

Issue/Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p>1. <i>Should the term WI-FI be used in the text of policy EV-18?</i></p> <p><i>(issue #12 on Reconciliation Table)</i></p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 9/21/11: Staff agreed that a general reference to technology consistent with language used in both the PARCC and Utilities Elements would be preferred, so as to not identify one form of technology over others. (See proposed edit).</p> <p>10/18/11: <i>Note:</i> Staff proposes a minor edit to the previous edit as follows, such that EV-18 is consistent with language in UT-81:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>Support greater accessibility for use of WI-FI advanced and affordable communications technology;</u> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> 9/21/11: The Planning Commission questioned the use of the term WI-FI in policy EV-18. 9/28/11: The Planning Commission approved the edit proposed by staff.</p>	<p>Opened 9/21/11</p> <p>Closed 9/28/11</p> <p>*see staff proposed edit</p>
<p>2. <i>Is the issue of parking sufficiently addressed in the Comprehensive Plan?</i></p> <p><i>See TR-19, 20 and 21; also UC-24, DT-29, 40, OV-43, 44, 45</i></p> <p><i>(issue #17)</i></p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 9/21/11: Staff identified various Elements in the Comprehensive Plan where the issue of parking is addressed. In the Transportation element: TR-19, 20 & 21. Urban Centers: UT-24, UC-25 and DT-43, for example. When the Council reviewed Package 1, the question of the City’s overall parking philosophy was identified on the Council issues matrix. Here is the staff explanation given at that time (June, 2011):</p> <p>Citywide parking policies are found in TR-19, 20, and 21. Parking planning and management are most important in Redmond’s urban centers due to higher residential and employment densities. In the urban centers, the philosophy underpinning parking management strategies is that urban centers are people-oriented places first, that clustered/shared parking is more efficient than piecemeal parking, parking should be coordinated with access to transit and other modes, and that the on-street parking supply should be managed for customers of urban center businesses. These ideas are manifest in the policies noted at left. Staff believes the Transportation parking policies are broadly consistent with the Urban Center policies. At the same time, staff welcomes suggestions from Councilmembers to help make the underlying philosophy clearer to the reader.</p>	<p>Opened 9/21/11</p> <p>Closed 9/28/11</p>

	<p>At the time of Package 1 review Council agreed to maintain policies as proposed and to further discuss parking strategies as part of the Transportation Master Plan update.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> <u>9/21/11:</u> Is the issue of adequate parking sufficiently addressed in the Comprehensive Plan? <u>9/28/11:</u> The Planning Commission determined that at this time the Comprehensive Plan provides sufficient policy direction regarding parking. They will continue to be interested in reviewing additional parking issues as they are addressed through the Transportation Master Plan, particularly how parking is managed at transit stations in the near term.</p>	
<p>3. <i>Should there be the use of numeric terms for describing Utilities Policy – FW-28?</i></p> <p>(issue #5)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> <u>9/28/11:</u> During the Planning Commission’s initial review of FW-28 in conjunction with Goals, Vision and Framework Policies, each phrase had been defined by a range of numeric years, e.g. <i>near</i> (0-6 years), <i>middle</i> (6-18 years) and <i>long-term</i> (18+ years). Staff subsequently removed the numeric modifiers in response to further work on the Capital Investment Strategy, which is intended to implement FW-28 and other policies in the Capital Facilities Element. The Planning Commission requested that a new modifier be inserted to provide the needed sense of time scale. Staff indicated that <i>near, middle and long</i> are approximately ‘thirds’ of time over the course of the Comprehensive Plan’s overall 2030 planning horizon. <u>10/12/11:</u> Staff modified the language in FW-28 to reflect this discussion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Optimize strategic actions and investments over near- middle- and long-term portions of the Comprehensive Plan’s 2030 planning horizon, while recognizing the need to retain flexibility to leverage opportunities and respond to changing conditions; <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> <u>9/28/11:</u> The Planning Commission requested clarification in policy FW-28, in which the phrases <i>near, middle, and long-term</i> are used to describe planning horizons for capital investment planning.</p>	<p>Opened 9/28/11</p> <p>Closed 9/28/11, pending PC approval of edit to FW- 28</p>

Planning Commission Issues Matrix, *October 12, 2011(Final)*
2010-2011 Periodic Update of the Comprehensive Plan: **Reconciliation Items**

N:\PLANNING\Comp Plan Update Periodic 2010-11\Intro & Wrap-up\Planning Commission review\Issues matrix FINAL