

**Planning Commission Meeting 1.08.09**

ID	Meeting	Commenter	Comment	Response At Meeting	Action Item	Assigned To	Outcome or Response After Meeting	Status
1	1/8/2009	Richard Amidei	On item 4 iii - Weather Protection, "5 feet in width." Do you mean width or depth?	John - Depth, I will make a note of that	Specify depth	Makers		Pending
2	1/8/2009	Erica Tiliacos	I know you said that this probably not where the roads will end up, but its probably likely people will try to use this type of configuration. The node on the top right -- we have a street that kind of loops thorough the area, but not in the critical, most dense area where you'll have the pedestrian and mixed used areas. We have the same thing in the NE. On the NW side we have one road that brings you back to the core. we need to figure out how we can build a bridge or what kind of technique we can use to loop that road out, because right now we're directing all traffic into that core, regardless of if its thru traffic or not. If that area becomes the most pedestrian friendly area, it could be problematic to try to force all traffic through there. The cul-de-sac should be joined in order to create a loop.		None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
3	1/8/2009	Tom Vance	There are only two exits.		None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
4	1/8/2009	Richard Amidei	On page 13, you have a note that says that street alignments are conceptual only. That note should be made more prominent throughout the document. I agree with area. We don't want people to lock in on this idea when it is merely conceptual.	John - Good point	None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
5	1/8/2009	Erica Tiliacos	On page 1, 21B.30.250 is repeated twice. The second instance should be 260. Buffers between residential areas of the Town Center will be located in what section of the code?	John - It should be in this section and in the landscaping section.	None	N/A	Question responded to at meeting	Complete
6	1/8/2009	Jan Klier	I like that design for parking. I think we need to add something that says that if parking is in the back, there must be a way to access the front of the building. If we want buildings to have entrances in the front, with everyone parking in the back, there needs to be access.	John - Good point	None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
7	1/8/2009	Tom Vance	If we want a walkable area, you need to provide a way for people to get to the front.		None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
8	1/8/2009	Scott Hamilton	You had mentioned that these are fairly restrictive standards. Have we done any reality check with developers as we've put this together? Suppose we go all the way through this document, get some comments here and there, and then hear from developers in June at the public hearing and they say that we're way off? That's a concern. -- It might be useful for the Commission, Council, the public, if you could have a memorandum explaining where some of these examples are from, so that we understand that this stuff isn't just being pulled out of thin air.	John - I think this is do-able. You see other developments around the region that do meet these standards. Burien is one example. Michael - It's a really good point that you raise. As part of this process we are looking to try and arrange for a design charrette with developers and architects so that they can evaluate the proposed development regulations, and give us their worst case and best case scenarios in terms of development regulations. -- That's a great idea, and if your colleagues are in favor of that we could develop some sort of matrix.	Develop matrix of proposed development standards	Makers/City staff	Pending	
9	1/8/2009	Tom Vance	I'm in favor of that...anyone else?		None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
10	1/8/2009	Erica Tiliacos	I worry that that would limit us solely to U.S. examples.	John - We could have illustrations showing examples of what we are talking about.	Provide examples of concepts	Makers		Pending
11	1/8/2009	Scott Hamilton	Erica's point is well-taken. Mr. Galvin has brought examples to the Commission from time to time.		None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
12	1/8/2009	Mahbubul Islam	We have a lot of pictures, but it would also be helpful to include place names so that people know what areas we are talking about.		Include place names in illustrative examples	Makers		Pending

13	1/8/2009	Richard Amidei	So far what I've seen is really good. Good balance of being general enough to leave a lot of latitude for developers, but also specific enough. As a former developer I would tell you that you're being way too restrictive, etc. From the city's point of view I would like us to err on the side of being too restrictive, rather than leaving the door wide open. One area of concern is I think we need stronger regulations for parking structures. Clearly we don't want surface parking. In my opinion, we also don't want parking structures like we saw in Mill Creek. We have high demand in Sammamish, a clean slate. Our parking structures need to be hidden as best as possible and I suggest we develop some language to address that. The most restrictive regulation, which might be too restrictive, is to require underground parking. We could require that only 25% of a parking structure be above grade. Let's start out with some reasonably tight parking structure regulations. I'd hate to see above-grade parking structures in Sammamish.	John - We've gone back and forth on this throughout the entire process. I'm sure that will be a front and center issue with developers. Structured parking is 10 times as much the cost of surface parking, and underground parking costs even more. We want to set the bar as high as we can initially. We can take your direction and add additional language for the parking structures as we go through the process. During the site design discussion would be a good time to discuss this further.	None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
14	1/8/2009	Richard Amidei	In the first sentence on 2a, why wouldn't we require them to be placed up to the edge of the street?	John - If you want to attract office development small setbacks might be advantageous. They can build up to the sidewalk if they like however.	None	N/A	Question responded to at meeting	Complete
15	1/8/2009	Tom Vance	Will we return to these paragraphs when we get to the landscaping section, so that once we have a better handle on landscaping we can determine if these regulations make sense?	John - Yes, we can do that	None	N/A	Question responded to at meeting	Complete
16	1/8/2009	Richard Amidei	The 50% parking lot requirement might make sense on shorter streets, but what if you have a 300 foot street? You could have 150 feet of parking fronting the street.	John - I'll make a note of that. I think we stipulate that only a certain amount can be dedicated to parking.	None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
17	1/8/2009	Scott Hamilton	Maybe we ought to include a requirement for screening and landscaping for parking areas.	John - Yes, definitely.	Include a requirement for screening and landscaping of parking areas	Makers		Pending
18	1/8/2009	Jan Klier	You should emphasize that buildings must have their primary entrance on the streetfront, and not just say "entrance."	John - Good point, we will make that change.	Add "primary entrance" to code language	Makers		Pending
19	1/8/2009	Scott Hamilton	Looking at picture 21B.300.100g, you need to consider the issue of cars having a hard time seeing pedestrians. Maybe you should stipulate that vegetation cannot block sight distance. Drivers needs to be able to see over or through landscaping.	John - Good catch. I'll make a note that we include language about sight bands. We have an image that goes along with that as well that we can include.	Include language regarding sight bands	Makers		Pending
20	1/8/2009	Richard Amidei	On E-i, the regulations for structured parking need to be beefed up again. We need to specify, for example, that no more than 25% of the face can be exposed. I think that can be done.	John - We'll make a note to beef that up when we get to it. Michael - At a later date we will be doing a thorough review of parking and circulation requirements. You will have another opportunity to review.	Increase development requirements for structured parking	Makers		Pending
21	1/8/2009	Erica Tiliacos	We're thinking of landscaping as being the visual barrier that helps separate things. There might be artistic ways of creating those barriers. Would people have the possibility of providing some kind of interesting solution that wouldn't require landscaping? -- You could create some sort of interactive wall perhaps.	John - We cover that in other areas, but I don't see it here. So we can add that.	Include language on additional visual barriers	Makers		Pending
22	1/8/2009	Scott Hamilton	Do you know the setback between City Hall and 228th so it can give us some frame of reference?	John - I would guess maybe 150 feet. This calls for a 50-foot vegetated buffer between any improvements.	None	N/A	Question responded to at meeting	Complete
23	1/8/2009	Tom Vance	I think some of the properties along 228th might have a problem with that.		None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
24	1/8/2009	Scott Hamilton	Having been on the PAB and helping to write the Comp. Plan I understand the issues at hand, but I'm not sure we need a 50-foot buffer. Maybe a 25-foot buffer?		None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
25	1/8/2009	Tom Vance	Maybe when we start talking about landscaping we could see some examples of 25, 50-feet, etc.	John - With 25-feet it would never look natural, it would look like a row of trees. Some trees require a large amount of space for their root systems as well.	Provide examples of various buffer widths	Makers		Pending

27	1/8/2009	Erica Tiliacos	It might be good to have some flexibility on that width as projects come in for master planning.	Michael - There are some mixed-use designations along 228th. One issue that comes up is net buildable. If you establish a significant setback you will cut into the possibility of development because of the topography. The Arbor School site is an example. One key question is: What is the 50-foot setback trying to accomplish and are there other ways to meet that goal?	None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
28	1/8/2009	Tom Vance	Yes, Arbor School is the property I was thinking of.	John - There will be intense pressure from auto-oriented types of development along 228th. If you don't want that there needs to be a way to say "No."	None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
29	1/8/2009	Scott Hamilton	The discussion during the PAB process was not that there wouldn't be any streetfront development, but that we did not want a continuous line of development. Maybe instead of a continuous 50 foot buffer, you have some areas of smaller setbacks. There are areas where you have natural restrictions, such as critical areas and topography.	John - That would be an easier, but much different standard. We can come back to you with a variety of options.	Provide Commission with variety of setback options for 228th	Makers		Pending
30	1/8/2009	Mahbubul Islam	There are some natural restrictions based on the topography. 228th is already built out, so whatever we do needs to adhere to what is already there otherwise it creates discontinuity.		None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
31	1/8/2009	Erica Tiliacos	Near the Civic Center, the proposed mixed use development should be up against the street in order to bring people in and it would also help draw people into the Civic space. Some of that might need to be fronted up to the sidewalk.		None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
32	1/8/2009	Tom Vance	At the same time we don't want Aurora Avenue either.		None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
33	1/8/2009	Richard Amidei	On C, maybe we should specify "retail signs," rather than "commercial signs," so as not to discourage office uses that might want a sign. We really need to think about where we want retail, where we want office, where we want a mix, etc.		None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
34	1/8/2009	Erica Tiliacos	We could also address this issue through the signage code.		None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
35	1/8/2009	Scott Hamilton	In the Town Center plan I had offered up an amendment that called for traffic calming to be incorporated in the street designs and I don't see that here in 21B. If you look at the NE and SW connector roads, they are wide roads with long straightaways that I feel would be conducive to speeding. Traffic calming would help to slow cars down along those straightaways.	John - Good catch, we will add that language as "21D."	Add language on traffic calming measures to code	Makers		Pending
36	1/8/2009	Scott Hamilton	In the SW quadrant on 13, you have an 84-foot wide blue street. That's quite wide. -- I sure hope you're going to use LID for that street.	John - It's that wide because it has a double bay for parking. -- Yes, definitely. LID throughout. Michael - Traffic calming is referenced in the Town Center plan. John - It will be added to this document as well.	None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
37	1/8/2009	Tom Vance	There is an error on the legend on Page 13. It should reference 21B.230.A	John - Good, we will fix that.	Correct typographical error on Page 13	Makers		Pending
38	1/8/2009	Jan Klier	Would there be any benefit to designating certain streets as "one-way?"	John - That could happen, it would be dependent on how the master planning or site development process play out. I generally tend not to do those. In some cases they do make sense, however.	None	N/A	Question responded to at meeting	Complete
39	1/8/2009	Tom Vance	Regarding stormwater, we currently have LID and stormwater on our Town Center work program. Will we have that info by the time we meet to discuss those regulations?	Michael - At that meeting we can have Eric do present his preliminary findings on the stormwater master plan. We will work to make sure that the results of those studies are made available to you before you make any final decisions.	None	N/A	Question responded to at meeting	Complete
40	1/8/2009	Mahbubul Islam	Again, including images would help to illustrate these concepts.	John - We will do that.	Provide images and/or examples	Makers		Pending
41	1/8/2009	Mahbubul Islam	One thought I have is that we need to provide people multiple ways to circulate within the Town Center area. Driving is one way, biking is another, etc. Are we assuming that trails are not just for recreation but also for circulation? -- This is the kind of place where residents come to play and shop, and providing continuity of trails so that people can use the trail network to get around would be good.	John - That's a good point. On page 39 we address trails further. We can add language to the concept map.	Add additional language regarding trails to the concept map	Makers		Pending

42	1/8/2009	Scott Hamilton	Looking at the conceptual trail network on page 13, we know that the trails in the Commons Bowl are paved trails, we also have unpaved trails and paths. Will those paths be unpaved? Maybe state that all trails will be paved. Also, "publically" is misspelled.	John - The document does indicate that the department will determine which trails are to be paved. They all have to be ADA-accessible, so by default these will probably be paved.	None	N/A	Question responded to at meeting	Complete
43	1/8/2009	Erica Tiliacos	Either that or hard surface, such as pavers, etc. -- This covers pedestrian use of pathways, we're not necessarily encouraging unpaved paths through parking lots, correct?	John - That's correct.	None	N/A	Question responded to at meeting	Complete
44	1/8/2009	Erica Tiliacos	The 0 feet for windowless firewalls, is that for interior walls?	John - It's for walls between buildings.	None	N/A	Question responded to at meeting	Complete
45	1/8/2009	Erica Tiliacos	On 21B.30.150 1-C, are those planted setbacks? -- If the buildings actually step back, would that count for the solar access provision? If you stepped your building so that it didn't become a big, tall building, maybe the stepping back could happen at higher floors, and not the whole building, in order to address the solar access issue. That would give you more options.	John - It's not specified, but we will add that language. -- I think that's part of the intent. -- We can look at that.	Add language on setbacks	Makers		Pending
46	1/8/2009	Tom Vance	Maybe we could include a graphic representation or picture.	John - Sure, we can do that.	Include examples of various setbacks	Makers		Pending
47	1/8/2009	Richard Amidei	Does the window transparency requirement apply to buildings where the back or side yard might be up against the street?	John - We will look into that.	Address question regarding window transparency requirements	Makers		Pending
48	1/8/2009	Scott Hamilton	On balconies, have you thought about having inset balconies? Saffron down the street is an example.	John - I think the same regulations would apply. I could change the drawing here to show that it would apply to an inset balcony as well.	Revise drawing to show inset balconies	Makers		Pending
49	1/8/2009	Richard Amidei	Are the depth of the balconies specified? -- What about a maximum depth? Would you want them to be able to go to the lot line?	John - I believe we say that they must be 6-feet wide to count as open space, and open space is required for multi-family dwellings. -- That's a very good point, I wouldn't think you'd want that. We might want to specify a maximum depth.	Add language on maximum balcony depth	Makers		Pending
50	1/8/2009	Erica Tiliacos	Do you have examples of commercial, multi-family or cottage housing open space, or are they all general? -- Could we see an example of commercial open space?	John - They're more general -- I will provide an example of a commercial development.	Provide example of commercial open space	Makers		Pending
51	1/8/2009	Richard Amidei	Can you define useable open space as opposed to cooperative open space?	John - Some of these terms overlap and are not mutually exclusive. A playground could be a cooperative open space or useable open space. -- What are the Commission's thoughts on cooperative open space? Should we require that in the Town Center? How much more cooperative open space do we need?	None	N/A	Question responded to at meeting	Complete
52	1/8/2009	Tom Vance	There are also critical areas that will remain natural.		None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
53	1/8/2009	Scott Hamilton	You don't have the ability to use critical areas though. I know that one of the issues that came up in developing the Town Center plan was to make sure that each quadrant had some sort of useable open space. Say for example, you have a group of elderly people or young mothers with baby strollers. Yes, you have the Commons, but that requires you to walk up hills. The idea was to give each quadrant useable open space. -- Then I'm not sure I understand your question.	John - I remember when you brought that up, and that will be included in the Master Plan process. -- Is cooperative open space needed in the Town Center, since we will already require dedicated open space?	None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
54	1/8/2009	Tom Vance	So cooperative would be useable by members of the development but not the public?	John - Yes, for the most part.	None	N/A	Question responded to at meeting	Complete
55	1/8/2009	Erica Tiliacos	These regulations seem very specific to certain types of uses. The idea was that the public space would be accessible to everyone.		None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
56	1/8/2009	Richard Amidei	Can you be more specific John? Let's say you have a 100,000 square foot building? -- In that case I think we need cooperative open space.	John - 10,000, half of which can be private such as balconies.	None	N/A	Question responded to at meeting	Complete
57	1/8/2009	Tom Vance	I think we should leave the language on cooperative open space in at this point.		None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
58	1/8/2009	Scott Hamilton	It might be good to have pocket parks scattered throughout. In the NW quadrant you might want to consider a pocket lot in the NW corner of the NW quadrant so that people can just sit and relax.		None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete

59	1/8/2009	Erica Tiliacos	There should be recreational space within a multi-family building. But that could include a workout room or party room. In terms of actual open space, instead of requiring that cooperative open space, charge them a fee so that you can develop cooperative open space in elsewhere in those areas. In lieu of making it specific to their building or development, they will be contributing to a pool for open space.	Susan - We currently have open space requirements for multifamily, as well as a fee in lieu program, which is not very often used.	None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
60	1/8/2009	Richard Amidei	How does "landscaped area" differ from "open space?" Is it something that isn't necessarily useable? -- Does the 30% include the 10%? -- That could result in a lot of landscaped area, and could be somewhat onerous.	John - That's correct. It could be a forested buffer, for example. Its mainly intended to keep the area green. -- Yes	None	N/A	Question responded to at meeting	Complete
61	1/8/2009	Mahbubul Islam	Until we know what will go in each quadrant it is difficult to tell what kind of open space we need. The use will help determine what type of open space is needed.	John - We can come back with a rewrite of this section that clarifies the terminology we are using, answer your questions, address the issues of mitigation fees, as well address landscaping.	None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
63	1/8/2009	John Galvin	I'd like to provide some input on affordable housing. I have some material I will leave with you. The draft affordable housing ordinance proposes a mandatory 10% affordable housing requirement. The assumption of state legislation is that an upzone is sufficient to meet this requirement. I have no problem with this requirement, but I think we will need to provide a broader range of incentives to make this work. The range of incentives is quite extensive. Only two cities, Redmond and Federal Way, have mandatory requirements for affordable housing, and they are not as draconian as ours. Sammamish basically has exclusionary zoning, and we want to use less than half of one percent of our land to meet the affordable housing requirements set forth in the GMA. If we want to get some affordable housing, I think we need to work hard to give them incentives, many of which won't cost the City much but would help developers. Ask developers what they need to make this work. Affordable housing does not stand alone. It is in relation to jobs and public transportation. We have to look at this in the context of Sammamish. -- Yes		None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
64	1/8/2009	Scott Hamilton	Does the material you are providing list suggestions?		None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
65	1/8/2009	Tony Shapiro	I am an architects with BCRA Architecture in Edmonds. Page 4 talks about churches and similar structures being exempt from setback requirements. I would urge you to force these structures to be closer to the street edge. The City Hall is a lovely building but it probably is not as inviting to the public because it is set back from the street. As architects we struggle with the issue of having parking lots provide primary access while primary access to the building has to be on the streetfront. On page 9, if you separate buildings from the street in a vertical fashion, perhaps the 10 foot criteria could be in the second dimension as well, by doing this you could have a smaller setback. I recommend the Commission consider a maximum of three parking bays with a total of 180 feet. If you make the requirement 150 feet, you exempt three bays of 90 degree parking.		None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
66	1/8/2009	Maureen Santoni	I am very interested in 228th. I thought what Makers had put down was the direction the City was looking for. I was somewhat disturbed by some of the comments. A lot of the fences along the road are kind of a mish-mash. I like the ideas Makers came up with to make 228th a beautiful street. Also, where did the 20-foot setback idea come from?		None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
67	1/8/2009	Ed Zercher	I didn't hear anything in the paperwork regarding minimum requirements for structured parking. Around here we have a lot of challenges, both geologically and hydrologically, to constructing underground parking. That needs to be taken into consideration. If you can only build 2 stories of above-ground structured parking, in order to accommodate the number of stalls needed you would have to have a large footprint. It is imperative for us as citizens that we are able to see examples of what other areas are doing. We need pictures and examples from other municipalities.		None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete

68	1/8/2009	Scott Hamilton	As someone who has been on both sides of that podium I can empathize with people being frustrated when they make comments or ask questions and we just say that we will make a note of it. I think it would be helpful if over the next six months we could have dialogue with the public and answer questions on the spot. I think that would be a good public service.		None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
69	1/8/2009	Tom Vance	We'll discuss that at the management meeting next time.		None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete
70	1/8/2009	Erica Tiliacos	I'd also like to give more time for comment to people who are experts in their field, such as Mr. Shapiro.		None	N/A	Comment noted	Complete