

**REDMOND CODE REWRITE COMMISSION
MINUTES**

January 11th, 2010

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Steve Nolen, Chair, Sue Stewart, Vice Chair, Robert Fitzmaurice, Nancy McCormick, Vibhas Chandorkar, Robert Pantley

COMMISSIONERS EXCUSED: None

STAFF PRESENT: Rob Odle, Judd Black, Lynda Aparicio, Jeff Churchill

RECORDING SECRETARY:

CRC/STAFF DISCUSSION

A meeting was held between staff members and the Commission to review the project and process thus far. Staff provided a memo outlining suggested discussion points. The discussion began at 5:30pm. A summary of the comments are provided below:

- The staff report format is generally acceptable; however duplicative information should be eliminated as much as possible.
- A suggestion was made for staff to keep definitions in mind as code is being drafted. The Commission was in general agreement that putting defined terms in italics would be very helpful to the end user. Staff agreed to include this formatting change when the code is printed.
- The Commission stated that it is often very time consuming to review the proposed code against the new code, and requested that the code crosswalk include the existing code section, together with how and where the section is addressed in the proposed code. Additionally, the Commission would like to see any proposed substantive changes noted in the crosswalk and in the staff presentation. Staff agreed that these changes will be incorporated.
- The issue matrix should be modified so that comments and respective responses from staff are formatted in a horizontal fashion. Code citations should be included in the “issue” column.
- CRC members expressed a desire to have the staff team and CRC deliberate on proposed amendments as a team. The CRC recognizes that staff, in certain cases must consult another staff group to discuss CRC-proposed changes, but in general, staff will try to come to resolution at the meetings.
- CRC and staff will make every effort to reach agreement on proposed changes, however if there are items that have differing recommendations between staff and the Commission, it is acceptable to present a recommendation to Council that includes a summary of both view points.

- Commissioners acknowledged that “sleeper issues” have come-up during the course of code review.
- A suggestion was made to streamline the staff presentation for the public hearing, but at the same time, let the viewing public know that materials are available on line.
- In general the Commission thinks the public outreach efforts completed and proposed are very comprehensive. The Commission requested that we try to provide a link on the City’s homepage to the project site. Staff indicated they will pursue that option.
- The Commission expressed a desire to be consulted with respect to staff recommendations on different zoning approaches, in particular, staff’s presentation to Council regarding performance zoning.
- Staff suggested that it would be acceptable for public hearings to remain open for written testimony only. The Commission agreed that they could close the oral portion of the public hearing, where appropriate, and keep the record open for written testimony to facilitate the project schedule.
- Staff suggested that it would be helpful to establish a protocol whereby commissioners contact the staff in advance of the meeting with any issues or questions regarding the materials provided. The Commission stated that they would prefer to contact staff if there are any issues or questions, rather than staff calling each commissioner every week.
- Staff presented a proposed monthly report to CRC which outlines issues the CRC wishes to track, including specific feedback being sought from Council. The Commission thought the format of the monthly report was acceptable.

CALL TO ORDER:

The regular meeting was called to order at 6:30 p.m. by Chairman Nolen in the Council Chambers at City Hall.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA and MEETING MINUTES:

No issues with tonight’s agenda. No meeting minutes to approve.

ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE:

Mr. Nolen noted there was no one from the public in the audience, but that if someone did show up later, that person would be given time to speak, as needed.

CONTINUED DISCUSSION, COMMERCIAL, INDUSTRIAL AND DESIGN DISTRICT ZONES:

Mr. Churchill noted that the CRC began discussing these zones at the January 4th meeting, specifically talking about the neighborhood commercial zone to get a better feel for the rest of the zone exhibits. Mr. Churchill has created an issues matrix that catalogs some of the issues from last week, and also adds some definitions. The *setback line* definition has been updated, as well. Mr. Churchill is looking for feedback prior to the public hearing on these zones, which is set for January 25th. He wants to know how the

CRC thinks this Code would work for a Code user or applicant. Staff wants to make sure they are meeting the objectives of the Code rewrite.

Mr. Nolen asked the CRC to deal with format and presentation first, and then deal with specific issues. Mr. Chandorkar likes the format presented for the zones, which appears similar to Kirkland's code. He is concerned about the users in the permitted use tables in RCDG Chapter 20C.50. He saw some uses missing from some tables. Mr. Churchill does not want to leave uses out, either. He said the City will adhere as closely as is reasonable for Redmond to the Land-based Classification System (LBCS). It is an accepted way to classify land uses, and the standard used for Redmond's land use database that feeds the GIS system. This was discussed at the January 4th meeting. Mr. Churchill said it was quite an exercise to match the old Code with the new format.

He is also trying to create as broad a category as feasible. There are some uses that fit into the same category, and if the category is listed, rather than all of the individual uses, that will save space and make the zoning code easier to use, in staff's opinion. Mr. Churchill suggested taking the name of the use and how it is defined in the definitions exhibit to see how the Code works. In principle, the staff is trying to match every use that is an old code and make sure it is in the new code. Mr. Chandorkar asked if a user would find a *map* in the Code, to make it easier to use. Mr. Churchill said some of the uses map well, but some map into several categories. Mr. Chandorkar understands the difficulty in this process, but wonders how users of the previous Code would find uses in the new Code. *Outdoor public assembly* and *athletic/fitness center* were two uses Mr. Chandorkar could not find in the new Code. Mr. Chandorkar also asked, in the format, what a "." meant in a row and column intersection. Mr. Churchill confirmed those were ditto marks, which he tried to make clear in the January 4th meeting. The idea is, when all the pagination is finalized, where a standard is same for one use and the use before it, and the use after it, the cells could be merged such that it is mentioned just once on a page. Exhibit G is a finished product, which Mr. Chandorkar saw and accepted.

Mr. Nolen has done some research on the LBCS and found a document produced by another city that had made this conversion. That city had a good-looking *crosswalk* for getting from old to new uses. Mr. Churchill said that might be a good, separate document to help with the transition to the new Code. Ms. McCormick has found a permitted use chart dating back to 1992, and noted that whenever a land use decision comes to the City Council, there will be a lot more paperwork. She would like to have a quick reference form, or *crosswalk* as Mr. Nolen suggested, that would allow people to find what is permitted very quickly. Mr. Churchill said creating a form like that is the full intention of the staff. Staff wants to help the customer who has a use in mind, and wants to know where that is allowed in the City, and also the customer who has a piece of property and wants to know what is allowed.

Mr. Chandorkar noted that many of the land use tables have footnotes, and how those are incorporated in the revised Code. Mr. Churchill said the footnotes are eliminated as footnotes, but are still in the Code. Some of those footnotes are in the regulations common to all uses of the Code. On the main table, the *special regulations* were almost

all footnotes before. Staff has done the best to make sure useful footnotes have been included, and others have been done away with. Mr. Chandorkar asked how the reference would work in terms of the numbering scheme, and Mr. Churchill pointed out the last few numbers of the code entry would serve as that reference.

Mr. Fitzmaurice asked if more pictures could be added, such that the plots of land discussed in the Code were the same size for every entry, so an applicant could go from one zone to another. Looking from business to residential zones, it appears the parcels look different. Mr. Churchill said in the Sketch Up program, all the parcels are the same. What makes them look different is that when a six-story height is allowed, and a four-story height is allowed, you can make the four-story look bigger because it takes up less space. In Exhibit C, the six-story building appears to have a smaller parcel because six stories take up so much vertical space. Mr. Churchill said one way to resolve that would be to make the parcel as big as it can be as a lowest common denominator. Formatting should help the pictures be clearer. Mr. Fitzmaurice said the parcel should look the same, and the building placement should be same, if possible. He asked if setbacks were indicated in the sketches. Mr. Churchill said setbacks were not taken into account, because it adds another layer of complexity.

Mr. Fitzmaurice wants to see proportionally similar zones in terms of massing in the sketches. Mr. Pantley said he likes the graphics, but wants to improve their accuracy to improve credibility. Mr. Nolen wants the graphics to generate answers, not questions. Ms. Stewart would like to see a universal scale for the graphics. Mr. Nolen said that placement of the building should be the same for all the pictures. Mr. Churchill appreciated the feedback. The CRC agreed the graphics added a great amount of clarity to the revised Code, overall.

Moving to substantive matters, Mr. Nolen turned the attention of the CRC to Exhibit A, with the minimum/maximum parking rules. Looking at multiple family dwellings, it appears there is just one number. Mr. Churchill said there is just one number there, which is the minimum and maximum. Mr. Nolen said that needs to be clearer. Mr. Churchill looked up 20.D.130 in the existing Code, and found that the number is the minimum, but notes there is no maximum. Mr. Pantley suggested putting in a *no maximum* phrase for this zone. Mr. Churchill said in some zones, there is a maximum listed, but in others, like in multiple family dwellings, there is no maximum listed. Mr. Chandorkar asked if any *maximum* phrase was needed. Mr. Churchill said he would work on clarifying this section. Mr. Nolen suggested adding *no maximum* in italics to add a visual cue for applicants, in this case.

Mr. Chandorkar asked about 20C.50.20-030, in Exhibit A, where the permitted use chart said multi-family dwelling is not permitted. Mr. Churchill said residential mixed use is really two separate uses, the use below and the use above. Those have been separated. Multi-family dwelling is permitted in neighborhood commercial, but only if it is in the upper story of a mixed-use structure. That is what the special regulation points out. Four or more units were in the old Code; now it is five or more. Mr. Churchill said that has changed because the definitions of mixed-use and multi-family dwellings have changed.

Mr. Pantley asked if that could switch back to four units, to encourage building in smaller areas. Mr. Nolen noted that putting in four units would fit in the quadrants of a building better than five. He asked if new non-conforming uses would be created in moving from four to five. Mr. Churchill said there are only two neighborhood commercial zones in the City. One has no dwellings; the other zone has more than five dwellings. Mr. Churchill said he could make the switch to four, but he will have to check to make sure the Code does not contradict itself.

Mr. Pantley said, by building code, a mixed-use four unit and a four-plex are different. Mr. Churchill agreed. He would like to push for four units to allow more flexibility for applicants. Mr. Fitzmaurice said highlighting this change in the Code, from four to five, would be important for an applicant. Mr. Nolen asked if that information should be in the *crosswalk* or the staff report. Mr. Fitzmaurice said the staff report should be fine. He does not want a long definition, but a single line, perhaps, noting that the code is different in this area. Mr. Nolen would like to see the item in the staff report and the crosswalk, because the crosswalk would be at the front of the Code.

Mr. Chandorkar asked about automobile sales/service, or rental establishment. He noted that in the revised Code, only gasoline service stations are allowed in Neighborhood Commercial zones. There is a part of the Code that indicates people might have living spaces above the gas stations, with multiple uses. He wondered if the City would approve such a project. Mr. Churchill said such a project, which Ms. Stewart said Arco has been working on in Redmond recently, would be more of a marketing challenge than a Code challenge. Mr. Nolen asked if separating gas stations out as a use of its own was a good idea. Mr. Churchill said that could happen, but that would add uses in other zones. He would prefer to keep it as is, in order not to upset the Land-based Classification System and be consistent.

Mr. Nolen likes that structure, but he is seeing a requirement for a lot of text without that separate designation. Mr. Churchill said staff is trying to find the broadest category that allows a reasonable presentation in the Code. Mr. Chandorkar asked when something does not fit, like a gas station, if that type of use should be called out. Mr. Churchill said that can and will happen in some cases, as in some matters where the Code goes up against the state law. Ms. Stewart asked if having more gas stations and service stations close to residential zones would help reduce trip miles for cars. Ms. McCormick said some restrictions on hours are needed for these businesses; the issues matrix does not indicate that. Mr. Churchill said restricted hours of operation may be a condition of approval for some projects similar to this.

Mr. Fitzmaurice asked about neighborhood commercial and the car rental establishments, and if those are a good idea in residential areas. He notes more people are using car sharing programs, and asks if car rental should be restricted in these areas. Neighborhood commercial is fairly restrictive, according to Mr. Churchill. Mr. Pantley wanted the Code to reflect car sharing, and Ms. Stewart wanted to ask the Council to expand the law and expand the uses allowed. Mr. Churchill said he will ask the Council about that issue and research it further. Mr. Fitzmaurice said this concept should incorporate possible transit

options in the future, as well. Mr. Pantley noted that some office buildings in Seattle have flexible lots where a lot of car sharing is going on.

Moving to Exhibit B, Mr. Pantley raised the question about FARs, and where they are very restricted, as with office buildings. The City is pushing for more residential use of older buildings in different areas, and the Code appears split on this issue, from the total size of the buildings to the uses of the buildings. A lot of FAR is allowed for residential, but a little bit for commercial. The unintended consequence could be no future development, as is the case in one area that is just a block from Sound Transit, for example. Mr. Pantley said in the case of an existing building that has so much building it cannot be taken out, it would be a mistake to not have any flexibility in the way the FAR can be used. Mr. Churchill said the City is not planning for the bulk of residential growth in the general commercial zone, but rather, in the downtown area and Overlake urban center.

Mr. Pantley said regardless of the zone, the City needs to look at the buildings on hand and if re-development is prevented due to FARs. Mr. Pantley pointed out the four-story brick office building next to Group Health, and noted that the site could not be re-developed without taking out that office building. No residential units would be added, simply due to the FAR rules. Mr. Churchill said the point is well taken for Overlake and downtown, but does not really apply in the general commercial zones. Mr. Pantley said the CRC needs to look ahead, with the general question of FAR in mind. Adding more on some sites would push the building in question out of conformance with the FAR. Mr. Churchill will review this issue and come back to the CRC.

Mr. Fitzmaurice asked about Section 090, finance and insurance, and noted it was odd there was a phrase about an exit driveway serving drive-through lanes should not exceed 11 feet in width within 20 feet of the curb. That appeared a strange dictation of policy within the Code that might be placed better elsewhere, outside of finance, and possibly in the transportation code. Ms. Stewart, and other Commissioners, say the 11-foot width can be a bit restrictive, especially when leaving the area and going into traffic. Mr. Churchill said he will research the matter, and if it were a footnote that was transferred into this part of the Code. Mr. Pantley asked about the adequate vehicle queuing spaces outside a public right of way, but he did not know what *adequate* means. Mr. Churchill said that is determined on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Nolen said that can be an issue when uses are changed into other uses.

Exhibit C is the business park section, and asked why FARs are so small and TDRs are so large in this zone. Other members of the CRC agreed that was a big incentive for businesses. Ms. McCormick notes that business park businesses are the most frequent purchasers of TDRs, because they get the most value for those purchases. The most TDRs, according to Mr. Churchill, have been used by Microsoft, and are in the Overlake Business and Advanced Technology Zone, or OBAT. Microsoft has also made use of TDRs in the business park zone. Receiving zones for TDRs are all of the commercial zones, and the urban center zones, except for neighborhood commercial. The only places they are not allowed are residential and neighborhood commercial. Mr. Churchill said the

FAR question is part of the reason there is a maximum development yield noted in the Code.

Mr. Pantley asked, though, if the City really wanted to minimize the base development in the business parks with FARs of 0.45. Ms. McCormick said this Code is based on lot coverage and setbacks. Mr. Churchill said the base was set a long time ago, back in the mid-1990s, when the business park zone was created. Ms. McCormick said the base was set back longer before that. Mr. Churchill pointed out the TDRs allow for some flexibility in the types of buildings created. Ms. McCormick noted that in the past, the FAR bases were set in order to prompt development in the Sammamish Valley. Regardless, Mr. Pantley wants to know where the Code should stand now. Mr. Churchill asked if this question about buildings might fit better in the major plan update that is due at the end of 2011. Mr. Nolen said this is an issue the CRC wants to raise with the Council. He said this is an example where the Code is lagging behind development, especially in light of the Growth Management Act.

On Exhibit C, Mr. Fitzmaurice asked about minimum tract size. He wanted to know what *standard* means in this part of the Code. The minimum tract size is not included in any other zones. The lot frontage of 30 feet was used in the other exhibits, but here, there is fronted street setback of 30 feet, a rear of 20 feet, and a side of 40 feet. A 30-foot entrance with 40-foot setbacks could create a problem, for one example. *Lot frontage* is a phrase that concerns Mr. Fitzmaurice, especially with a flag-shaped lot, when it comes to setbacks. Mr. Churchill said in those narrow areas, a structure would not be built, but would rather be a driveway, most likely. Mr. Fitzmaurice wanted to know how setbacks fit in, and landscaping requirements, in this situation. Mr. Churchill pointed out a 30' wide site would have to be a conforming site, and an applicant would have to have access.

Mr. Pantley asked about a 30' easement in back of a site, and if that would make a lot non-conforming. Ms. Stewart asked if a graphical representation of the intent would be included. Mr. Churchill said there will be a chapter included for lot frontage, setbacks, tract area, and impervious surface area, as indicated in Exhibit J. The way to calculate the standard is shown, as well as the graphic. Mr. Pantley asked if there would be a way to add a special designation for flag lots and easements. Mr. Fitzmaurice pointed out a short plat could be split into two small tracts, and complications for access. Mr. Churchill said he would research this issue. Mr. Pantley pointed out some old standards, and some ratios that are 75-25 and 75-20. Mr. Churchill will investigate that too, as it may be an issue of old standards copied over.

Ms. Aparicio pointed out that the minimum lot frontage requirement is the width of the lot which adjoins a public or private street, or access corridor. The definition of an access corridor is a vehicle circulation area in private ownership, including easements, tracts, and driveways in a common ownership, over which access is afforded to two or more lots or residences. *Lot frontage* is a new definition in the revised Code, and it is the side of a lot abutting on a public or private street, or access corridor, or the width of the lot as it

abuts a public or private street, or access corridor. The portion of a remote lot that borders on the easement or access corridor would be the frontage.

Mr. Fitzmaurice said the table still needs to provide a quick read to let applicants know what frontage is. Mr. Nolen said every defined word in some other city codes are italicized, such as Burien's, and Mr. Churchill said he would like to incorporate that concept in Redmond's Code. Mr. Nolen is okay with separating the term *frontage* into the definition area. Mr. Pantley would like to add *access tract* to frontage to avoid confusion. Mr. Fitzmaurice noted this is more of an access issue, and added that 30' is sometimes not enough. The CRC agreed that if the terms were defined properly, and italicized, this Code could stand as is.

Mr. Fitzmaurice asked about section 140 in Exhibit C, which said at least 75% of business activity must be conducted indoors. He is concerned about that percentage, and if that were a dollar number. Mr. Churchill said this is a question of square footage, instead. Mr. Nolen suggested the Code should say 75% of the area allotted to business activity must be indoors, to create more clarity. Mr. Churchill agreed that was not clear. Mr. Fitzmaurice wanted to make sure that the business square footage area did not necessarily mean the parking lot areas, as well. Mr. Churchill said he would review the City's outdoor storage requirements and what percentages were involved in those requirements. Mr. Nolen said this section of the Code makes sense for a car lot, but not for a manufacturing location. Mr. Churchill said the purpose for this requirement is to exercise some control over the business park zone; this is not the manufacturing park zone. This is not necessarily heavy industry. Mr. Pantley asked about delicatessens in these areas, and how they were only allowed 1,000 square feet. Ms. McCormick said the City is trying to discourage retail sales in business park zones, but Mr. Pantley said some property owners are trying to get more direct sales on their sites.

Ms. Stewart asked whether 8% is going to be written as 8%, *eight percent*, or some combination. She would like to keep the numbers, simply because the Code would become shorter. Mr. Churchill said there is a Code reviser that makes these changes automatically. Mr. Nolen said there have been studies done that indicate it is easier to read written text rather than numbers. Mr. Pantley would like to keep the Code shorter.

Moving to manufacturing parks, Mr. Nolen noted the City is trying to limit outside uses. But he sees bars and drinking establishments described in business parks and manufacturing parks, and what the intent is there. Mr. Churchill said those sites are limited to 50 people, unless they are associated with a business creating a related product. There is a sports bar in Woodinville that uses a manufacturing site, and does well due to the side benefit of off-parking hours. Mr. Nolen said regarding noise and traffic, these park zones are good places for bars and drinking establishments. The size allotment for such establishments is different for business parks and manufacturing parks, however.

Regarding industry, Mr. Pantley asked why the FAR was so limited in this zone. Ms. McCormick said this is a small area, acreage-wise, and there is not much demand for it. Mr. Pantley asked if there would be more demand with more FAR. Ms. Stewart noted

there is definitely an inclination in this part of the Code not to have other uses. Mr. Pantley is not encouraging other uses, but rather encouraging businesses that exist there already, or might be attracted to the area. Mr. Nolen pointed out the sketch on this section of Code, in particular, seems really off in relation to the FAR. Mr. Churchill said he will review those sketches. Mr. Pantley said the Council should consider building more in these commercial and industrial areas, in order to ease the tax burden in the residential areas. Mr. Nolen asked how TDRs are used in this zone. Mr. Churchill said they can be used to put another story on a building, or increase the allotted impervious surface area. TDRs can also be substitutes for park land requirements.

Mr. Fitzmaurice asked about height, in Exhibit E, and the concept that the maximum height limit for *these features* shall be 90 feet (SMP). Mr. Churchill said that refers to the rock crushing and other items noted in the previous sentence. Mr. Nolen said some clarity could be added with a sentence such as, *This height restriction does not apply to these features*, and then list of those features. Mr. Churchill noted that this section of Code, due to the Shoreline Master Program designation, could have very limited changes. Mr. Nolen said defining *features* would be a good idea, and would not change the substance of the Code. Mr. Churchill will investigate the matter further.

Exhibit F deals with the Gateway Design District. Mr. Chandorkar noted that this district could go away. He said in the future, this use could be folded into another land use or zone, because it is very similar to some other zones. Mr. Churchill said that a change now would involve a change in land use, which would involve changing the Comprehensive Plan, which is not possible. So, this district will not be eliminated as of now. Mr. Nolen would like to recommend making that change to the Council. Mr. Churchill said business park and general commercial are two good zones to look at, and said the Council should look into that. Some of the mega-stores, like Home Depot and Target, fall in this zone. Ms. McCormick commented that on page 186 of the existing Code, there is a much shorter list of uses than on the revised Code. Mr. Churchill said the first use created a real matching problem, which expanded the Code in that area.

Mr. Fitzmaurice went back to Exhibit E, on page three of four dealing with manufacturing and wholesale trade. In that subsection, it said a vegetative buffer shall be established between batch plants and Evans Creek. Mr. Fitzmaurice noted what the width of the buffer would be. Mr. Churchill said the buffer is listed in the Critical Areas Ordinance. Mr. Fitzmaurice said this phrase is specific to this area, and Mr. Churchill brought up the fact that this piece of code pre-dates the CAO, and may not be needed. Ms. McCormick said the Council did review this issue with the Shoreline Master Plan a few years ago. Mr. Fitzmaurice asked about the 90-foot height listed here, and Mr. Churchill said that is an indication of the height needed for those types of structures in relation to the SMP. Mr. Nolen said vegetative buffers are required for all projects around all shorelines, which is why Mr. Churchill said this may indeed be repetitive.

Exhibit G is the Bear Creek Design District. Mr. Churchill said this district does look different toward the end. It looks a lot like a development agreement. There are lots of prohibitions specific to this zone, to a particular development that was envisioned to

happen. In creating the regulations for this zone, Mr. Churchill said there are a lot of specialized rules. Mr. Fitzmaurice pointed out a discrepancy in the base density, 0.8 FAR, which contradicts the 0.25 FAR, 3-story building depicted. Mr. Churchill admitted that was a mistake, and he will correct it.

Mr. Nolen asked why the height limit is different for this zone. Mr. Churchill said the height limit is 30 feet in residential zones, and 35 feet in the commercial zones. This is the zone that would have retirement residences, most likely, and would generally support residential building. Those height limits are slightly shorter than unincorporated King County.

REPORTS/SCHEDULING/TOPICS FOR NEXT MEETING(S):

Mr. Churchill brought up the issues of performance zoning, form-based zoning, and alternative zoning techniques, and how they will be brought in front of the Council on the night after this meeting. The purpose of this study session will allow the Council to understand these different techniques. Staff has looked through the Code and found examples of performance-based elements and form-based elements. Staff will put those elements in the context of the Code rewrite, and let Council members know the CRC is trying to broaden the use categories as much as possible. Throughout the rewrite, the CRC will be looking to incorporate those elements in the zoning code, as long as the Comprehensive Plan is adhered to. Mr. Nolen wants to make sure Mr. Churchill lets the Council know the CRC has an interest in this issue.

The next meeting will be January 25th, during which staff is hoping to wrap up the first two packages, Miscellaneous Uses and Development Standards I. There will be a public hearing for commercial, industrial, and design district zones. The CRC will also begin discussion of the Administration and Procedures Chapter. There will be study sessions scheduled in February for the Council regarding Miscellaneous Uses and Development Standards I. Mr. Pantley said the CRC chair might want to consider being at those study sessions. Ms. McCormick said the Planning Commission has done that before on certain issues. Mr. Nolen said someone on the CRC should indeed be at those meetings. Mr. Churchill said, generally, if there is an issue large and complex, a Commission member could help guide the discussion. On issues with more narrow scope, the Council prefers a written report from the Commission, as well as a staff report, according to Mr. Churchill. Mr. Nolen expressed he was willing to help, but did not want to monopolize the fun. Mr. Chandorkar suggested waiting on Council to ask for CRC representation, if necessary. Mr. Fitzmaurice noted the staff could tell Council if they want help, the CRC could provide it. February 9th and the 23rd are the tentative dates for those study sessions.

ADJOURNMENT:

Chairman Nolen adjourned the meeting at approximately 8:35 p.m.

Minutes Approved On:

Code Rewrite Commission Chair

