



# PLANNING COMMISSION REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION TO CITY COUNCIL

June 24, 2026

<b>Annual Docket Year:</b>	<b>2026-2027</b>	
<b>Staff Contact:</b>	Glenn B. Coil, Sr. Planner	425.556.2742

## FINDINGS OF FACT

### Public Hearing and Notice

#### a. Planning Commission Study Session and Public Hearing Dates

- I. The Planning Commission held study sessions on May 27 and June 10, 2026.
- II. The Planning Commission held a public hearing on adding proposed amendments to the 2026-2027 annual docket of Comprehensive Plan amendments on June 10, 2026, and continued the hearing to June 24, 2026 for written comments. Public comments received for the public hearing are summarized in Attachments C and E. The Planning Commission closed the public hearing on June 24, 2026.

#### b. Notice and Public Involvement

The public hearing notice (Attachment D) was published in the Seattle Times on May 20, 2026, in accordance with RZC 21.76.080 Review Procedures - Notices. Notice was also provided by including the hearing schedule in the City's public hearing notice webpage, Planning Commission agendas and extended agendas, and distributed by email to various members of the public and various agencies.

### Annual Comprehensive Plan Amendment Docket Application Summary and Criteria Evaluation

Title	Description
<b>Stormwater and Surface Water Systems Plan</b>	Adopt the functional plan by reference into the Capital Facilities element in order to fulfill GMA requirements for capital facilities planning, and the City's capital facilities policies CF 1, CF 2, & CF-3.
<b>MP, BP, and Industrial Policies and Regulations</b>	<p>Revise land use policies and the future land use map related to Business Park (BP) and Manufacturing Park (MP) land use designations to advance Redmond 2050 policies for economic vitality and diversity and to support policy direction for the Southeast Redmond manufacturing and industrial centers.</p> <p>Concurrently revise the zoning map and zone-based regulations to implement the above policy changes.</p>

<b>Neighborhood Planning</b>	Update citywide neighborhoods policies to align with Redmond 2050 and advance complete neighborhoods.
<b>Repeal Neighborhood Connections maps</b>	Repeal Neighborhood Connections Maps in the Neighborhoods Element of the Comp Plan. These duplicate the adopted maps in the Transportation Master Plan (TMP). The maps in the TMP were more recently vetted, with infeasible connections removed.
<b>Transportation Facilities Plan (TFP) update</b>	Update TFP project list per GMA requirements for capital facilities and transportation planning.

The proposed amendments meet the criteria to be included in the annual docket as summarized below and shown in Attachment A.

Criteria	Stormwater and Surface Water Systems Plan	Land Use/Zoning Maps Amendment – Industrial Consolidation	N’hood Planning	Repeal N’hood Connections Maps	Transportation Facilities Plan (TFP) update
a. Appropriate mechanism	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Meets</b>
b. Appropriate to individually docket	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Meets</b>
c. Consistent with law, policy	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Meets</b>
d. Adequate resources	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Meets</b>
e. Community interests, changed conditions	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Meets</b>
f. Not considered, rejected in last two years	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Meets</b>	<b>Meets</b>

## RECOMMENDED CONCLUSIONS

The Planning Commission has reviewed:

- *Docketing Threshold Criteria Analysis (Attachment A)*
- *Cumulative Effects Analysis (Attachment B)*
- *Public Comments (Attachment C)*

### Recommendation

The Planning Commission concludes that the following annual docket applications are **consistent with the threshold criteria set forth in RZC 21.76.070.J.6 Threshold Criteria** and recommends that they be added to the 2026-27 Annual Docket of Comprehensive Plan Amendments.

- Stormwater and Surface Water Systems Plan
- MP, BP, and Industrial Policies and Regulations
- Neighborhood Planning
- Repeal Neighborhood Connections maps
- Transportation Facilities Plan (TFP) update

## REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY THE PLANNING COMMISSION



---

Carol Helland  
Planning and Community Development Director



---

Susan Weston  
Planning Commission Chair

### Attachments

- A. Docketing Threshold Criteria Analysis
- B. Cumulative Effects Analysis
- C. Public Comments
- D. Public Hearing Notice
- E. Planning Commission Public Hearing Minutes

## 2026-27 Annual Docket of Comprehensive Plan Amendments

### Docketing Threshold Criteria

The following threshold decision criteria per [RZC 21.76.070.J.6](#) will be used in determining which proposed Comprehensive Plan amendments will receive further consideration in a given docket cycle.

Proposed Amendment: **Stormwater and Surface Water Systems Plan**

Criteria	Staff Evaluation Meets/Does Not meet	Notes
a. Amending the Comprehensive Plan is the most appropriate mechanism available, as the desired outcome cannot be addressed as a regulatory or budgetary process, or by a work program approved by City Council.	Meets	This functional plan is intended to be adopted into the Redmond 2050 Comp Plan – capital facilities element - by reference to fulfill GMA requirements for stormwater/surface water capital facilities planning.
b. The proposed amendment is best addressed as an individually docketed item, instead of evaluated as part of a periodic update to Redmond’s Comprehensive Plan, neighborhood plan update, or other planning processes such as those led by regional or state agencies.	Meets	The SWSW Systems was originally intended to be adopted as part of Redmond 2050, but due to delays, will need to be included on an annual docket in order to be adopted into the Comp Plan.
c. The proposed amendment is consistent with policy implementation in the King County Countywide Planning Policies, the Growth Management Act, other state or federal law, and the Washington Administrative Code.	Meets	Yes, is consistent with GMA requirements for capital facilities, and King Co CPPs around stormwater management and environmental protection.
d. The proposed amendment can be reasonably reviewed within the staffing resources and operational budget allocated to the Department. In making this	Meets	The SSWS Plan was budgeted for in previous City budgets. The Plan used consultant services to ensure the Utility had the capacity to complete the work.

**2026-27 Annual Docket of Comprehensive Plan Amendments**

Criteria	Staff Evaluation Meets/Does Not meet	Notes
<p>determination the following shall be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The amount of research and analysis needed to develop the proposal;</li> <li>ii. The potential for the proposal to impact multiple sections of the Comprehensive Plan and or zoning code;</li> <li>iii. The amount of public engagement needed to fully develop the amendments; and</li> <li>iv. If consultant support would be needed to fully develop the proposal.</li> </ul>		
<p>e. The proposed amendment addresses the interests and changed conditions of the entire City as identified in its long-range planning and policy documents and is compatible with the overall vision and goals of the Comprehensive Plan.</p>	Meets	This is a functional plan as defined by the GMA acts. It identifies how the City's stormwater utility will meet growth as detailed in the Redmond2050 Comprehensive Plan.
<p>f. The proposed amendment or similar amendment has not been considered or rejected within the last two years.</p>	Meets	

**2026-27 Annual Docket of Comprehensive Plan Amendments**

Proposed Amendment: **Land Use/Zoning Maps Amendment - Industrial Consolidation**

Criteria	Staff Evaluation Meets/Does Not meet	Notes
<p>a. Amending the Comprehensive Plan is the most appropriate mechanism available, as the desired outcome cannot be addressed as a regulatory or budgetary process, or by a work program approved by City Council.</p>	Meets	Updating the Land Use and Zoning Map are the most appropriate mechanism available to achieve industrial consolidation to protect industrial and manufacturing lands and jobs from the pressure of commercial retail and housing.
<p>b. The proposed amendment is best addressed as an individually docketed item, instead of evaluated as part of a periodic update to Redmond’s Comprehensive Plan, neighborhood plan update, or other planning processes such as those led by regional or state agencies.</p>	Meets	The timeline for implementing this is time sensitive to changes by the state legislature that will goes into effect in 2028.
<p>c. The proposed amendment is consistent with policy implementation in the King County Countywide Planning Policies, the Growth Management Act, other state or federal law, and the Washington Administrative Code.</p>	Meets	King County Countywide Planning Policies that are consistent with the proposed amendments include: EC-22, EC-23, and DP-2
<p>d. The proposed amendment can be reasonably reviewed within the staffing resources and operational budget allocated to the Department. In making this determination the following shall be considered:</p> <p>i. The amount of research and analysis needed to develop the proposal;</p>	Meets	The Proposed amendment will be accounted for in the long-range planning work plan and budget.

**2026-27 Annual Docket of Comprehensive Plan Amendments**

Criteria	Staff Evaluation Meets/Does Not meet	Notes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ii. The potential for the proposal to impact multiple sections of the Comprehensive Plan and or zoning code;</li> <li>iii. The amount of public engagement needed to fully develop the amendments; and</li> <li>iv. If consultant support would be needed to fully develop the proposal.</li> </ul>		
<p>e. The proposed amendment addresses the interests and changed conditions of the entire City as identified in its long-range planning and policy documents and is compatible with the overall vision and goals of the Comprehensive Plan.</p>	Meets	The proposed amendments will respond to pressure to redevelop industrial land for retail and housing. It is compatible with the vision established in Redmond 2050.
<p>f. The proposed amendment or similar amendment has not been considered or rejected within the last two years.</p>	Meets	

**2026-27 Annual Docket of Comprehensive Plan Amendments**

Proposed Amendment: **Neighborhood Planning**

Criteria	Staff Evaluation Meets/Does Not meet	Notes
<p>a. Amending the Comprehensive Plan is the most appropriate mechanism available, as the desired outcome cannot be addressed as a regulatory or budgetary process, or by a work program approved by City Council.</p>	Meets	Neighborhood Planning process and neighborhood polices are currently in the comprehensive plan and need to be updated to reflect Redmond 2050 polices and process.
<p>b. The proposed amendment is best addressed as an individually docketed item, instead of evaluated as part of a periodic update to Redmond's Comprehensive Plan, neighborhood plan update, or other planning processes such as those led by regional or state agencies.</p>	Meets	Neighborhood planning could have been adopted as part of Redmond 2050, but due to workload will need to be included on an annual docket to be adopted into the Comp Plan.
<p>c. The proposed amendment is consistent with policy implementation in the King County Countywide Planning Policies, the Growth Management Act, other state or federal law, and the Washington Administrative Code.</p>	Meets	King County Countywide Planning Policies that are consistent with the proposed amendments include: DP-40, H-18, EC-14, and H3. PSRC Vision 2050 polices that are consistent with the proposed amendments include: MPP-DP-4
<p>d. The proposed amendment can be reasonably reviewed within the staffing resources and operational budget allocated to the Department. In making this determination the following shall be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The amount of research and analysis needed to develop the proposal;</li> <li>ii. The potential for the proposal to impact multiple sections of</li> </ul>	Meets	The proposed amendment can be reasonably reviewed within the staffing resources and operational budget allocated to the Department. There is allocated staff time for research, drafting, and community engagement. There is additional budget to help fund community engagement and sufficient staff resources to fully develop the proposal.

**2026-27 Annual Docket of Comprehensive Plan Amendments**

Criteria	Staff Evaluation Meets/Does Not meet	Notes
<p>the Comprehensive Plan and or zoning code;</p> <p>iii. The amount of public engagement needed to fully develop the amendments; and</p> <p>iv. If consultant support would be needed to fully develop the proposal.</p>		
<p>e. The proposed amendment addresses the interests and changed conditions of the entire City as identified in its long-range planning and policy documents and is compatible with the overall vision and goals of the Comprehensive Plan.</p>	Meets	<p>Updating neighborhood polices addresses the interests and changed conditions resulting from the Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan and process. The neighborhood planning policies will be focused on implementation of Redmond 2050 in neighborhoods.</p>
<p>f. The proposed amendment or similar amendment has not been considered or rejected within the last two years.</p>	Meets	

**2026-27 Annual Docket of Comprehensive Plan Amendments**

Proposed Amendment: **Repeal Neighborhood Connections maps**

Criteria	Staff Evaluation Meets/Does Not meet	Notes
<p>a. Amending the Comprehensive Plan is the most appropriate mechanism available, as the desired outcome cannot be addressed as a regulatory or budgetary process, or by a work program approved by City Council.</p>	Meets	Repealing the Comp Plan maps streamlines and updates available information to the most recently adopted map in the Transportation Master Plan (TMP).
<p>b. The proposed amendment is best addressed as an individually docketed item, instead of evaluated as part of a periodic update to Redmond’s Comprehensive Plan, neighborhood plan update, or other planning processes such as those led by regional or state agencies.</p>	Meets	The TMP was adopted in February 2026. Repealing the Comp Plan maps aligns the Redmond 2050 Plan with more recently adopted materials.
<p>c. The proposed amendment is consistent with policy implementation in the King County Countywide Planning Policies, the Growth Management Act, other state or federal law, and the Washington Administrative Code.</p>	Meets	The Neighborhood Connections map promotes Redmond’s pedestrian network and offers multimodal transportation options.
<p>d. The proposed amendment can be reasonably reviewed within the staffing resources and operational budget allocated to the Department. In making this determination the following shall be considered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. The amount of research and analysis needed to develop the proposal;</li> <li>ii. The potential for the proposal to impact multiple sections of</li> </ul>	Meets	The TMP already completed extensive public engagement that built upon the work done for Redmond 2050. The Neighborhood Connections map in the TMP reflects feedback from these efforts.

**2026-27 Annual Docket of Comprehensive Plan Amendments**

Criteria	Staff Evaluation Meets/Does Not meet	Notes
<p>the Comprehensive Plan and or zoning code;</p> <p>iii. The amount of public engagement needed to fully develop the amendments; and</p> <p>iv. If consultant support would be needed to fully develop the proposal.</p>		
<p>e. The proposed amendment addresses the interests and changed conditions of the entire City as identified in its long-range planning and policy documents and is compatible with the overall vision and goals of the Comprehensive Plan.</p>	Meets	<p>The updated Neighborhood Connections map in the TMP promotes Redmond 2050 policies for safe and sustainable multimodal travel that reduces vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions.</p>
<p>f. The proposed amendment or similar amendment has not been considered or rejected within the last two years.</p>	Meets	

## 2026-27 Annual Docket of Comprehensive Plan Amendments

### Proposed Amendment: **Transportation Facilities Plan (TFP) Update**

Criteria	Staff Evaluation Meets/Does Not meet	Notes
a. Amending the Comprehensive Plan is the most appropriate mechanism available, as the desired outcome cannot be addressed as a regulatory or budgetary process, or by a work program approved by City Council.	Meets	Updating the TFP projects is most appropriate as an amendment as the TFP is an appendix to the Transportation Master Plan, which is adopted by reference into the Redmond 2050 Comp Plan and these updates will align with community priorities.
b. The proposed amendment is best addressed as an individually docketed item, instead of evaluated as part of a periodic update to Redmond's Comprehensive Plan, neighborhood plan update, or other planning processes such as those led by regional or state agencies.	Meets	Updating the TFP projects is most appropriate as an amendment as the TFP is an appendix to the Transportation Master Plan and these updates will align with community priorities. Delay in including/revising these projects would jeopardize funding and inclusion in the construction program in the City's Capital Improvement Program (CIP).
c. The proposed amendment is consistent with policy implementation in the King County Countywide Planning Policies, the Growth Management Act, other state or federal law, and the Washington Administrative Code.	Meets	The updated TFP projects promote Redmond's pedestrian and bicycle network and offers multimodal transportation options.
d. The proposed amendment can be reasonably reviewed within the staffing resources and operational budget allocated to the Department. In making this determination the following shall be considered:  i. The amount of research and analysis needed to develop the proposal;  ii. The potential for the proposal to impact multiple sections of	Meets	The TMP already completed extensive public engagement that built upon the work done for Redmond 2050. The updated TFP projects in the TMP Appendix reflects feedback from these efforts.

**2026-27 Annual Docket of Comprehensive Plan Amendments**

Criteria	Staff Evaluation Meets/Does Not meet	Notes
<p>the Comprehensive Plan and or zoning code;</p> <p>iii. The amount of public engagement needed to fully develop the amendments; and</p> <p>iv. If consultant support would be needed to fully develop the proposal.</p>		
<p>e. The proposed amendment addresses the interests and changed conditions of the entire City as identified in its long-range planning and policy documents and is compatible with the overall vision and goals of the Comprehensive Plan.</p>	Meets	Updating these shared-use path projects in the TFP promotes Redmond 2050 policies for safe and sustainable multimodal travel that reduces vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions.
<p>f. The proposed amendment or similar amendment has not been considered or rejected within the last two years.</p>	Meets	

**2026-27 Annual Docket of Comprehensive Plan Amendments**

Proposed Amendment: **Housing Incentives**

Criteria	Staff Evaluation Meets/Does Not meet	Notes
<p>a. Amending the Comprehensive Plan is the most appropriate mechanism available, as the desired outcome cannot be addressed as a regulatory or budgetary process, or by a work program approved by City Council.</p>	<p>Does not meet</p>	<p>Specific comprehensive plan policies have not been identified that could be amended or added to support the proposed zoning code amendments.</p> <p>Staff does not find that a Comprehensive Plan amendment is necessary to address the displacement concerns that were raised by the public. The Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan includes strong policies related to equity, housing stability, and displacement prevention, including Policy HO-1 in the Housing Element. These policies provide high-level guidance. Implementation occurs through regulations and programs adopted by the City.</p>
<p>b. The proposed amendment is best addressed as an individually docketed item, instead of evaluated as part of a periodic update to Redmond’s Comprehensive Plan, neighborhood plan update, or other planning processes such as those led by regional or state agencies.</p>	<p>Does not meet</p>	<p>The issues raised would be best addressed through the city’s existing programs and policies. It should be noted that the City of Redmond does not build housing. Instead, it adopts regulations and processes that allow development to occur. Mandatory Inclusionary Zoning and the voluntary Multifamily Property Tax Exemption program require or incentivize a portion of units in new developments to be income-restricted and affordable. These programs can be reviewed to better support the goals of affordable housing. Amending the Comprehensive Plan would not address these specific concerns</p>

**2026-27 Annual Docket of Comprehensive Plan Amendments**

Criteria	Staff Evaluation Meets/Does Not meet	Notes
		around displacement as it serves as a high-level policy document.
c. The proposed amendment is consistent with policy implementation in the King County Countywide Planning Policies, the Growth Management Act, other state or federal law, and the Washington Administrative Code.	Does not meet	Although the intention of this proposal is supported by anti-displacement policies, it is not consistent with policies around increasing housing supply. Amended or new policies and regulations supporting the proposal might have the opposite intended effect, decreasing housing supply in Redmond, and further driving up the costs of existing housing supply.
d. The proposed amendment can be reasonably reviewed within the staffing resources and operational budget allocated to the Department. In making this determination the following shall be considered:  i. The amount of research and analysis needed to develop the proposal;  ii. The potential for the proposal to impact multiple sections of the Comprehensive Plan and or zoning code;  iii. The amount of public engagement needed to fully develop the amendments; and  iv. If consultant support would be needed to fully develop the proposal.	Does not meet	This proposal does not identify a specific comprehensive plan policy amendment, and staff did not identify any that could support this proposal.  This proposal would need significant staff resources to identify the impacts - both benefits and costs. This would be better evaluated during a periodic comprehensive plan update, or during updates to strategic documents, such as the Housing Action Plan.
e. The proposed amendment addresses the interests and changed conditions of the entire City as identified in its long-range planning and policy documents and is compatible with the overall	Does not meet	The issues raised were evaluated and addressed in updated policies in the Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan, which was adopted in Nov. 2024. The conditions related to housing

**2026-27 Annual Docket of Comprehensive Plan Amendments**

Criteria	Staff Evaluation Meets/Does Not meet	Notes
vision and goals of the Comprehensive Plan.		displacement have not changed since this update.
f. The proposed amendment or similar amendment has not been considered or rejected within the last two years.	Meets	There has not been a proposal to modify housing policies since the Redmond 2050 Comp Plan was adopted.

Attachment B : Analysis of the Cumulative Effects of Amendments on the 2026-27 Comprehensive Plan Docket

Project File No.	Amendment Name	Relationship 1:	Relationship 2:	Relationship 3:	Relationship 4:	Relationship 5:	Cumulative Effects of 2026-27 Docket
		Economic Vitality	Housing	Utilities	Land Use	Critical Areas/Natural Environment	
LAND-2026-00282 SEPA-2020-00934	Stormwater and Surface Water Systems Plan	Will be consistent with and support the City's economic vitality goals and policies, including EV-3 and EV-13.	Strategies and projects identified will help support the city's housing goals.	This plan will provide a long-term strategy and CIP project list that will be implemented to support the stormwater utility.	No impacts on land uses. The SWSWP does not propose land use changes or changes to land use designations.	The SWSWSP will identify strategies and projects that help support the protection and enhancement of critical areas.	
LAND-2026-00140 SEPA-2026-00139	MP, BP, and Industrial Policies and Regulations	Final actions are intended to preserve, protect, and support jobs and businesses in Redmond as well as be consistent with EV-30 (maintaining MP zones).	Updated policies are intended to support both of the City's goals for jobs and housing.	Potential land use and zoning map changes could result in a need to review and update utility functional plans.	This proposal is intended to study land use policies in these zones and provide recommendations that may result in changes to land use policies and the land use map while advancing the overall Redmond 2050 land use vision.	This proposal will consider the impacts to critical areas, such as the critical aquifer recharge areas (CARA). The MP, BP and I zones in SE Redmond are within the CARA.	
LAND-2026-00152 SEPA-2026-00153	Neighborhood Planning	Updated neighborhood policies are intended to support the City's economic vitality goals and policies, especially around complete neighborhoods.	To be determined. Updated neighborhood policies are intended to support the City's housing goals and policies while advancing complete neighborhoods.	Updates to policies and, in the future, zoning, may require an evaluation of utility plans to ensure adequate levels of service.	Updated policies may result in updates to the City's land use policies and map, principally to advance complete neighborhoods.	This proposal will consider impacts to the natural environment and critical areas.	
LAND-2026-00135 SEPA-2026-00136	Repeal Neighborhood Connections maps	N/A - This is a technical amendment to ensure consistency between the Comprehensive Plan and the Transportation Master Plan (which is adopted by reference into the Comp Plan).	N/A - This is a technical amendment to ensure consistency between the Comprehensive Plan and the Transportation Master Plan (which is adopted by reference into the Comp Plan).	N/A - This is a technical amendment to ensure consistency between the Comprehensive Plan and the Transportation Master Plan (which is adopted by reference into the Comp Plan).	N/A - This is a technical amendment to ensure consistency between the Comprehensive Plan and the Transportation Master Plan (which is adopted by reference into the Comp Plan).	N/A - This is a technical amendment to ensure consistency between the Comprehensive Plan and the Transportation Master Plan (which is adopted by reference into the Comp Plan).	
LAND-2026-00154 SEPA-2026-00155	Transportation Facilities Plan (TFP) update	Although this amendment is technical in nature and is intended to add projects that were unintentionally not included in the adopted Transportation Facilities Plan (part of the TMP update), timely inclusion of these projects will ensure they support proposed development projects. This proposal adds shared- used path projects that are shown in studies to have economic benefits.	These transportation projects support the city's overall goal of having a walkable community.	Adding these projects will ensure that the City's Capital Investment Strategy is up to date and ensures coordination amongst the functional areas.	Inclusion of these projects supports implementation of the City's land use policies.	The proposed projects include shared used paths, which are intended to support the natural environment by reducing the use of automobiles and their associated impacts (such as greenhouse gas and other emissions) to critical areas.	
<b>Cumulative Effects of Amendments and Relationships</b>		Proposals cumulatively support the city's economic vitality goals.	Proposals cumulatively support the city's housing goals.	Projects do not have any identified impact on the provision of utility services, and help enhance the city's levels-of-service by proposing new capital projects consistent with the city's vision and goals. Changes to the land use and zoning maps may require an evaluation of existing functional plans to ensure capital projects are aligned.	Proposals may lead to updated policies and map boundaries for neighborhood zones and job-producing zones.	Proposals cumulatively support the city's natural environment goals.	

## **Introduction**

I'm writing in **support of including** the [Stormwater and Surface Water Systems Plan \(SSWSP\)](#) in the [2026-2027 Annual Docket of Comprehensive Plan Amendments](#). I've spoken to the Planning Commission and the City Council about **nine gaps** in Redmond's water management programs (see below). The delayed adoption of the SSWSP is one of the most consequential of those gaps, and I strongly **support** the [City-initiated application to adopt it by reference into the Capital Facilities element of Redmond 2050](#).

## **Why the SSWSP Is Urgently Needed**

The SSWSP is Redmond's primary planning vehicle for [preventing flooding, reducing stormwater pollution, restoring stream and lake habitat](#), and guiding capital investment in surface water infrastructure. According to the [City's project page](#), the plan is being developed "[to guide actions to reduce and prevent flooding, protect and restore natural habitat, keep pollutants away from fish and wildlife, protect our drinking water aquifer, and keep our lake, river, and streams healthy for everyone to enjoy](#)."

Without an adopted SSWSP, the city lacks updated level-of-service standards for stormwater, a formally adopted capital project list, and a prioritized framework for directing growth-related infrastructure investments consistent with Redmond 2050. Redmond 2050 concentrates significant residential and commercial growth in Downtown and Overlake — areas already served by aging stormwater infrastructure and directly upstream of sensitive receiving waters including the Sammamish River, Bear Creek, Evans Creek, and Lake Sammamish.

## **The Current Timeline and the Role of the Annual Docket**

[The SSWSP was originally intended to be adopted as part of Redmond 2050](#) in November 2024. The City's updated [project timeline](#) now calls for a public draft in Summer 2026, Planning Commission review in Q1 2027, and City Council adoption in Q1-Q2 2027. As the [docketing threshold criteria analysis](#) correctly notes, the SSWSP will need to be included on an annual docket in order to be adopted into the Comprehensive Plan. Including it in the 2026-2027 docket is therefore the right and necessary step to keep the plan on its current adoption trajectory. I urge the Commission to **recommend without delay that the City Council include the SSWSP in the docket**.

## **Climate Considerations**

I urge the Commission to ensure that the final SSWSP explicitly incorporates climate-change scenario modeling. [Washington has experienced four consecutive drought emergencies](#), and the Pacific Northwest is projected to face [more intense precipitation events](#) alongside [drier summers](#). Level-of-service standards and capital project priorities based solely on historical rainfall data will be inadequate for the 20- and 30-year planning horizon that Redmond 2050 requires. The **SSWSP should model future climate conditions, not just past ones**.

## **Integration with Other Water Programs**

Finally, I encourage the Commission to consider whether the SSWSP, once adopted, should be explicitly linked to Redmond's other water management plans — particularly the [Water System Plan](#), the [General Wastewater Plan](#), and the [Groundwater Management Area Plan](#). [Redmond 2050 calls for environmental sustainability](#). A truly [sustainable water future](#) requires these plans to speak to one another, not operate in isolation. The SSWSP is an opportunity to begin building that integration.

## **Conclusion**

I strongly **support including the SSWSP in the 2026-2027 Annual Docket**, and I urge the Planning Commission to recommend it to City Council without delay. I also urge the Commission to ensure that the adopted plan is climate-informed, equity-conscious, and explicitly connected to Redmond's broader [One Water](#) resource management goals.

---

I want to talk about **nine gaps** between Redmond's current water management programs and the goals and **vision of Redmond 2050**.

Redmond has genuine strengths to build on. Your **Critical Aquifer Recharge Area protections** are among the most rigorous in the state, backed by decades of **groundwater monitoring**. Redmond's **General Wastewater Plan** was updated in 2024 to reflect Redmond 2050 growth projections. And the new **Stormwater and Surface Water Systems Plan** will reflect a commitment to healthier streams and lakes for the entire community.

But a review of Redmond's plans\* across five water domains — potable water, wastewater, stormwater, groundwater, and surface water — reveals **nine significant gaps** that deserve attention.

Five of these are **critical**:

**First**, Redmond has **no water reuse or recycled water program** — no framework to distribute reclaimed water for non-potable uses like irrigation or industrial cooling.

**Second**, there's a **limited graywater reuse policy** — limited ways for dense new development in Downtown or Overlake to reuse sink and shower water on-site.

**Third**, the **Stormwater and Surface Water Systems Plan**, though urgently needed, has **not yet been adopted, funded, or released for public review**.

**Fourth**, Redmond has **no formal One Water governance structure**. Your water utilities and programs operate in separate silos, with no unified resource plan, shared metrics, or joint capital investment strategy.

**Fifth**, Redmond's **Water Shortage Response Plan**, which was last updated in 2016, is seriously outdated. It consists largely of deferred references to **Cascade Water Alliance** and **Seattle Public Utilities** plans, contains no independent local triggers or demand reduction targets, and was written before **Washington experienced four consecutive drought emergencies**. It urgently needs a climate-informed update.

There are four additional major gaps:

1. Full **dependence on King County for wastewater treatment** limits your ability to pursue reuse opportunities;
2. Intensifying development in your **Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas** threatens groundwater quality and replenishment with no managed recharge program to offset it;
3. Your citywide **Watershed Management Plan** is thirteen years old and predates Redmond 2050;
4. And you lack a formal **Water Conservation Plan** with binding demand-reduction targets.

**Redmond 2050 sets ambitious sustainability goals**. Closing these nine gaps — particularly through an integrated **One Water governance framework** — is how you make those goals real. Please prioritize this work.

\*The documents, plans, policies, programs, and agreements that were reviewed include:

### **Potable Water**

1. [City of Redmond 2024 Water System Plan](#)
2. [A Resolution of the Board of Directors of the Cascade Water Alliance Regarding Wholesale Water Supply Contract Negotiations](#) and [Resolution No. 2025-01](#)
3. Redmond's [groundwater wells](#)
4. [Distribution & quality operations](#)
5. [Water conservation](#)

### **Wastewater**

6. [General Wastewater Plan \(GWP\) – 2024 update](#)
7. [King County wastewater treatment partnership](#)

### **Stormwater**

8. [Stormwater & Surface Water Systems Plan \(SSWSP\)](#)
9. [NPDES Phase II Municipal Stormwater Permit](#)
10. [Stormwater Management](#)
11. [Private Stormwater Inspection Program](#)
12. [Stormwater utility & rate structure](#)

### **Groundwater**

13. [Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas \(CARA I & II\)](#)
14. [Temporary Construction Dewatering](#)
15. [Wellhead Protection Program](#)
16. [Redmond–Bear Creek Valley Groundwater Management Area Plan](#)
17. [Groundwater Protection Incentive Program](#)

### **Surface Water**

18. [Watershed Management Plan](#)
19. [Streams and habitat restoration program](#)
20. [Shoreline Master Program](#)
21. [WRIA 8 / Bear Creek Watershed partnerships](#)
22. [Comprehensive Flood Hazard Management Plan \(CFHMP\)](#)

RE: Written Public Comment — 2026-2027 Annual Docket of Comprehensive Plan Amendments, submitted by David Morton

Public Hearing: June 10, 2026, 7:00 p.m., Redmond City Hall Council Chambers

Dear Chair and Members of the Redmond Planning Commission,

I take a strong interest in the long-term planning and environmental stewardship of your city. I respectfully submit this written comment for the record in connection with the [June 10, 2026 public hearing on the proposed 2026-2027 Annual Docket of Comprehensive Plan Amendments](#). I offer comments on each of the five proposed docket items below, followed by overarching observations on the docket as a whole.

## **I. STORMWATER AND SURFACE WATER SYSTEMS PLAN**

I **support** adoption of the [Stormwater and Surface Water Systems Plan](#) (SSWSP) by reference into the [Capital Facilities element of the Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan](#). This amendment appropriately fulfills Growth Management Act (GMA) requirements for capital facilities planning and advances the City's capital facilities policies [CF-1](#), [CF-2](#), and [CF-3](#). Incorporating a long-term, financially analyzed infrastructure strategy into the Comprehensive Plan strengthens the City's accountability to its residents and provides meaningful guidance for future capital investment decisions.

I ask the Commission to **ensure the following** as this item proceeds:

- **Environmental Integration:** The plan explicitly commits to identifying strategies and projects that **protect and enhance critical areas**, including [wetlands, Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas, frequently flooded areas, and fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas](#). I urge the Commission to confirm that plan implementation will include enforceable standards and measurable benchmarks, not merely aspirational language.
- **Climate Resilience:** Redmond and the broader Eastside region face **increasing stormwater volumes** and **intensified storm events** attributable to climate change. The plan should reflect current and [projected climate data](#), not solely historical averages, in sizing and prioritizing infrastructure projects.
- **Community Transparency:** As projects are added to the [Capital Improvement / Investment Program \(CIP\)](#) under this plan, the City should ensure that affected neighborhoods receive timely notification and meaningful engagement opportunities prior to construction.

## **II. UPDATE TO MANUFACTURING PARK, BUSINESS PARK, AND INDUSTRIAL LAND USE/ZONING MAPS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS**

I offer **conditional support** for this proposal, which would consolidate Manufacturing Park (MP), Business Park (BP), and Industrial (I) land use designations and create a [range of industrial zones](#). I understand the intent is to preserve and strengthen Redmond's employment land base consistent with [Redmond 2050's economic vitality goals](#) and to provide policy direction for the [Southeast Redmond manufacturing and industrial centers](#).

However, several issues warrant careful attention during the substantive amendment phase:

- **Critical Aquifer Recharge Area (CARA):** The **Cumulative Effects Analysis** acknowledges that **the MP, BP, and Industrial zones in Southeast Redmond fall within a Critical Aquifer Recharge Area**. Any consolidation of land use designations or creation of new industrial zones must rigorously evaluate impacts on groundwater quality and recharge capacity. I ask the Commission to **require that environmental review for this amendment specifically address CARA protection standards**.
- **Community Engagement:** The Southeast Redmond industrial area is adjacent to residential neighborhoods and trails. Changes to land use designations and zoning regulations will affect those communities. I strongly encourage robust and early engagement with nearby residents before final recommendations are made.
- **Economic Diversity:** While preserving industrial and manufacturing lands is a legitimate and important goal, the City should ensure that the revised policies support a genuinely diverse range of employers — including small businesses and light manufacturing — and do not inadvertently favor only large-scale industrial users.

### **III. AMENDMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOODS ELEMENT TO ALIGN WITH REDMOND 2050**

I support updating the **Neighborhoods Element** and related policies to reflect the goals of Redmond 2050. The concept of “**complete neighborhoods**,” where residents can access daily needs within a short walk or bike ride, is central to both environmental sustainability and quality of life. Aligning neighborhood and corridor planning policies with this vision is the right direction for Redmond's growth.

I ask that the Commission keep the following priorities in view as this amendment is developed:

- **Equity and Affordability:** “**Complete neighborhoods**” should mean complete for all residents, regardless of income. Updated policies should explicitly reference the need to preserve affordable housing within walkable mixed-use corridors and **avoid displacement of existing lower-income residents**.
- **Community-Driven Planning:** Neighborhood plans carry meaning precisely because they reflect the voices of the people who live there. I urge the Commission to set a high bar for community engagement in developing neighborhood-specific policies under the revised framework, and to avoid a one-size-fits-all approach that flattens the distinct character of Redmond's diverse neighborhoods.
- **Natural Environment:** Updated neighborhood policies should reinforce — not dilute — existing protections for urban **tree canopy**, **open space**, and **wildlife corridors**. As neighborhoods densify, green infrastructure must be treated as essential, not discretionary.

#### **IV. REPEAL OF NEIGHBORHOOD CONNECTIONS MAPS IN THE NEIGHBORHOODS ELEMENT**

I support the proposed repeal of the Neighborhood Connections Maps in the Neighborhoods Element of the Comprehensive Plan. As described in the staff materials, these [maps duplicate the adopted maps in the Transportation Master Plan \(TMP\)](#), and the TMP's versions are more current — having been vetted to remove connections identified as infeasible. Eliminating this duplication reduces the risk of conflicting guidance between planning documents and improves administrative clarity.

I would ask the Commission and staff to confirm two things before this repeal is finalized:

- Completeness of TMP Maps: That the TMP's adopted [Neighborhood Connections Maps](#) fully capture all connections that the repealed maps contained, minus only those specifically removed as infeasible, so that no viable pedestrian or bicycle connection is inadvertently lost.
- Public Legibility: That the Comprehensive Plan, following repeal, will clearly and prominently cross-reference the TMP's Neighborhood Connections Maps so that residents and applicants can easily locate this information.

#### **V. UPDATE TO THE TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES PLAN TO ADD PROJECTS**

I enthusiastically support updating the [Transportation Facilities Plan \(TFP\)](#) to add two new shared-use path projects and to modify an existing project to include a shared-use path component. Specifically:

- NE 40th Street shared-use path (158th Avenue NE to 156th Avenue NE)
- NE 70th Street shared-use path (188th Avenue NE to the Evans Creek Trail)
- [NE 72nd Street modification \(east of 188th Avenue NE\)](#)

These additions advance Redmond's commitment to active transportation, connectivity, and reducing automobile dependence. They also [support the natural environment by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and other vehicle-related impacts](#), as noted in the Cumulative Effects Analysis. From a GMA standpoint, updating the TFP is appropriate to ensure consistency with the City's [capital investment strategy](#) and to support proposed development projects that depend on these connections.

I urge the Commission to recommend timely prioritization and funding of these projects within the City's [Capital Investment Strategy \(CIS\)](#), and to ensure that design standards for all three paths reflect best practices for user safety, accessibility, and ecological sensitivity. It's worth noting that the [CIS is also known as](#) the [Vision Blueprint](#) and is now 15 years old.

## VI. OVERARCHING OBSERVATIONS ON THE 2026-2027 DOCKET

Having reviewed all five proposed docket items together, I offer the following cross-cutting observations:

- Cumulative Environmental Stewardship: The Cumulative Effects Analysis correctly finds that the 2026-27 docket amendments are generally expected to have a positive impact on the City's natural environment goals. I ask the Commission to hold this finding to account during the substantive amendment phases — particularly for the Industrial Consolidation item given its CARA implications — and to require rigorous environmental review rather than treating positive cumulative findings as a substitute for rigorous review.
- Coordination Across Plans: Several items on this docket are inherently linked. The stormwater plan, neighborhood policies, and transportation projects all have interdependencies with land use designations and infrastructure capacity. I encourage the Commission to recommend that the City proactively coordinate these workstreams rather than treat them as siloed amendments.
- Redmond 2050 Alignment: All five docket items are framed as advancing Redmond 2050's goals. I ask that this alignment be substantive rather than rhetorical — that each amendment include clearly defined outcomes and that the City establish mechanisms to evaluate whether those outcomes are being achieved over time.
- Housing Displacement: I note from the staff memo that a community-initiated proposal on housing displacement incentives did not meet the docketing threshold criteria. While I respect the Commission's decision, the underlying concern about housing affordability and displacement is real and urgent. I encourage the Commission to identify an appropriate vehicle — whether through the Neighborhoods Element update (see the first bulleted item under Amendment #III above) or another process — to address these concerns within the current planning cycle.

I appreciate the Planning Commission's careful consideration of these amendments and your commitment to an open public process. I support placing all five items on the 2026-2027 Annual Docket and look forward to continued opportunities to participate as the substantive amendments are developed.

Thank you for your service to the city of Redmond.

Respectfully submitted,

David Morton  
206-909-5680

RE: Written Public Comment — 2026-2027 Annual Docket of Comprehensive Plan Amendments, submitted by David Morton

Public Hearing: June 10, 2026, 7:00 p.m., Redmond City Hall Council Chambers

Dear Chair and Members of the Redmond Planning Commission,

I take a strong interest in the long-term planning and environmental stewardship of your city. I respectfully submit this written comment for the record in connection with the [June 10, 2026 public hearing on the proposed 2026-2027 Annual Docket of Comprehensive Plan Amendments](#). I offer comments on each of the five proposed docket items below, followed by overarching observations on the docket as a whole.

## I. STORMWATER AND SURFACE WATER SYSTEMS PLAN

I **support** adoption of the [Stormwater and Surface Water Systems Plan](#) (SSWSP) by reference into the [Capital Facilities element of the Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan](#). This amendment appropriately fulfills Growth Management Act (GMA) requirements for capital facilities planning and advances the City's capital facilities policies [CF-1](#), [CF-2](#), and [CF-3](#). Incorporating a long-term, financially analyzed infrastructure strategy into the Comprehensive Plan strengthens the City's accountability to its residents and provides meaningful guidance for future capital investment decisions.

I ask the Commission to **ensure the following** as this item proceeds:

- **Environmental Integration:** The plan explicitly commits to identifying strategies and projects that **protect and enhance critical areas**, including [wetlands, Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas, frequently flooded areas, and fish and wildlife habitat conservation areas](#). I urge the Commission to confirm that plan implementation will include enforceable standards and measurable benchmarks, not merely aspirational language.
- **Climate Resilience:** Redmond and the broader Eastside region face **increasing stormwater volumes** and **intensified storm events** attributable to climate change. The plan should reflect current and [projected climate data](#), not solely historical averages, in sizing and prioritizing infrastructure projects.
- **Community Transparency:** As projects are added to the [Capital Improvement / Investment Program \(CIP\)](#) under this plan, the City should ensure that affected neighborhoods receive timely notification and meaningful engagement opportunities prior to construction.

## II. UPDATE TO MANUFACTURING PARK, BUSINESS PARK, AND INDUSTRIAL LAND USE/ZONING MAPS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS

I offer **conditional support** for this proposal, which would consolidate Manufacturing Park (MP), Business Park (BP), and Industrial (I) land use designations and create a [range of industrial zones](#). I understand the intent is to preserve and strengthen Redmond's employment land base consistent with [Redmond 2050's economic vitality goals](#) and to provide policy direction for the [Southeast Redmond manufacturing and industrial centers](#).

However, several issues warrant careful attention during the substantive amendment phase:

- **Critical Aquifer Recharge Area (CARA):** The **Cumulative Effects Analysis** acknowledges that **the MP, BP, and Industrial zones in Southeast Redmond fall within a Critical Aquifer Recharge Area**. Any consolidation of land use designations or creation of new industrial zones must rigorously evaluate impacts on groundwater quality and recharge capacity. I ask the Commission to **require that environmental review for this amendment specifically address CARA protection standards**.
- **Community Engagement:** The Southeast Redmond industrial area is adjacent to residential neighborhoods and trails. Changes to land use designations and zoning regulations will affect those communities. I strongly encourage robust and early engagement with nearby residents before final recommendations are made.
- **Economic Diversity:** While preserving industrial and manufacturing lands is a legitimate and important goal, the City should ensure that the revised policies support a genuinely diverse range of employers — including small businesses and light manufacturing — and do not inadvertently favor only large-scale industrial users.

### **III. AMENDMENT TO THE NEIGHBORHOODS ELEMENT TO ALIGN WITH REDMOND 2050**

I support updating the **Neighborhoods Element** and related policies to reflect the goals of Redmond 2050. The concept of “**complete neighborhoods**,” where residents can access daily needs within a short walk or bike ride, is central to both environmental sustainability and quality of life. Aligning neighborhood and corridor planning policies with this vision is the right direction for Redmond's growth.

I ask that the Commission keep the following priorities in view as this amendment is developed:

- **Equity and Affordability:** “**Complete neighborhoods**” should mean complete for all residents, regardless of income. Updated policies should explicitly reference the need to preserve affordable housing within walkable mixed-use corridors and **avoid displacement of existing lower-income residents**.
- **Community-Driven Planning:** Neighborhood plans carry meaning precisely because they reflect the voices of the people who live there. I urge the Commission to set a high bar for community engagement in developing neighborhood-specific policies under the revised framework, and to avoid a one-size-fits-all approach that flattens the distinct character of Redmond's diverse neighborhoods.
- **Natural Environment:** Updated neighborhood policies should reinforce — not dilute — existing protections for urban **tree canopy**, **open space**, and **wildlife corridors**. As neighborhoods densify, green infrastructure must be treated as essential, not discretionary.

#### **IV. REPEAL OF NEIGHBORHOOD CONNECTIONS MAPS IN THE NEIGHBORHOODS ELEMENT**

I support the proposed repeal of the Neighborhood Connections Maps in the Neighborhoods Element of the Comprehensive Plan. As described in the staff materials, these [maps duplicate the adopted maps in the Transportation Master Plan \(TMP\)](#), and the TMP's versions are more current — having been vetted to remove connections identified as infeasible. Eliminating this duplication reduces the risk of conflicting guidance between planning documents and improves administrative clarity.

I would ask the Commission and staff to confirm two things before this repeal is finalized:

- **Completeness of TMP Maps:** That the TMP's adopted [Neighborhood Connections Maps](#) fully capture all connections that the repealed maps contained, minus only those specifically removed as infeasible, so that no viable pedestrian or bicycle connection is inadvertently lost.
- **Public Legibility:** That the Comprehensive Plan, following repeal, will clearly and prominently cross-reference the TMP's Neighborhood Connections Maps so that residents and applicants can easily locate this information.

#### **V. UPDATE TO THE TRANSPORTATION FACILITIES PLAN TO ADD PROJECTS**

I enthusiastically support updating the [Transportation Facilities Plan \(TFP\)](#) to add two new shared-use path projects and to modify an existing project to include a shared-use path component. Specifically:

- NE 40th Street shared-use path (158th Avenue NE to 156th Avenue NE)
- NE 70th Street shared-use path (188th Avenue NE to the Evans Creek Trail)
- [NE 72nd Street modification \(east of 188th Avenue NE\)](#)

These additions advance Redmond's commitment to active transportation, connectivity, and reducing automobile dependence. They also [support the natural environment by reducing greenhouse gas emissions and other vehicle-related impacts](#), as noted in the Cumulative Effects Analysis. From a GMA standpoint, updating the TFP is appropriate to ensure consistency with the City's [capital investment strategy](#) and to support proposed development projects that depend on these connections.

I urge the Commission to recommend timely prioritization and funding of these projects within the City's [Capital Investment Strategy \(CIS\)](#), and to ensure that design standards for all three paths reflect best practices for user safety, accessibility, and ecological sensitivity. It's worth noting that the [CIS is also known as](#) the [Vision Blueprint](#) and is now 15 years old.

## VI. OVERARCHING OBSERVATIONS ON THE 2026-2027 DOCKET

Having reviewed all five proposed docket items together, I offer the following cross-cutting observations:

- **Cumulative Environmental Stewardship:** The Cumulative Effects Analysis correctly finds that the 2026-27 docket amendments are generally expected to have a positive impact on the City's natural environment goals. I ask the Commission to hold this finding to account during the substantive amendment phases — particularly for the Industrial Consolidation item given its CARA implications — and to require rigorous environmental review rather than treating positive cumulative findings as a substitute for rigorous review.
- **Coordination Across Plans:** Several items on this docket are inherently linked. The stormwater plan, neighborhood policies, and transportation projects all have interdependencies with land use designations and infrastructure capacity. I encourage the Commission to recommend that the City proactively coordinate these workstreams rather than treat them as siloed amendments.
- **Redmond 2050 Alignment:** All five docket items are framed as advancing Redmond 2050's goals. I ask that this alignment be substantive rather than rhetorical — that each amendment include clearly defined outcomes and that the City establish mechanisms to evaluate whether those outcomes are being achieved over time.
- **Housing Displacement:** I note from the staff memo that a community-initiated proposal on housing displacement incentives did not meet the docketing threshold criteria. While I respect the Commission's decision, the underlying concern about housing affordability and displacement is real and urgent. I encourage the Commission to identify an appropriate vehicle — whether through the Neighborhoods Element update (see the first bulleted item under Amendment #III above) or another process — to address these concerns within the current planning cycle.

I appreciate the Planning Commission's careful consideration of these amendments and your commitment to an open public process. I support placing all five items on the 2026-2027 Annual Docket and look forward to continued opportunities to participate as the substantive amendments are developed.

Thank you for your service to the city of Redmond.

Respectfully submitted,

David Morton  
206-909-5680



**Redmond**  
WASHINGTON

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING  
CITY OF REDMOND**

**2026-2027 Annual Docket of Comprehensive Plan Amendments**

The City of Redmond Planning Commission will hold a Public Hearing at Redmond City Hall Council Chambers, 15670 NE 85th Street, Redmond, Washington on **June 10, 2026 at 7 p.m.** or as soon thereafter, on:

**SUBJECT:** 2026-2027 Annual Docket of Comprehensive Plan Amendments. There are five proposed docket items:

- Adopt the Stormwater and Surface Water Systems Plan as a functional plan by reference into the Capital Facilities element
- Update to Manufacturing Park, Business Park, and Industrial Land Use/Zoning Maps, Policies, and Regulations
- Amend the Neighborhoods element and related policies to align with Redmond 2050
- Amend the Neighborhoods Element by repealing Neighborhood Connections Map that duplicate the adopted maps in the Transportation Master Plan (TMP)
- Update the Transportation Facilities Plan to add projects

Copies of the proposals are available at <https://www.redmond.gov/2587/2026-27-Comprehensive-Plan-Docket>.

**REQUESTED ACTION:** Planning Commission recommendation on establishing the 2026-2027 Annual Docket of Comprehensive Plan Amendments.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:** Join in-person at City Hall, watch live at [redmond.gov/RCTV](https://www.redmond.gov/RCTV), Comcast channel 21/321, Zply channel 34, on [facebook.com/CityofRedmond](https://www.facebook.com/CityofRedmond), or listen live by phone by calling 510-335-7371.

Public comment can be provided in-person or by phone during the meeting by providing a name and phone number to [PlanningCommission@redmond.gov](mailto:PlanningCommission@redmond.gov) no later than 5 p.m. on the day of the hearing.

Written public comments should be submitted prior to the hearing by email to [PlanningCommission@redmond.gov](mailto:PlanningCommission@redmond.gov) no later than 5 p.m. on the hearing date. Comments may also be sent by mail to: Planning Commission, MS: 4SPL, P.O. Box 97010, Redmond, WA, 98073-9710.

If you have any comments, questions, or would like to be a Party-of-Record on this proposal, please contact Glenn Coil, Senior Planner, 425-556-2742 [gcoil@redmond.gov](mailto:gcoil@redmond.gov).

If you are hearing or visually impaired, please notify Planning Department staff at 425-556-2441 one week in advance of the hearing to arrange for assistance.

**LEGAL NOTICE:** May 20, 2026



## MEETING MINUTES

### REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING

Wednesday, June 10, 2026 – 7:00 p.m.

#### 1. Call to Order & Roll Call – 7:01 p.m.

Commissioners Present:	Chair Susan Weston, Commissioners Denice Gagner (virtual), Tara Van Niman, and Aparna Varadharajan (virtual)
Commissioners Absent:	Vice-Chair Jeannine Woodyear, Commissioners Adam Coleman and Bryan Copley (Excused)
Staff Present:	Lauren Alpert, Jeff Churchill, Glenn Coil, Peter Holte, Francesca Liburdy, and Chris Wyatt
Recording Secretary:	Carolyn Garza, LLC

#### 2. Approval of the Agenda

- *Motion to approve the Agenda by Commissioner Van Niman, seconded by Commissioner Aparna. The Motion passed.*

#### 3. Approval of Meeting Minutes & Summaries

- *Motion by Commissioner Van Niman to approve the May 27, 2026 Meeting Summary. Motion seconded by Commissioner Aparna. The Motion passed unanimously.*

#### 4. Items from the Audience (General)

- **David Morton**, Redmond 98053, stated having spoken previously regarding seven of nine gaps between the current Water Management programs and

goals of Redmond 2050. Gaps eight and nine regarding the city-wide Watershed Management Plan (WMP) and the lack of a formal water conservation plan with binding demand reduction targets were described and commented on.

## 5. 2026-27 Annual Comprehensive Plan Docket – Public Hearing and Study Session

Senior Planner Coil presented the topic.

Chair Weston opened the Public Hearing.

### *Public Hearing*

- **Linda Seltzer**, 80<sup>th</sup> Street/Senior Apartment Complex, stated disappointment that a part of Redmond 2050 code that incentivizes redevelopment has not been removed, failing to prioritize housing preservation, and asked about a Human Services Commission reference for the issue.
- **David Morton**, Redmond 98053, stated support for placing all five items on the Docket and asked for additional details to be added; more than aspirational language, rigorous groundwater impact requirements, addressing housing affordability and environment, that the Transportation Master Plan maps be complete before any repeal is finalized, and funding prioritization for shared use path projects.

Chair Weston closed the verbal portion of the Public Hearing while the written portion would remain open.

Commissioner Aparna asked for clarification regarding the impact analysis and the Stormwater Plan occurring concurrently. Senior Planner Coil replied that the actual process will be worked on in the next steps. Chair Weston stated that the docket is approved first and then process details will be examined. Senior Planner Coil and Senior Planner Alpert replied that projects are at this time being approved for placement on a list to begin work on.

Commissioner Gagner asked for clarification regarding page one of 12 in the Staff Memo, Section D, the origin of funds for the budget mentioned. Senior Planner Holte replied part of the Public Works budget carried over and an extended contract to complete work. Commissioner Gagner asked, regarding page five of 12, for clarification regarding a Neighborhood Plan budget for community engagement. Senior Planner Coil replied that the Neighborhood Plan is a special project and all projects are in the regular work plan for the city.

Senior Planner Coil asked if the Planning Commission is ready to make a recommendation or if there is direction in order to prepare the report for the next meeting and approval. Commissioner Van Niman replied that there is a quorum and that the docket should be advanced. Chair Weston asked that the report be prepared and that a vote would occur at the next meeting when more Commissioners are present.

## 6. 2026 Annual Code Cleanup – Study Session

Senior Planner Alpert presented the topic.

Chair Weston asked if a Matrix should be created now and Senior Planner Alpert stated that notes would be taken for an Issues Matrix to be presented at the next meeting.

Commissioner Aparna asked for clarification regarding development agreements. Planning Manager Churchill replied that development agreements are defined as contracts by State Law, and voluntary in that a property owner and the city can choose to enter into the agreement but neither is required to; once created the contract is binding. Commissioner Aparna asked for more information to be provided in the Issues Matrix and asked if projects that go through development agreements do not go through a Public Hearing because they are voluntary, and Planning Manager Churchill replied that the projects require Public Hearings by State Law. Commissioner Aparna asked if a Public Hearing is still required if there is no development agreement and Planning Manager Churchill replied yes, but only if zoning code requires one for the type of project.

Chair Weston asked for clarification regarding where Open Space changes apply.

Commissioner Van Niman asked what is being changed with pedestrian pathways.

Chair Weston asked for clarification regarding parking restrictions and Open Space as well as the goal.

Chair Weston asked if sustainability regulation changes were verbiage and typographic changes only or if there is any impact on meaning from the previous version.

Chair Weston stated that further questions could be sent to staff through the weekend.

## 7. Staff & Commissioner Updates

Senior Planner Alpert stated that interviews are being conducted for the Planning Commission Youth Advisor position and thanked Chair Weston for participating.

## 8. Adjourn

- *Motion by Commissioner Van Niman to adjourn at 7:34 p.m. Motion seconded by Commissioner Aparna. The Motion passed unanimously.*

Minutes approved on:

Planning Commission Chair

June 26, 2026

