

| Issue / Commissioner | Discussion Notes | Issue status |
|---|--|--|
| <p>1. The City’s overall approach to undergrounding utility distribution and service lines is undesirable.</p> <p><i>(Chandorkar)</i></p> | <p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></p> <p>5/24/12:</p> <p>Commissioner comments speak to a broader discussion of utility undergrounding, however these points extend beyond the scope of the Planning Commission’s 2011 discussion and City Council’s ultimate direction, as well as the scope of the proposed Zoning Code Amendment. In 2011 the Planning Commission discussed alternatives for relieving single family residential development from high cost burdens associated with undergrounding utility distribution lines. The Planning Commission recommended an exemption-based approach as a solution to relieving single family residential development from high cost burdens; City Council confirmed the recommendation and directed staff to develop corresponding Zoning Code Amendments in 2012.</p> <p>Staff thereby recommends this discussion be included in the Planning Commission’s Report as items for City Council to consider in the future.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p> <p>The overall approach to utility undergrounding is undesirable for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unequal applicability. It is unfair that property location relative to distribution lines determines whether an applicant will need to | <p><u>Opened</u></p> <p>5/23/12</p> <p><u>Closed</u></p> |

| Issue / Commissioner | Discussion Notes | Issue status |
|---|---|--|
| | <p>perform undergrounding, for example those that are adjacent to distribution lines versus those across the street from such lines.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Because utility undergrounding yields a public benefit, the applicant should not be solely responsible for covering development-related costs. • The current incremental approach to undergrounding results in a patchwork of above and below-ground electrical and telecommunications utilities. • The requirement to underground service lines on-site suffers from similar inequities as its distribution line counterpart. | |
| <p>2. By eliminating the requirement for single family residential development to underground utility distribution lines, the proposal limits instances in which undergrounding would occur, and the overall timeline for completing desired undergrounding.</p> <p><i>(Biethan; Gregory)</i></p> | <p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 5/24/12</p> <p>In response to the first point, staff does recognize that one drawback to the proposal is that it would extend the overall timeline for completing utility undergrounding. However, this may be offset by relieving high cost burdens for minor residential development. That could help facilitate minor residential projects that add a greater diversity of housing types and/or beautify Redmond’s built environment.</p> <p>In response to the second point, the proposed Zoning Code</p> | <p><u>Opened</u> 5/23/12</p> <p><u>Closed</u></p> |

| Issue / Commissioner | Discussion Notes | Issue status |
|----------------------|---|--------------|
| | <p>Amendment does not change undergrounding requirements for other land use types. In other words, more significant private development projects would still be required to perform undergrounding. Land use actions in residential areas still required to perform undergrounding would include subdivisions, short plats, local improvement districts, multifamily residential development, building complexes, and “other projects that are of a size to warrant undergrounding.”</p> <p>[Note: Commercial and industrial development and binding site plans also still require undergrounding; this response is speaking directly to the question of impact to <u>residential</u> areas].</p> <p>Lastly, and to address the Commission’s follow up questions, the City would still perform undergrounding in residential and commercial areas alike, as part of future capital projects. The City’s Capital Improvement Program currently has an undergrounding program to contribute toward public projects that trigger the undergrounding requirement. In addition, the City and Puget Sound Energy share costs for undergrounding associated with public projects. Public involvement for City-initiated undergrounding currently occurs via the biennial Budgeting-by-Priorities process, whereby the public is invited to comment on proposed capital projects and related allocations to the undergrounding program.</p> <p>Redmond has not conducted a citywide study targeting key corridors for undergrounding. Were that to occur, it could provide additional opportunities for public involvement. If the Planning Commission is</p> | |

| Issue / Commissioner | Discussion Notes | Issue status |
|---|--|--|
| | <p>suggesting this action, staff recommends it be included in the Planning Commission’s Report for City Council to consider in the future.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p> <p>Follow-up questions to the overall initial comment include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Were the proposal to be enacted, how would undergrounding occur, especially in residential areas, other than through City-initiated efforts? • At what point is the public involved in corridor, or citywide approaches to undergrounding? | |
| <p>3. Please explain why criteria for short plats were not included in the proposed Zoning Code Amendment. Consider re-examining this option as part of future undergrounding follow-up. <i>(Hinman)</i></p> | <p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u></p> <p>5/24/12</p> <p>The Technical Committee did consider developing criteria for determining whether short plats be required to underground utility distribution lines, consistent with Planning Commission recommendation and City Council direction from 2011. However, upon considering criteria such as existing and proposed configuration</p> | <p><u>Opened</u></p> <p>5/23/12</p> <p><u>Closed</u></p> |

| Issue / Commissioner | Discussion Notes | Issue status |
|----------------------|---|--------------|
| | <p>of utilities, streets, and new lots, the Committee does not recommend adding such criteria due to the wide range of complexity and scale inherent to short plat development. A single set of criteria identifying conditions under which utility undergrounding is required would not apply equally across all anticipated short plat proposals, based on the range of circumstances experienced with short plats previously reviewed by the City.</p> <p>The Technical Committee acknowledged that provisions to petition the decision maker for relief from undergrounding requirements could be improved by relocating that text to the end of Zoning Code Chapter 21.54, giving the provision a prominent heading in the chapter and reinforcing that that option is available to any development type.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p> | |