

**Attachment A: Amendments to 2018-19 Comprehensive Plan**  
City Council Issues Matrix - Final

	Discussion Notes	Status
1. <b>Planning Commission Work Flow (Myers)</b>	<p><b><u>City Council Discussion</u></b></p> <p>Councilmember Myers asked how many docketed topics is the Planning Commission capable of handling each year and what conditions impact that number?</p> <p>2/26 Councilmember Myers stated that the crux of the issue was the capacity of the Planning Commission to review more docket items over the course of a year.</p> <p><b><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></b></p> <p>Typically, a proposed amendment requires an initial study session, a combined public hearing followed by a study session, a third study session to close the issues matrix and make a recommendation, and a fourth meeting to approve the Planning Commission Report. Leading up to the Planning Commission there can be several months needed for staff research, public outreach, staff and director reviews, SEPA review, and Technical Committee review meetings. Once the docket item passes from Planning Commission to Council, the item is not removed from the docket until Council takes final action. For example, the Proctor-Willows Amendment to the Comprehensive Plan is a recommended carryover item for the 2018-19 docket even though the Commission approved the Planning Commission Report on November 28, 2018.</p> <p>The number of topics deliberated yearly by the Planning Commission partly depends on the nature and depth of the proposed amendment and the frequency of Commission meetings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Straightforward amendments</u> that address routine matters with little to no public testimony can often flow through the Commission in 3 - 4 meetings within two months. (E.g Periodic cleanup of the RZC – minor amendments.)</li> <li>• <u>Complex amendments</u> may require one or more briefings to acquaint the Planning Commission with terminology, applications, regulatory framework etc. before the proposed amendment is formally introduced taking 3 - 8 or more months to flow through the Commission. (E.g. PARCC Plan Update, Amendment to Code and Policies for Marymoor Subarea of SE Redmond.)</li> </ul> <p>Other factors that impact the flow of docketed items through the amendment process include:</p>	<p>Opened 1/8/19 Closed 2/26/19</p>

**Attachment A: Amendments to 2018-19 Comprehensive Plan**

*City Council Issues Matrix - Final*

<p><b>1. Continued Planning Commission Work Flow (Myers)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>Staff Capacity</u>: Docket items brought to the Planning Commission are led by staff from different departments. The overall work plan in the functional area will determine when the docketed item is assigned. <b>This is the primary obstacle in completing more staff analysis for Commission review.</b></li> <li>• <u>Agenda Setting and Sequencing</u>: Meetings typically have two or more agenda items to avoid short, one agenda item meetings. Sequencing of Docket Items: Often docketed items are not “ripe” to move forward until another docketed item is complete, however, both items are listed on the approved docket so the next related docket item is already cued up and ready to move forward. (E.g. <i>Stormwater Functional Plan Update</i> is listed but must occur after companion item, <i>Updates to Stormwater Policies in the Comprehensive Plan’s Utility Element</i>.)</li> <li>• <u>Placeholders</u>: Docketed items are sometimes used to reserve a “place in space” <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to alert residents of the City’s intention to work on an item (E.g. Sammamish Valley Neighborhood Plan Update);</li> <li>• to allow staff to move forward when sufficient material has been gathered. (E.g. <i>Minor Corrections to Comprehensive Plan Text, Policies and Maps</i> or developer activity requires revisions to the <i>Updates to the Transportation Master Plan (TMP)</i>)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <u>Pace</u>: The Planning Commissioners set their own pace for deliberations.</li> </ul> <p>Planning Commission work plan items completed during the past three docket cycles are listed in the table below.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="415 941 1728 1352"> <thead> <tr> <th>Docket Cycle</th><th>Docketed Comprehensive Plan Amendments</th><th>Non-docketed items: RZC Amendments, Briefings, Tours, and Annual Retreat</th></tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>2017-18</td><td>6</td><td>5 RZC Amendments 5 Briefings; 1 Tour – 162TEN; 1 Retreat</td></tr> <tr> <td>2016-17</td><td>5</td><td>2 RZC Amendments 1 RMC Amendment 3 Briefings; 1 Joint Mtg. PC/DRD; 1 Retreat</td></tr> <tr> <td>2015-16</td><td>4</td><td>4 RZC Amendment 8 Briefings; 1 Jt. Mtg. w/Landmark Comm.; 1 Retreat</td></tr> </tbody> </table>	Docket Cycle	Docketed Comprehensive Plan Amendments	Non-docketed items: RZC Amendments, Briefings, Tours, and Annual Retreat	2017-18	6	5 RZC Amendments 5 Briefings; 1 Tour – 162TEN; 1 Retreat	2016-17	5	2 RZC Amendments 1 RMC Amendment 3 Briefings; 1 Joint Mtg. PC/DRD; 1 Retreat	2015-16	4	4 RZC Amendment 8 Briefings; 1 Jt. Mtg. w/Landmark Comm.; 1 Retreat	
Docket Cycle	Docketed Comprehensive Plan Amendments	Non-docketed items: RZC Amendments, Briefings, Tours, and Annual Retreat												
2017-18	6	5 RZC Amendments 5 Briefings; 1 Tour – 162TEN; 1 Retreat												
2016-17	5	2 RZC Amendments 1 RMC Amendment 3 Briefings; 1 Joint Mtg. PC/DRD; 1 Retreat												
2015-16	4	4 RZC Amendment 8 Briefings; 1 Jt. Mtg. w/Landmark Comm.; 1 Retreat												

**Attachment A: Amendments to 2018-19 Comprehensive Plan**  
City Council Issues Matrix - Final

<b>2.</b> <b>Frequency of Planning Commission Meetings (Myers)</b>	<p><b><u>City Council Discussion</u></b></p> <p>Councilmember Myers asked why so many Planning Commission meetings were cancelled last year.</p> <p>2/26 Councilmember Myers was satisfied with the staff response and there was no further discussion on this issue.</p> <p><b><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></b></p> <p>Only one noticed meeting was cancelled in 2018: The Planning Commission’s annual meeting was cancelled and then rescheduled with proper notice. None of the 2018 meetings were cancelled because of a lack of quorum. A couple of regularly-scheduled meetings did not occur because relevant work items were not ready to come forward for deliberation and approval.</p> <p>The table below shows the frequency of meetings from 2015-18. The total number of meetings ranged from 20 – 24 per year.</p> <table><tr><th></th><th>Total</th><th>Jan</th><th>Feb</th><th>Mar</th><th>Apr</th><th>May</th><th>June</th><th>July</th><th>Aug</th><th>Sept</th><th>Oct</th><th>Nov</th><th>Dec</th></tr><tr><td><b>2018</b></td><td><b>21</b></td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td><b>2017</b></td><td><b>20</b></td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>4</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>1</td><td>-</td><td>-</td></tr><tr><td><b>2016</b></td><td><b>23</b></td><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>1</td><td>4</td><td>3</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>-</td><td>1</td></tr><tr><td><b>2015</b></td><td><b>24</b></td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>3</td><td>1</td><td>1</td><td>2</td><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>3</td><td>2</td><td>2</td><td>2</td></tr></table>		Total	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec	<b>2018</b>	<b>21</b>	1	1	1	1	3	2	2	3	1	2	3	1	<b>2017</b>	<b>20</b>	3	2	4	1	1	3	2	1	2	1	-	-	<b>2016</b>	<b>23</b>	3	3	3	2	1	4	3	1	1	1	-	1	<b>2015</b>	<b>24</b>	1	1	3	1	1	2	3	3	3	2	2	2	Opened 1/8/19 Closed 2/26/19
	Total	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	June	July	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec																																																											
<b>2018</b>	<b>21</b>	1	1	1	1	3	2	2	3	1	2	3	1																																																											
<b>2017</b>	<b>20</b>	3	2	4	1	1	3	2	1	2	1	-	-																																																											
<b>2016</b>	<b>23</b>	3	3	3	2	1	4	3	1	1	1	-	1																																																											
<b>2015</b>	<b>24</b>	1	1	3	1	1	2	3	3	3	2	2	2																																																											
<b>3.</b> <b>Time-related factors in RZC Threshold Criteria (Carson)</b>	<p><b><u>City Council Discussion</u></b></p> <p>Provide an explanation of how the time-related factors in two of the zoning code threshold criteria are applied to comprehensive plan applications.</p> <p>2/26 Councilmember Carson was satisfied with the staff response and there was no further discussion on this issue.</p> <p><b><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></b></p> <p>The Technical Committee and the Planning Commission applied the seven-threshold criteria contained in Redmond Zoning Code Section 21.76.070(2)(b) to evaluate whether a comprehensive plan proposal should be given further consideration as an item for the 2018-19 Comprehensive Plan docket. Two of these criteria include an element of time.</p>	Opened 1/8/19 Closed 2/26/19																																																																						

**Attachment A: Amendments to 2018-19 Comprehensive Plan**  
City Council Issues Matrix - Final

<p><b>3. Continued</b></p> <p><b>Time-related factors in RZC Threshold Criteria (Carson)</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Criterion 4 asks, “Is the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment timely with respect to other City and community initiatives, and planned public and private development activity?”</li> <li>• Criterion 7 asks, “Has the proposed Comprehensive Plan amendment or similar amendment not been considered or rejected within the last two years?”</li> </ul> <p>Timeliness in Criterion 4 refers to other ongoing City initiatives and the age of recently adopted plans. The City should not accept an application for docket consideration that is contrary to recently adopted plans (5-10 years or less) because of the relatively long-time frames to implement plans; for example, the adopted <i>2014 Southeast Redmond Plan</i> is still being implemented through rezones, design standards, infrastructure planning, and other city efforts and it would be premature to reconsider the plan before a reasonable amount of implementation time has elapsed.</p> <p>The two-year requirement in Criterion 7 is to ensure appropriate consideration and to allow adequate staff time for review of other applications. If an applicant is denied, but then returns every year, it consumes a large amount of City resources to manage further review for a proposal which was very recently denied without any time elapsed to constitute a change of circumstances. The Comprehensive Plan reflects the community vision and the requirement for time to elapse between rejected proposals also promotes plan stability. Reevaluating proposals in the absence of changed circumstance would cause residents to mobilize annually to provide feedback on previously rejected proposals, and this can diminish community trust in government. If a similar project arrives on the docket between two and four years after a previous rejection, there is still a criterion which requires a change in circumstances to effect approval. (RZC 21.76.070.J.3.h).</p>	
<p><b>4.</b></p> <p><b>Periodic Rezoning of Property (Carson)</b></p>	<p><b><u>City Council Discussion</u></b></p> <p>Councilmember Carson suggested that the 4.21-acre Pier 67 Property has only been rezoned once in the last eighty or so years, and maybe never developed since it was logged years ago, and that perhaps it would be beneficial to place this proposal for a land use amendment (Single-Family to Multi-Family Urban) on the docket to discuss rezoning of this parcel.</p> <p>2/26 Councilmember Carson was satisfied with the staff response and there was no further discussion on this issue.</p> <p><b><u>Staff Response:</u></b></p> <p>There is no land use policy that requires zoned single-family residential densities for a given site to keep pace with population growth in the City. In fact, most single-family zoned properties in Redmond have not been rezoned and establishing such a threshold could spur a large number of requests across the City to increase densities in single family neighborhoods.</p>	<p>Opened 1/8/19 Closed 2/26/19</p>

**Attachment A: Amendments to 2018-19 Comprehensive Plan**  
*City Council Issues Matrix - Final*

<p><b>5.</b>  <b>Application for a Land Use Amendment vs. Application for a Project (Myers, Carson)</b></p>	<p><b><u>City Council Discussion:</u></b>  In discussing the Pier 67 Capital Partners LLC application request Councilmembers Myers and Carson refer to the application as a project that would provide low-income senior housing.</p> <p>2/26 Councilmember Carson was satisfied with the staff response and there was no further discussion on this issue.</p> <p><b><u>Staff Response:</u></b>  The Pier 67 application is not a request to build a housing project, rather it is a request to change the land use for a 4.21-acre parcel from Single-Family to Multi-Family Urban. The applicant states the intention is to develop “a state of the art, multifamily and senior housing community...across various unit configurations, building designs, site layouts and price points.” (refer to page 2 of the application). However, the City has no means to require the applicant or subsequent owners to build senior housing if multi-family land use and a later rezone were approved.</p>	<p>Opened  1/8/19  Closed  2/26/19</p>
<p><b>6.</b>  <b>Suggestions to place Pier 67 application on the docket. (Myers, Carson)</b></p>	<p><b><u>City Council Discussion</u></b>  Councilmembers Myers and Carson asked staff for suggestions on how to place the Pier 67 Capital Partners LLC’s application on the docket for further consideration.</p> <p>2/26 Councilmembers Carson and Myers were satisfied with the staff response and felt this issue had been further addressed during their earlier deliberations to identify other possible amendments to add to the docket to address emerging issues related to workforce housing, housing affordability in relation to undeveloped land. Namely, possibly amending the Redmond Zoning Code and/or the Comprehensive Plan:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To reflect outcomes from a re-evaluation of threshold criteria in Section 21.76.070(2)(b);</li> <li>• To create multi-family overlays along particular corridors of the City to achieve specific goals;</li> <li>• To reflect outcomes from potential updates to the Education Hill Neighborhood Plan, a functional plan or an evaluation of the Bear Creek/Avondale Corridor - both which would involve a multi-year effort, a shift in resources, and a reprioritization of current budgeted Planning projects.</li> <li>• Amending Bear Creek and Education Hill boundaries along Avondale Rd. NE.</li> </ul> <p><b><u>Staff Response:</u></b>  Staff has identified the following methods:</p>	<p>Opened  1/8/19  Closed  2/26/19</p>

**Attachment A: Amendments to 2018-19 Comprehensive Plan**

**City Council Issues Matrix - Final**

<p><b>6. Continued</b></p> <p><b>Suggestions to place Pier 67 application on the docket. (Myers, Carson)</b></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. As the City Attorney stated previously, Council would have to make a finding that the application in question satisfies the threshold criteria.</li><li>2. Council could decide to introduce a new docket item to evaluate—and possibly change—the existing threshold criteria. This would require amending the Comprehensive Plan and RZC, and could allow the project on the docket in subsequent cycles. A review of the legislative history shows that the threshold criteria was developed to:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• increase transparency in how the docketing process works,</li><li>• improve consistency in how applications are evaluated for further consideration,</li><li>• create a more direct forum for applicants to describe their proposals, and</li><li>• make the amendment processing time more efficient.</li></ul>The threshold criteria were modeled in part by criteria used by the City of Seattle. In 2014, Councilmembers Myers, Carson, and Margeson served on the Council during the deliberations of the criteria and all three voted to approve the ordinance. Before the vote, Councilmember Margeson pulled the item from consent to change the Planning Commission-recommended four-year to a two-year waiting period for a same or similar docketed item to reapply after denial. Councilmember Margeson reasoned that two years is sufficient time since Council positions changed every two years, a two-year sitting out period for a denied application would not encumber future Councils from reconsidering applications since “things do change over time.” (15:09 mins into 6/3/14 Council meeting, approving Ord. 2740)</li><li>3. Multi-family Urban Land Uses include R-12 to R-30 zones, and residential development in these zones are focused in or near Redmond’s two urban centers and Marymoor Village. Council could introduce a docket item to evaluate these higher-density zoning designations and recommend amendments to comprehensive plan policies and the zoning code that would allow multi-family development outside of (or away from) the urban centers.</li></ol>	
--	---	--