the revised street alignments rather than the parks development aspect. Mr. Cox indicated that was the case.

Chair Hinman asked whether staff had talked with Sears and other retail owners on the Lower Site regarding the near-term street changes, and talked with the residential owners near the Upper Site regarding the parks aspect. Mr. Cox replied that those respective topics had been the focus of the conversations. Furthermore, the City has also opened conversations with Sound Transit, who has expressed interest in looking at a collaborative effort for the transit station. Chair Hinman asked if there were more interested parties in the Upper Site conversations compared to the larger parcels affected by the Lower Site plans. Mr. Cox confirmed that was the case.

Chair Hinman asked whether City staff would prefer that the Planning Commission focus their conversations on the near-term developments, or if they would prefer the discussion include both sites, and all three phases. Mr. Cox replied that the most pressing issue was to implement strategies and then talk to the Lower Site owners. Mr. Hitch added that the Lower Site project details would drive many of the project's subsequent needs so those details needed to be worked out earlier. Chair Hinman said he understood that but he was reluctant from a procedural point of view to grant any sort of endorsement without thoroughly going over all the plan details. He would have preferred if their presentation materials had been included in the meeting packet for review prior to the meeting. Chair Hinman believed that the Commission had room in their upcoming meeting agendas to discuss these details in the future after those materials had been reviewed. Mr. Cox offered to provide either additional materials and/or a more concise overview of the program if either of those materials would assist in that review. Chair Hinman reported the Sears presentation from earlier in the evening, in case either Mr. Cox or Mr. Hitch was unaware of those details. Chair Hinman asked to clarify whether Bellevue would be involved in at least some of the stormwater treatment, and should therefore be considered involved in this project. Mr. Hitch replied that the City was talking to Bellevue about possible collaboration or cooperation, but to date an agreement was not in place.

Chair Hinman asked if there was at least some potential that the stormwater vault could be asked to serve some of Bellevue's needs. Mr. Hitch replied yes it was possible and that would impact the vault size, but to date Bellevue had not yet formally requested that capacity. Furthermore, the City could move forward with implementation without Bellevue support. Bellevue so far has been mildly interested in the project but not interested enough to actively participate. Final vault sizing will depend on upcoming soil studies, individual parcel owner interest, and whether Bellevue decides to actively participate. Chair Hinman agreed that at least keeping Bellevue

informed would be a good neighbor courtesy, and that Redmond would need to move forward with plans even if Bellevue chose not to participate in the creation of those plans.

Chair Hinman asked about the comment in Sear's letter regarding consistent SEPA reviews. Mr. Cox explained that the policies adopted in 2007 were adopted under SEPA's Planned Action Document, which required a final supplemental Environmental Impact Statement for the Overlake area. The document governs projects which involve studies, policies and plans for a specific area, and are not physical projects that move forward with defined site soil, air and/or water quality impacts. The current project under discussion implements those policies, so the SEPA document for this plan is twofold:

- 1) It meets criteria for falling under SEPA documentation for the Overlake SEPA planned action.
- 2) It is a study and a plan which is then called out in the Overlake Master Plan. It implements, rather than creates, existing policy.

The next step is to ask the administrator to make findings that the City's SEPA analysis is within guidelines. Commissioner O'Hara asked whether the intent is to start construction on these near-term projects within five years, and simply pave over the top of the vault in the short term, while the remaining redevelopment aspects are worked out over time. Mr. Hitch explained that Phase I of the plan does not depend on redevelopment. The next phase may need either plumbing or parking improvements, but again does not require redevelopment of the actual site. The phases would be scheduled around the bulk of the holiday retail season, resulting in a new parking lot over that vault. Commissioner O'Hara pointed out that the Sears property has not changed much in the last 15 years. He asked whether some of the project is waiting for the Sears property to be redeveloped, while acknowledging that it may not ever be redeveloped. Mr. Cox confirmed that much of this project is on an opportunistic basis if future conditions warrant the work. The assumption is that eventually those conditions will exist. Chair Hinman clarified that the vault project is definitely warranted, while the park development is the only portion of the project which may not be done.

Commissioner Miller asked what design options they had to mitigate petroleum runoffs and heavy metal contamination, given the presence of a parking lot atop the vault. Mr. Cox replied that there are two answers to his question. First, a phased approach would move forward with the vault to address existing issues in that area, and then implement the park as they get that opportunity. The other option is to simply buy the land outright, at which point the City could move forward on all fronts without the need to phase the development. The City is at least listing that option and what would need to occur under that scenario. In the meantime, the must-do vault work will proceed.

Mr. Hitch added that the first phase not only includes the big vault project but also a number of smaller projects to address water quality issues. The challenge there is to find property owners willing to incorporate those projects into their development plans. Redmond does not currently use porous pavements because the soil may not allow for proper breakdown of oils and greases coming off the cars. So the best existing compromise is treatment of parking lot stormwater runoff.

Commissioner Miller added that structured parking would be important for the City, and that acres of vacant parking lots should be avoided if at all possible. Secondly, he looked forward to seeing positive, distinct steps towards improved water quality.

Commissioner Biethan was curious about seeing whether these policies would allow for flexibility for specific property owners as these plans move forward. The Sears owner specifically requested more flexibility. Chair Hinman said that would be excellent guidance to give to staff, and he suggested that Mr. Cox and Mr. Hitch provide some specific language which incorporate the expressed concerns and suggestions. Chair Hinman asked the Commission members how much more information they wanted regarding Phase II and Phase III. Mr. Cox added that the final draft of their plan is due within 24 hours, and he will make the final draft available to the Commissioners, along with whatever additional detail the Commission would like. Chair Hinman said they could go over those materials before their next meeting and form questions or suggestions during their next preparatory meeting.

BREAK

BRIEFING: Zoning Code Rewrite Project, presented by Lynda Aparicio, Steve Fischer, Dennis Lisk, Gary Lee and Jeff Churchill, Redmond City Planners.

Ms. Aparicio covered some of the key accomplishments to date during this project, along with updates and next steps for each of the code sections.

Key accomplishments included:

- 1) Completed recommendations from the Code Rewrite Commission for both the Miscellaneous Uses and Development Standards 1 packages. Those packages have received preliminary endorsement from City Council.
- 2) Recommendations have been approved for Commercial, Industrial, and Design District zones, as well as Administration and Procedures. They are scheduled to finish with City Council study sessions on those two packages at the end of June.
- 3) They have a recommendation from the Code Rewrite Commission on the Environmental Regulations. They are scheduled to begin study sessions on that package also at the end of June.
- 4) They anticipate completion of residential regulations at the end of June.

Mr. Fischer described the Environmental Package changes:

- 1) Some environmental sections have been reorganized to provide greater clarity.
- 2) The tree retention code's incentive program has been modified to encourage developers to save more than the minimum, while also providing greater clarity for how that can be achieved. Additionally, Commission members and staff have created exceptions to that section for Redmond's two urban centers, given the goal of more intense development within those two locales.
- 3) There is now a definition for noise walls.
- 4) Environmental regulations section of the code is now titled SEPA Procedures. This section of code also includes the newly updated Planned Action Language for the Overlake neighborhood.

- 5) The provision of code that addresses wetland and stream mitigation plans has been updated to be in compliance with new state regulations.

The transmittal report has been signed and they go before City Council with the environmental package on June 15th, and that study session begins June 29th.

Mr. Lisk presented the Residential Regulations and Urban Recreation Zone changes:

- 1) A big part of the Residential Regulations deals more with organizational issues, and trying to make the code more user-friendly and concise.
- 2) They have reorganized that section into four sub-sections:
- 3) Introduction.
- 4) Zone-by-Zone summary sheet with a list of permitted uses and site requirements, and a calculation of maximum density development.
- 5) Another aspect is streamlining Neighborhood Residential Design Standards that come out of the neighborhood planning process. This helps minimize redundancy.
- 6) One proposal has been that as new regulations come out of the neighborhood planning process, there is a mechanism for introducing those new regulations Citywide when appropriate. However, many neighborhoods also include unique design standards which will also be retained.
- 7) The Agricultural and Urban Recreation Chapter is being reworked, such that the Agricultural zone is eliminated to bring that chapter into compliance with the City's Comprehensive Plan goals and policies. There are two properties which are currently zoned agricultural and would need to be rezoned simultaneously with adoption of the new draft.

Chair Hinman asked if the City had contacted the owners of those two properties, and whether the owners were in favor of that rezoning. Mr. Churchill replied that he did not believe the owners had been contacted regarding the Code Rewrite project specifically, but the rezoning issue has existed for some time. It had been settled through a long legal process, and this simply codified that result. This would not be a new issue.

Mr. Churchill reported that one large goal of the Code Rewrite Commission has been to make sure the zone chapters are set up consistently. He did report that there are zones currently on the books for which there are no corresponding land-use regulations, and there are land-use regulations for which there are no zones. The updated code will fix that. Additionally, the group held a public hearing some time ago and received generally favorable input from Microsoft and other private property owners.

Chair Hinman asked what the next steps were for the Overlake group. Mr. Churchill replied that the Code Rewrite Commission was still reviewing the draft, and they expected a recommendation from that Commission in July, after which it would go to City Council.

Mr. Lee reported on the Downtown group. There are no substantive changes going on other than updating the pedestrian systems map, to bring it into compliance with the TMP and Downtown East/West corridor study, and generally reorganizing the code. Chair Hinman asked if those

materials would eventually be needed for the Overlake urban area. Mr. Churchill said those materials are already serving as a reference for Overlake development.

Chair Hinman asked if anyone had any questions for Mr. Lee. There were none. Ms. Aparicio reported that the next regulations to go before the Code Rewrite Commission were the Land Division, Performance Bonding and Telecommunications Regulations, which are scheduled in July, along with introduction of the Design Standard Regulations in August. Chair Hinman asked what was scheduled for the rest of the year. Ms. Aparicio indicated that the group would have some reconciliation days during that period and that by November they will have gone through each targeted packages. Mr. Churchill added that there were two other packages not already listed, which are also due to be reviewed in that timeframe. Those two packages are Development Standards II and Development Standards III. The DSII package includes parking regulations, historic preservation and affordable housing. The DSIII package includes landscaping regulations, open space and external effects regulations. Chair Hinman asked where LID policies fit into these packages. Mr. Churchill replied that any new stormwater code recommendations stemming from the Overlake Storm Water implementation would be included in an Overlake package expected to come to the Planning Commission later this year.

Chair Hinman asked about preliminary endorsement. Ms. Aparicio replied that the intent is to adopt the code all at once, rather than piecemeal. Preliminary endorsement gives the green light to that section of code without necessarily adopting it formally. Chair Hinman asked which group the Code Rewrite staff was working on with City Council. Ms. Aparicio replied that staff attended the monthly Planning and Public Works committee meetings. Chair Hinman asked if there were any other questions. There were none.

REPORTS

Mr. Marpert reported that Redmond City Council met with the Sammamish City Council to discuss parks districts, the Sammamish Parks update, transit and transportation issues. A video is available of that meeting.

SCHEDULING/TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING(S)

The Commission discussed the issues to be addressed in upcoming meetings.

ADJOURN

Chair Hinman adjourned the meeting at approximately 9:30 p.m.

Minutes Approved On:

Planning Commission Chair