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CITY OF REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION MINUTES

March 11, 2020

COMMISSIONERS PRESENT: Chairman Captain, Vice Chairman Nichols, Commissioners Knopf and Shefrin

Commissioners Rajpathak and Varadharajan via remote participation

STAFF PRESENT: Beckye Frey and Beverly Mesa-Zendt, Planning Department

EXCUSED ABSENCE: Commissioner East

RECORDING SECRETARY: Carolyn Garza, LLC

CALL TO ORDER:

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 p.m. by Chairman Captain.

APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

MOTION to approve the Agenda by Vice Chair Nichols. MOTION seconded by Commissioner Knopf. The MOTION passed unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MEETING SUMMARY FOR FEBRUARY 26, 2020

MOTION to approve the Meeting Summary by Vice Chair Nichols. MOTION seconded by Commissioner Knopf. The MOTION passed unanimously.

ITEMS FROM THE AUDIENCE: None

Chairman Captain stated that the public can email the Planning Commission at any time whether the communication is regarding an item on the Agenda or not. The email address can be located on the City website.

Briefing, Downtown Light Rail Extension

Chairman Captain stated that the Briefing would not be presented at this meeting in order to have limited staff present. The presentation is on the City website.

Ms. Mesa-Zendt stated that as the Briefing was informational and any questions from the Commission can be submitted to the Planning Department.
Public Hearing and Study Session, Scope for 2020 Comprehensive Plan Annual Docket

Chairman Captain stated that the presentation would be given first, followed by any comments and public testimony.

Ms. Mesa-Zendt began the presentation. In review, there are two ways in which the Comprehensive Plan can be amended; one through the periodic update required by State law every eight years and the second, through the Annual Docket process. The subject of the presentation would be the Annual Docket process. The Growth Management Act states that cities and jurisdictions subject to requirements of the Growth Management Act may amend Comprehensive Plans no more than once per year.

Ms. Mesa-Zendt’s presentation was a summary of the previous staff presentation held on March 4, 2020. Points emphasized included the: docket process, seven minimum threshold criteria to be applied to each proposed amendment to evaluate whether it should be included on the docket; the Technical Committee recommendation, and the upcoming schedule for docket adoption.

The Public Hearing was opened by Chairman Captain.

Public Hearing

Mr. Hossein Khorram offered public testimony and submitted written comment. Mr. Khorram asked the Commissioners to consider a change to his proposal. He explained that he would like to increase the density of his site from R-12 to R-20 and in doing so would add more affordable units, more than required under the code. Mr. Khorram’s written material was entered into the record.

Study Session

Chairman Captain asked the Commission if issues could be read in order and the Commission agreed.

Vice Chair Nichols reminded the Commission that the focus is on the seven threshold criteria and not on the merits of a proposal. An evaluation of the appropriateness or need of a proposal is not the goal at this time.

Ms. Mesa-Zendt stated that the doors were being checked to ensure that no one was outside attempting to enter who could not, as doors had been locked in the recent past when meetings had been cancelled.

Chairman Captain began with Issue 1A. Vice Chair Nichols asked for clarification regarding zones, in example, where in a Business Park zone a written code restriction is for no retail to serve the general public but businesses that do serve the general public such as fitness centers or dance studios have become tenants. Ms. Mesa-Zendt replied that recommended uses for a Business Park zone are broad. Some allowed non-residential uses from the Redmond Zoning
code are automobile sales, rental and service and heavy and durable consumer goods sales, rental and service. Convenience stores as well as finance and insurance professional services are allowed. Staff evaluates the purpose statement with the proposed uses. Some uses not allowed in a Business Park are health and personal care, real estate services, travel services and general sales and service. Staff believes that there is enough range not to say that the Comprehensive Plan supports a use, but rather that the Comprehensive Plan and previous implementations do not preclude a review of the use with the community, not overtly in opposition to the purpose statement. The process is not perfect. Vice Chair Nichols stated that Business Park, Manufacturing Park and Industry zones do not specifically rule out uses but Neighborhood Commercial 2 does. Ms. Mesa-Zendt replied that a business should be one that will be utilized by most of the households in the neighborhood and examples of various appropriate uses in the different zones were described. There is no category for specialty grocery stores such as PCC Community Market, which might draw from the neighborhood but also the larger community. Another example is that Trader Joes or Whole Foods, stores that customers will drive to from another City, would be captured in current Neighborhood Commercial 2 language. The focus is if most households in the neighborhood will use the business on a regular basis. Vice Chair Nichols stated that in Business Park areas, in example, dance studios and gymnastics academies have been allowed although not intended to serve employees and residents in the immediate area. Ms. Mesa-Zendt replied that staff examines purpose statements and determinations have been open to interpretation. Decisions are not always consistent. Vice Chair Nichols stated being satisfied with the response.

Chairman Captain stated that Business Parks look very different now compared to decades ago and there is generally a degree of flexibility from the view of a layperson; the same flexibility should be given to a Neighborhood Commercial zone. Chairman Captain stated being satisfied to close the issue.

Chairman Captain continued with Issue 1B. Operating Hours have been submitted and the Commissioners were asked if there were further questions or comments.

Ms. Mesa-Zendt asked if the Commissioners remotely participating agree with closing both Issue 1A and 1B. Chairman Captain asked if Ms. Frey would be reading responses from the remote Commissioners choosing to add comments or questions. Ms. Frey replied that the remote Commissioners were in a live chat and comments can be read, but the Commissioners can also unmute if further participation is desired. Chairman Captain asked for confirmation that the remote Commissioners were hearing and watching the meeting and Ms. Frey replied yes, the remote Commissioners are aware that they can speak. Commissioner Varadharajan subsequently submitted a comment that there were no questions regarding Issues 1A or 1B.

Chairman Captain closed both Issue 1A and Issue 2B.

Chairman Captain moved to Issue 1C. Commissioner Varadharajan was satisfied with the response and the Issue was closed via email and verbal agreement on March 10, 2020.

Chairman Captain continued to Issue 1D. Commissioner Varadharajan was satisfied with the response and the Issue was closed via email and verbal agreement on March 10, 2020.
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Chairman Captain continued with Issue 1F. Commissioner Varadharajan was satisfied with the response and the Issue was closed via email and verbal agreement on March 10, 2020.

Chairman Captain stated that Issue 2A and Issue 2B would be skipped, remaining open for further discussion and Commissioner Knopf agreed.

Chairman Captain continued to Issue 2C. Commissioner Varadharajan was satisfied with the response and the Issue was closed via email and verbal agreement as of March 10, 2020.

Chairman Captain continued with Issue 3A. Commissioner Varadharajan was satisfied with the response and the Issue was closed via email and verbal agreement as of March 10, 2020.

Chairman Captain continued to Issue 3B. Commissioner Varadharajan was satisfied with the response and the Issue was closed via email and verbal agreement as of March 10, 2020.

Chairman Captain continued with Issue 3C. Commissioner Varadharajan was satisfied with the response and the Issue was closed via email and verbal agreement as of March 10, 2020.

Chairman Captain continued to Issue 3D. Commissioner Varadharajan was satisfied with the response and the Issue was closed via email and verbal agreement as of March 10, 2020.

Chairman Captain continued with Issue 3E. Commissioner Varadharajan was satisfied with the response and the Issue was closed via email and verbal agreement as of March 10, 2020.

Ms. Mesa-Zendt explained that mis-lettering had occurred in Issue 3F. Commissioner Varadharajan was satisfied with the response but the Issue had not been closed yet to confirm the Issue was in fact what Commissioner Varadharajan wished to close. Chairman Captain stated that the Issue would be revisited.

Ms. Frey stated that Commissioner Rajpathak had asked a question regarding Issue 1A, if there are other instances of a retail marijuana business in a Neighborhood Commercial zone 1 or 2 in Redmond. Ms. Mesa-Zendt replied no. Chairman Captain stated that Issue 1A would remain closed.

Chairman Captain continued to the last item, Issue 5, a process question. Commissioner Varadharajan was satisfied with the response and the Issue was closed via email verbal agreement on March 10, 2020.

Chairman Captain asked if the Commissioners both present and online were comfortable with progress so far. All replied yes.

Chairman Captain returned to Issue 2A. Mr. Knopf was satisfied with the response and the Issue was closed.
Ms. Frey stated that Commissioner Rajpathak had typed a comment, Pier 67 is back on docket. Chairman Captain replied yes, a carryover. Ms. Frey asked Commissioner Rajpathak to unmute in order to ask a question. Commissioner Rajpathak stated that Pier 67 may not be a good precedent for Issue 2A. Chairman Captain replied that Pier 67 proposal was submitted for docket consideration by the Commission; the Council recommended the proposal be included on the docket. Issue 2A asked for clarifications regarding a comparison. Commissioner Knopf was satisfied with the response. Vice Chair Nichols replied that Pier 67 was not a precedent and that the proposal is being evaluated by threshold criteria only at this time. Chairman Captain asked Commissioner Rajpathak if Issue 2A could be closed, and Commissioner Rajpathak replied yes.

Chairman Captain asked if Issue 2B had been a follow-up, and Ms. Mesa-Zendt replied yes and that the item had been added by Chairman Captain. Chairman Captain stated being satisfied with the response. Today the applicant has submitted new information for review, but the Issue should remain open to the next meeting so that the information can be evaluated. Commissioner Rajpathak asked how the new information applies to the Issue and Chairman Captain replied that since the new material had just been submitted by the applicant this evening and there is not sufficient time for it to be reviewed by the Commissioners, it has been the Chairman’s practice not to take action on new material received that very same evening.

Ms. Frey asked Commissioner Varadharajan to unmute in order to ask a question. Commissioner Varadharajan asked if the new material would be shared with the Commissioners after the meeting. Ms. Mesa-Zendt replied that the information would be scanned and emailed.

Chairman Captain revisited Issue 3F. Commissioner Varadharajan was satisfied with the response and the Issue was closed.

Chairman Captain continued to Issue 3G. Commissioner Varadharajan was satisfied with the response and the Issue was closed.

Chairman Captain moved to Issue 4A. Commissioner Varadharajan stated that the Issue may need to be revisited but not during this process. The Issue was closed.

Chairman Captain stated that all Issues had been closed except for Issue 2B, and the information submitted today would be shared with the Commissioners. Commissioner Knopf asked if the new information was regarding increasing density on the Milano property. Chairman Captain replied that staff would review the new information and forward an opinion while the Commissioners are reading the new information personally. Ms. Mesa-Zendt stated that the applicant, who was present, can be asked for clarification regarding a change. Chairman Captain stated to Commissioner Knopf that discussions with applicants are not conducted by the Commission but if clarification is required directly, the question could be asked and the applicant can answer at the microphone. Mr. Knopf asked the applicant if the new proposal was to increase the density on the site from R12 to R20. Mr. Khorram replied that if R20 would be allowed, some market units could be increased to affordable units. Chairman Captain stated that the project would continue to be discussed at the next meeting, March 25, 2020. Commissioner Knopf was satisfied with the answer.
Chairman Captain asked the Commissioners if there were any additions to the Issues Matrix and the Commissioners replied no. Chairman Captain closed oral testimony while leaving written testimony open until March 25, 2020.

**Staff and Commissioner Updates**

Ms. Frey stated that there had been a request to clarify the new reappointment process. There are three seats on the Planning Commission set to expire and the office of the City Clerk has informed staff that everyone in a seat can choose to continue in the seat until the new process for reappointments is settled. A Commissioner can choose to vacate a seat at the end of a term but remaining in the seat until the process is final is valid as well. All Commissioners have reapplied. When the process will be completed is uncertain at this time.

The March 25, 2020 Annual Meeting is postponed but the extended Agenda will be amended to include the meeting regarding the Comprehensive Plan Annual Docket for that date. Remote access will be available. Instructions regarding online participation were emailed to Commissioners today. Ms. Mesa-Zendt stated that general guidance is that if work under review is tied to future Council action, this should continue. As the Planning Commission is a State-required body for review, meetings will continue.

Commissioner Varadharajan stated that the ability to participate online is going great. Chairman Captain stated that the mute option for online Commissioners worked well.

Vice Chair Nichols stated that the Sound Transit Open House will be rescheduled, and that Planning Commission badges should be worn when attending. Ms. Frey stated that if Commissioners would like to attend other community events, staff should be emailed so that a possible quorum can be advertised as present but for no action.

**ADJOURNMENT:**

MOTION to adjourn by Vice Chair Nichols. MOTION seconded by Commissioner Shefrin. The MOTION passed unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 8:08 p.m.

---

Minutes Approved On:  
Planning Commission Chair

__________________________  ________________________________
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