

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues
Code Rewrite Commission DGA Text Amendment**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>1. How will the Planning Commission continue to be involved with the Code Rewrite process? (several, April 29)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> The Planning Commission (PC) will have representation on the Code Rewrite Commission (CRC) as two Planning Commissioners will suspend their service on the PC to serve on the CRC. The CRC could brief and seek input from the PC on major issues under consideration and project milestones on a quarterly or more frequent basis.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> Commissioner Chandorkar wondered if there was a way to involve the 5 PC members who would not be serving on the CRC. Commissioner Hinman expressed support for quarterly or more frequent briefings to the PC and wondered if such briefings could be called for in the rules adopted by the CRC.</p> <p>The Commission discussed the frequency with which the CRC should communicate with the PC during the project. Several thought more frequent communication than quarterly (such as monthly) would be necessary while others noted that it may be difficult to specify frequency at this stage given lack of a project work plan. Commissioners Query and Hinman noted that communication could come in various forms including face-to-face, meeting minutes, and more. Commissioner Hinman suggested that the PC consider appointing a PC liaison to the project who could do brief updates and recommend to the CRC when more substantial communication might be warranted.</p> <p>The Commission agreed that the amendment should require the CRC to communicate with “all impacted boards and commissions on an appropriate basis.”</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	<p>Closed, with update to amendment</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues
Code Rewrite Commission DGA Text Amendment**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>2. Are two PC representatives enough on the CRC or should more be appointed? (McCarthy, April 29)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> Staff proposed two PC representatives as a way to ensure PC representation on the CRC and also leave a solid base membership on the PC. Staff would not recommend any more than three PC representatives serve on the CRC as this could weaken the institutional knowledge residing with the remaining PC members.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> Commissioner McCarthy wondered if more than two PC representatives should be appointed to the CRC. He noted that should the PC members serving on the CRC choose to return to the PC after the Code Rewrite project is completed, they would have leadership opportunities in helping other PC members understand the new code.</p> <p>Commissioners Gregory and Query expressed concern with appointing more than 2 existing PC members to the CRC citing the reduction in institutional knowledge that would result as the greatest concern. The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the questions raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	<p>Closed.</p>
<p>3. Should the PC membership be able to go as low as 5 during the existence of the CRC? (McCarthy, April 29)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> Staff recommends that the PC membership remain at 7 during the existence of the CRC as the larger land use and policy issues that the PC will continue to consider are worthy of a wider community representation than 5 members could provide. The CRC will only consider changes to the zoning code that are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, keeping their scope more limited than that of the PC. Due to the limited duration of the CRC, the membership of that body is proposed to be between 5 and 7 members as staff anticipates it could be difficult to fill positions mid-way through the project and get new members caught up on the work of the CRC. Recruitment for</p>	<p>Closed.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues
Code Rewrite Commission DGA Text Amendment**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>members to backfill those PC members who transition to the CRC could begin as early as June 2009. Potential PC members could also be identified through the CRC recruitment process.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> Commissioner McCarthy expressed concern for backfilling the 2 PC members who transition to the CRC. He also expressed concern for achieving quorum for PC meetings during the existence of the CRC if new PC members are not appointed quickly.</p> <p>The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the questions raised.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	
<p>4. Should a member of the Design Review Board serve on the CRC? (Chandorkar, April 29)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> Staff recommends that a DRB member not be required to serve on the CRC, as proposed for two PC members, for a number of reasons. The purpose of the DRB is not as closely linked to that of the CRC as is the purpose of the PC; the DRB's purpose is to review architectural and landscape plans to promote visual quality throughout the City. Though the DRB may use certain sections (design standards) of the RCDG to evaluate proposals, it does not use or consider all aspects of the code as does the PC. Further, staff is concerned about challenges that would be encountered in backfilling a DRB position; it is easier to recruit for the PC as there are a larger number of eligible candidates (all Redmond residents over 18) than there are for the DRB (professional architects). Staff proposes to keep the DRB involved in the process by briefing the group quarterly or more frequently on issues pertinent to their purview.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> Commissioner Chandorkar wondered why no DRB member is</p>	<p>Closed, with update to amendment (see Issue 1)</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues
Code Rewrite Commission DGA Text Amendment**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>proposed to serve on the CRC, similarly to the proposed PC representation.</p> <p>The Commissioners agreed that the information provided addressed the questions raised. They further agreed that the amendment should specify requirements for the CRC to communicate with other boards and commissions, such as the DRB, as discussed in Issue 1 above.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	
<p>5. Clarification of qualifications for business representatives</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> Staff proposes to revise the amendment to allow business representatives with a “demonstrated connection to the Redmond community” be considered for appointment to the CRC rather than specifying that business representatives must have a “physical presence in Redmond.”</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> Commissioner Gregory expressed concern about the vagueness of the term “demonstrated connection.” Commissioner Hinman suggested that the business representatives be required to work for a company paying the business tax in Redmond. The Commissioners agreed that one business representative must work for a company with a physical presence in Redmond and that the other could have a “demonstrated connection to the Redmond community.”</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	<p>Closed, with update to amendment</p>
<p>6. Clarification of “resident” qualifications</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> Staff proposes to revise the amendment to allow resident representatives on the CRC to reside either within the City limits or within Redmond’s Potential Annexation Areas (PAA). Residents of Redmond’s PAA have participated on Citizen Advisory Committees in</p>	<p>Closed, with update to amendment.</p>

**Attachment B: Summary of Planning Commission Discussion Issues
Code Rewrite Commission DGA Text Amendment**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>the past and have a history of being involved with various planning efforts.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> The Commission agreed that the input of residents of Redmond’s PAA could be valuable and that this change was beneficial to be consistent with planning practices on neighborhood planning efforts. The Commissioners agreed that only one of the three general resident representatives could be from a PAA.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	
<p>7. Why does the CRC report to the City Council and not the PC? (Gregory, McCarthy, May 13)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation and Reasoning</u> Staff considered alternatives to the CRC as proposed, including options such as a Citizens Advisory Committee which would report to the PC on the Code Rewrite project. The proposed structure was the option with that offered the least impact on the PC work load with the most involvement of the PC through the appointment of 2 members to the CRC.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> Commissioner Gregory questioned why the CRC would report directly to the City Council rather than to the PC, noting that this chain seems to take the PC out of one of its fundamental duties: reviewing amendments to the RCDG. Commissioner Query expressed concerns for the work load of the PC if the CRC reported to that body.</p> <p>The Commissioners agreed that the structure as proposed was appropriate.</p> <p><u>Public Comments (if any)</u></p>	<p>Closed.</p>