

**NOTE REGARDING PUBLIC NOTICE REQUIREMENTS FOR ACTIONS  
AFFECTING LARGE AREAS**

1. Memo from Planning Commission (written by Jim Stanton) to Mayor Marchione dated June 16, 1987, gave recommendations for notice requirements for "Development Guide and Zoning Map Amendment", (page F-18), see page 28 of that memo.
2. Memo from Kay Shoudy, Planning Director to Mayor Marchione, dated July 8, 1987 for the July 14 Council meeting, presented page 28 alone (with some changes from the Planning Commission memo) to Council, which was then adopted by Council through Ordinance No. 1379.
3. Memo from Kay Shoudy to Mayor Marchione, dated August 4, 1987 for the August 4 Council meeting, presented minor housekeeping amendments, DGA-85-14, *minus page 28* since it had been adopted earlier by Ordinance 1379, adopting Ordinance No. 1381 with attached exhibit pages 1 through 35, minus page 28.

ORDINANCE NO. 1381

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF REDMOND, WASHINGTON, AMENDING THE REDMOND MUNICIPAL CODE AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT GUIDE, DGA-85-14, FOR THE PURPOSE OF MAKING MISCELLANEOUS MINOR CLARIFICATIONS AND CODIFICATIONS OF ADMINISTRATIVE INTERPRETATIONS.

WHEREAS, periodically the Planning Department recommends adoption of minor clarifications and amendments to the Redmond Community Development Guide commonly known as "minor housekeeping amendments" and the Planning Commission considered such recommended revisions during public meetings and hearings between March 25 and May 13, 1987, and

WHEREAS, after considering public input and reviewing the proposed revisions, the Planning Commission forwarded its recommendation to the City Council, and after consideration of the recommendation, the City Council has determined that the Community Development Guide should be amended as set forth hereinafter, now, therefore,

THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF REDMOND, WASHINGTON, ORDAINS AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The Redmond Municipal Code and Community Development Guide is hereby amended as set forth on Exhibit A, attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference as if set forth in full.

Section 2. This ordinance, being an administrative action, is not subject to referendum and shall take effect five (5) days after publication.

DATED this 4th day of August, 1987.

CITY OF REDMOND:

Doreen Marchione  
MAYOR, DOREEN MARCHIONE

ATTEST/AUTHENTICATED:

Doris A. Schauble  
CITY CLERK, DORIS A. SCHAIBLE

APPROVED AS TO FORM:  
OFFICE OF THE CITY ATTORNEY

BY Jerry C. Martin

FILED WITH THE CITY CLERK: 7-30-87  
PASSED BY THE CITY COUNCIL: 8-04-87  
SIGNED BY THE MAYOR: 8-06-87  
PUBLISHED: 8-09-87  
EFFECTIVE DATE: 8-14-87  
ORDINANCE NO. 1381

EXHIBIT A TO ORDINANCE # 1381

MINOR HOUSEKEEPING

DEVELOPMENT GUIDE AMENDMENTS

Proposed Text

Each amendment that has been revised from its previously adopted form is presented below such that a double parenthesis (( )) includes that language which is proposed to be removed; and text which is underlined reflects that which is proposed as new. Charts which have been changed by an amendment are included.

1. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): 20A.60.020 ACCESS CORRIDOR; page A-2

PROBLEM: When calculating density, access corridors are subtracted from the gross acre. For multi-family development, access corridors are not generally held as tracts or easements, but as undescribed driveways. This definition does not presently include driveways.

RECOMMENDATION: Revise the language in 20A.60.020 to read as follows:

20A.60.020 ACCESS CORRIDOR is a vehicle circulation area in private ownership, including easements ((and)) , tracts and driveways in common ownership, over which access is afforded to more than thirty (30) dwelling units in a multi-family development. Driveways serving a group of less than thirty (30) dwelling units in multi-family developments shall not be considered access corridors.

RATIONALE: Clarifies definition and assures inclusion of density formula

2. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): 20A.60.220 Day Care Operation: page A-4  
20A.60.502 Preschools: page A-7

PROBLEM: Confusion over how preschools are regulated by the City. In the past preschools have been regulated similar to day care facilities by the City due to similar land use impacts but they are not referenced or defined in the Development Guide. Further clarification is needed in the definitions portion of the Development Guide.

- RECOMMENDATION:
1. Amend 20A.60.220 Day Care Operations definition on page A-4 to add new last sentence as follows:  
  
Add: Preschools are considered day care operations for City land use regulation purposes.
  2. Add new section entitled: 20A.60.502, Preschools (page A-7)  
  
20A.60.502 Preschools See Section 20A.60.220, Day Care Operations. Preschools are considered day care operations for City regulation purposes.

RATIONALE: These amendments will further clarify that with regard to land use regulations only the Development Guide treats preschools in the same fashion as day care facilities.

---

3. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): 20A.60.000 Definitions; page A-8

PROBLEM: There is no definition for subdivision or short subdivision. The City Attorney has suggested that definitions for both be developed.

- RECOMMENDATION: Add the following definitions to Section 20A.60.000 - Definitions on page A-8:
- Short Subdivision: means the division or redivision of land, creating four (4) or fewer lots.
- Subdivision: means the division of land, creating five (5) or more lots.

RATIONALE: This more clearly distinguishes the division of land from the creation of lots.

4. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): 20C.10.200(10), page C-4; rows 12 and 13 regarding Mini Day Care and Day Care centers in City Center zones.

PROBLEM: Chart does not refer reader to Section 20C.20.030 Day Care which specifies day care requirements.

RECOMMENDATION: Amend 20C.10.200(10) PERMITTED LAND USES IN THE CITY CENTER as follows:

Cross reference chart to refer to Section 20C.20.030 which specifies Mini Day Care and Day Care Center regulations. In addition, combine into one row as noted below:

A Part of Subsection 20C.10.200(10) PERMITTED LAND USES IN THE CITY CENTER							
LAND USES	DESIGN AREAS						
	CONVENIENCE COMMERCIAL			COMPARISON COMMERCIAL			GENERAL COMMERCIAL
	AREA 1	AREA 3	AREA 7	AREA 2	AREA 5	AREA 6	AREA 4
Mini Day Care, Day Care Center	G X	G X	G X	G X	G X	G X	G X

Refer to Section 20C.20.030 Day Care

RATIONALE: Cross reference guides reader to specific day care requirements in Section 20C.20.030.

5. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): 20C.10.200(10) Permitted Land Uses in the City Center, page C-5

PROBLEM: The first line on the second page does not indicate mixed uses as a permitted (P) use in City Center Design Area 7. However, Section 20C.10.200(05) City Center Design Areas Map indicates mixed uses are permitted.

RECOMMENDATION: Amend 20C.10.200(10) as follows:

Add a "P" to line 1 page C-5 under Area 7 (Mixed Uses)

A Part of Subsection 20C.10.200(10) PERMITTED LAND USES IN THE CITY CENTER							
LAND USES	DESIGN AREA						
	CONVENIENCE COMMERCIAL			COMPARISON COMMERCIAL			GENERAL COMMERCIAL
	AREA 1	AREA 3	AREA 7	AREA 2	AREA 5	AREA 6	AREA 4
Mixed uses (commercial and/or multi-family housing not to exceed 30 dwellings per acre) where indicated by Subsection 20C.10.200(05), "City Center Design Areas"			P (ADD)	P		P	S

RATIONALE: Correction is necessary to have City Center Permitted Land Use Chart correspond with Section 20C.10.200(05), City Center Design Areas Map.

6. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): 20C.10.200(10) Permitted Land Uses in the City Center, page C-5

PROBLEM: On page C-5, column 1 row 2 (entitled Mixed uses...) reference not made to the title of the map (City Center Design Areas) as is done in the amendment above.

RECOMMENDATION: Amend 20C.10.200(10) as follows:

Add the words "City Center Design Areas" at the end after Section 20C.10.200(05).

RATIONALE: Reference will more clearly direct reader to the City Center Design Area Maps as intended.

7. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S) : 20C.10.200(05) City Center Design Areas Map  
20C.10.200(15)(b) City Center linkage  
System, Page C-6

PROBLEM: The City of Redmond Technical Committee has adopted Appendix H - City Center Linkage System Construction Specifications. With the adoption of this appendix, the City set a new width standard for all sidewalks in City Center at eight (8) feet (see page H-3 of Appendix in Development Guide). The current maps and charts call for the sidewalk for a "type V" linkage system to be only five (5) feet in width.

RECOMMENDATION: Amend 20C.10.200(05), City Center Design Area Maps, and 20C.10.200(15)(b) as follows:

Change all reference from Type V - five (5) feet to Type V - eight (8) feet.

RATIONALE: Design standards and Code Requirements should be the same.

The minimum eight foot walkway width is necessary to meet future pedestrian needs.

---

8. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): 20C.10.235(40)(c), tenth bullet, page C-8g

PROBLEM: This address submittal requirement was originally put in to accommodate Bellevue's process. It should have been eliminated in Redmond's code since we do not give notice for site plan review.

RECOMMENDATION: Amend 20C.10.235(40), Tenth bullet as follows:

Delete: ((.Address labels for all property owners within 300' of the subject property along with a copy of King County Assessor's map identifying these properties.))

RATIONALE: The City of Redmond does not require notice as part of the site plan review process.

9. SECTION(S) AND PARAGRAPH(S): 20C.10.235(45)(c) Signs, Page C-80 (right column, second paragraph under "Signs")

PROBLEM: The current method of processing sign applications elsewhere in the City is for review and approval by staff. The staff only forwards signs onto the Design Review Board if they believe there is a significant design issue which needs Design Review Board scrutiny.

RECOMMENDATION: Amend 20C.10.235(45)(c) Signs as follows:

- . Each sign must be architecturally integrated with the structures with which it is associated. ((The Design Review Board shall review each sign for compatibility of form, color and building materials.))

RATIONALE: The change brings the sign review process of the Evergreen Highlands into conformance with the current process used in the rest of the City.

It relieves the Design Review Board of unnecessary work. This process still allows the forwarding of sign permits to the Design Review Board when it is determined by the staff to be necessary.



10. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): 20C.10.235(50)(a) Pollution and Hazardous Waste Control Standards, page C-8p

PROBLEM: As currently written, the requirement applies to all of the Evergreen Highlands Performance Areas. This requirement is not necessary for the residential development in Performance Area A since the same requirement is not stipulated elsewhere in the City. In addition, the current wording does not include all contact agencies that may have jurisdiction over hazardous materials.

RECOMMENDATION: 1. Delete current wording in paragraph a.  
2. Reword Section 20C.20.235(50)(a) as follows:

Prior to issuance of a building permit or occupancy permit in Performance Areas B, C and D, and at the time when the occupants of a building are identified, the applicant shall provide documentation to the City of Redmond that all agencies with jurisdiction over hazardous materials use have been contacted and that all applicable standards will be met prior to the occupancy of the structures. To the maximum extent possible the contact must occur early in the development process so that the necessary measures may be implemented during the construction phase.

RATIONALE: This requirement is not justified in Performance Area A where only residential development is allowed. In addition, current language identifies only selected agencies which may have jurisdiction, excluding others such as the King County Department of Health, State Department of Transportation, Washington State Department of Labor and Industry, Washington State Department of Fisheries and Game. Proposed language would solve this problem. Many of the potential occupants (research and development; business services and manufacturing, etc.) uses allowed in these zones could be using hazardous materials in their operations.

11. SECTION(S) AND PARAGRAPHS(S): 20C.10.240(05) Permitted Land Uses Chart; page C-9  
 20C.20.110(05) Mobile Homes Generally; page C-38

PROBLEM: It is unclear whether mobile homes are permitted on individual platted lots anywhere outside mobile home parks in the City.

RECOMMENDATION: 1. Add cross reference in 20C.10.240(05) Permitted Land Use Chart to Section 20C.20.110(05) as follows:

A Part of Subsection 20C.10.240(05) PERMITTED LAND USES																						
LAND USES	ZONING DISTRICTS																					
	G	A	RE	R-1	R-2	R-3	R-4	R-5	R-6	R-8	R12	R20	R30	PO	NB	CO	CB	GC	BP	LI	HI	U
Mobile Home Parks (see 20C.20.110(05))											S	S	S	S								

2. Amend 20C.20.110(05) on page C-38 as follows:

Add New "b": (b) Mobile homes are permitted in mobile home parks only.

Move existing "b" down to become new paragraph (e) under Section 20C.20.110(10) Mobile Home Park Design and modify as follows:

(e) Mobile homes where permitted ((on individual permitted lots)) shall have foundations and tie down anchors. Permanent foundations are not required in mobile home parks with rental sites, but as a minimum mobile homes shall be placed in blocks to specifications prepared and distributed by the Building Department. The area under the mobile home must be screened from view.

RATIONALE: This change will clarify the code and respond to how mobile homes are administered by the City at present.

12. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): 20C.10.240(05) Permitted Land Uses; page C-10

PROBLEM: Permitted recreation activities in residential neighborhoods are not well defined. Some commercial activities present a land use problem in residential neighborhoods.

RECOMMENDATION:

The existing Section 20C.10.240(05) Permitted Land Uses has the following recreational categories:

A Part of Subsection 20C.10.240(05) PERMITTED LAND USES																							
LAND USES	ZONING DISTRICTS																						
	G	A	RE	R-1	R-2	R-3	R-4	R-5	R-6	R-8	R12	R20	R30	PO	NB	CO	CB	GC	BP	LI	HI	U	
Recreation Activities: golf course, yacht club.	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S										
Recreation Activities: tennis courts, swimming pools and beaches, playfields.	P		P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	P	S	S		
Gymnasiums, Recreation Center			S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	P	P	P	P						
Recreation Activities: athletic club, health club.														P		P	P	P	P				
Recreation Activities: bowling.														P		P	P	P					

The proposed new categories are noted below:

- Recreational Activities (Public or Private): golf course, yacht club
- Recreational Activities (Non-Commercial): Tennis courts, public swimming pools and beaches, playfields.
- Gymnasiums, Indoor Recreation Center (Non-Commercial)
- Recreation Activities (Commercial): Athletic clubs, health clubs, fitness centers, indoor skiing, baseball, etc.
- Recreational Activities: (Commercial) Bowling

In addition, a new category entitled "Recreational Activities: Swimming Pools (Commercial)" is proposed as noted below:

A Part of Subsection 20C.10.240(05) PERMITTED LAND USES																						
LAND USES	ZONING DISTRICTS																					
	G	A	RE	R-1	R-2	R-3	R-4	R-5	R-6	R-8	R12	R20	R30	PO	NB	CO	CB	GC	BP	LI	HI	U
Recreational Activities: Swimming Pools (Commercial)			S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	S	P	P	P	P	P				

RATIONALE: Need to clarify where commercial recreation activities are permitted for the following reasons:

1. Differentiate between private commercial facilities and public noncommercial facilities open to the public.
2. Clarify where recreational activities should be allowed given that when the Development Guide was adopted, commercial recreational activities were not so prevalent as they are today.

**PROBLEM:** Development Guide unclear whether pure sales offices without on-site associated warehouse, storage or distribution facilities are allowed in the CO, CB, CG, BP zone for the following categories:

Wholesale Trade/Bulk Sales  
Wholesale Trade  
Bulk Retail

TRADE WHOLESAL AND RETAIL	G	A	RE	R-1	R-2	R-3	R-4	R-5	R-6	R-8	R12	R20	R30	PO	NB	CO	CB	GC	BP	LI	HI	U
Wholesale Trade/Bulk Sales: metals, petroleum, scrap and waste materials but excluding motor vehicles, livestock.																						G
Wholesale Trade: general merchandise, products, supplies, materials, equipment.																		P	P	P		
Bulk Retail: lumber, building materials, paintglass, heating, plumbing, electrical supplies.																		P	G	P		

**RECOMMENDATION:** For each of the above categories add additional "office only" reference similar to existing Contract Construction category (see below). These "office only" sales offices should then be permitted in CO, CB, CG, BP zones where traditionally these uses are allowed.

A Part of Subsection 20C.10.240(05) PERMITTED LAND USES																						
LAND USES	ZONING DISTRICTS																					
	G	A	RE	R-1	R-2	R-3	R-4	R-5	R-6	R-8	R12	R20	R30	PO	NB	CO	CB	GC	BP	LI	HI	U
Contract Construction Services: office and storage of materials and equipment.																						P
office only																P	P	P	P			

**RATIONALE:**

1. This change formalizes the Planning Director's Administrative Interpretation of March, 1983.
2. It is not the intent of the code to preclude office uses from the CO, CB, CG, BP zones.
3. Other similar office uses are allowed with similar impacts are allowed, including Contract Construction.
4. These types of strict office uses do not usually draw walk-in or drive-in traffic.

14. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): 20C.10.240(05) Permitted Land Uses; pages C-12 and C-14

PROBLEM: Confusion over how Commercial Photographers catering to industrial/commercial clients and not the general public are categorized. Not appropriate under Personal Services category on page C-14.

RECOMMENDATION: Codify May, 1984, Administrative Interpretation from Planning Director as follows:

1. Create new category entitled "Commercial/Industrial Photography, Cinematography, Video Production" which would be allowed in the PO, CO, CB, GC, BP and LI zones, and,

SERVICES	G	A	RE	R-1	R-2	R-3	R-4	R-5	R-6	R-8	R12	R20	R30	PO	NB	CO	CB	GC	BP	LI	HI	U	
Commercial / Industrial Photography, Cinematography, Video Production														P		P	P	P	P	P			

2. add words "Photo Finishing" in Printing, Publishing, Allied Product Manufacturing category under manufacturing.

MANUFACTURING	G	A	RE	R-1	R-2	R-3	R-4	R-5	R-6	R-8	R12	R20	R30	PO	NB	CO	CB	GC	BP	LI	HI	
Printing, Publishing, Allied Product Manufacturing <i>Photo Finishing</i>																			P	P	P	

RATIONALE: Commercial/Industrial photo studios and cinematographers which primarily photograph products and not people, which do not encourage general public drop-in traffic, and which pick up and deliver their own products should be categorized separately from portrait photographers. It is more appropriate to locate these types of uses near their commercial and industrial clients and to distinguish commercial/industrial photographers from portrait photographers which are categorized as photo studios under Personal Services on page C-14.

In addition, those businesses which are primarily processing film should be specifically noted under the Manufacturing section in the Printing, Publishing and Allied Products Manufacturing category.

15. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): 20C.10.240(05) Permitted Land Uses; pages C-17

PROBLEM: Clarify the Development Guide relative to food preparation businesses with off-premise sales and commercial catering services with no on-site sales in BP and LI zones.

RECOMMENDATION: Add new category to Section 20C.10.240(05) on page C-17, under Services entitled:

Bulk Food Preparation for Catering Services - no on-site sales

Add: P in chart under BP and LI columns.

SERVICES	G	A	RE	R-1	R-2	R-3	R-4	R-5	R-6	R-8	R12	R20	R30	PO	NB	CO	CB	GC	BP	LI	HI	U
Bulk Food Preparation for Catering Services - No on-site sales																			P	P		

- RATIONALE:
1. Codify May, 1985 administrative interpretation.
  2. Similar activities are allowed in BP and LI zones under the Food Products Manufacturing category of the Permitted Land Use Chart.
  3. Such uses would not contradict the intent of the BP, LI zones.
  4. Such activities, with non on-site sales, do not draw significant amounts of walk-in drive-in traffic by the general public.

16. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): 20C.10.250(30) Site Requirements; page C-20

PROBLEM: Confusion whether unstaffed, ancillary, utility facilities must meet the 1.5 acre minimum tract area requirement of the Business Park (BP) zones.

RECOMMENDATION: Section 20C.10.250(30); add new sentence:

Add: Unstaffed, ancillary utility facilities are exempt from this requirement.

RATIONALE:

1. There is no minimum lot size required in BP zones.
2. Requiring unmanned utility substations to develop on 1.5 acres would be an inefficient use of property.
3. These facilities do not constitute normal "development" as intended by this section.
4. The City retains review authority of these facilities through the short plat and site plan review procedures.

---

17. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): 20C.10.250(20) Minimum Lot Area Per Dwelling Unit; page C-20

PROBLEM: Last sentence of this section conflicts with Section 20F.10.060(15) Nonconforming Lots of Record, on page F-3, which states that lots which were legally conforming to the zoning in place prior to the adoption of the Development Guide "may be used as otherwise permitted."

RECOMMENDATION: Amend last sentence of Section 20C.10.250(20) to read as noted below:

10.050(20) Minimum Lot Area Per Dwelling Unit --  
The chart establishes the minimum lot area per dwelling unit at the densities set in paragraph (15) of this section. The minimum lot sizes have been established to encourage clustering of dwelling units. The reduction of lot sizes to meet the minimum does not permit an increase in the number of dwelling units established by paragraph (15) of this section. Lots existing at the time of adoption of this section may be developed provided that development is in accordance with the applicable standards and procedures of Development Guide, including Section 20F.10.060(15) ((at the minimum lot size established by this section)).

RATIONALE: Make language of the Development Guide consistent recognizing that legally nonconforming lots have the right to develop as long as other standards are met.



18. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): 20C.10.250(50) Front, Rear and Side Building Setbacks; page C-21

PROBLEM: There is no indication of where to measure setbacks from access corridors.

RECOMMENDATION: Add language to Section 20C.10.250(50) as indicated below:

10.250(50) Front, Rear and Side Building Setbacks  
- All setbacks shall be measured perpendicularly from the nearest property line, or in the case of access corridors for single family residential development, from the interior edge of the easement to the foundation line of the structure. Front, side and rear directions shall be determined as provided in paragraph (e) of this subsection.

RATIONALE: Further clarifies setback measurement and ensures that setbacks from access corridors is consistent with setbacks from right-of-ways.

---

19. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): 20C.10.250(50)(f) Front, Rear and Side Building Setbacks; page C-21

PROBLEM: Do setbacks have to be met from all private streets and access easements? Not clear in Development Guide.

RECOMMENDATION: 20C.10.250(10)(f); rewrite as follows:

(f) Front setbacks shall apply whenever a lot abuts a street or access corridor except where provided by part (c), setback exceptions, of this section. Setbacks from private streets and access easements must be met when the private access corridor or easement serves two or more separate lots, except as provided by Section 20C.10.250(90)(h).

RATIONALE:

1. This has been the common practice in previous site plan reviews.
2. Two or more lots usually creates a situation where it would be desirable to have to setback due to traffic volumes.

PROBLEM: Above section does not limit flagpole height which can have potential design impacts on a project.

RECOMMENDATION: Include flagpoles in the last sentence of the paragraph along with chimneys, antennas, smoke and ventilation stacks, as noted below:

"...Chimneys, antennas, smoke and ventilation stacks, flagpoles, may exceed the height by no more than 15 feet."

RATIONALE: Limitations on flagpole height is not currently identified elsewhere in the Code. Addition to this sentence will make flagpoles consistent with other like structures.

22. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): 20C.20.020(10) and (20), page C29-30

PROBLEM: Rabbits are identified as both household pets and small domestic animals. This creates conflict between maximum number allowed (3 vs. 10) and minimum acreage requirements (1.5 acres minimum required for small domestic animals).

RECOMMENDATION: Delete reference to rabbits in Section 20C.20.020(20): small domestic animals.

RATIONALE: Most prevalent situation in the City is where rabbits are kept as household pets, and therefore, should be treated as such.

23. SECTION(S) AND PAR(S): 20C.20.030(05)(b) Family Day Care Homes;  
page C-31.

PROBLEM: Since preschools and day care facilities are regulated similarly by the City with regard to the land use impacts, but differentiated for State licensing purposes, the above section should be clarified to respond to this regulatory distinction.

RECOMMENDATION: Add language to Section 20C.20.030(05)(b) as noted below:

- (b) State licensing standards and requirements must be met where appropriate; and

RATIONALE: The additional language will prevent local regulations from creating double jeopardy situation for preschools by inadvertently forcing them to comply with unnecessary day care regulations. Preschools which meet for less than four hours per day are exempt from State day care regulations.

24. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): DAY CARE 20C.20.030(10)(  
20C.20.030(15)(c), page C-31

PROBLEM: All current fees are noted on the APPLICATION FEES CHART which is a separate handout from the Development Guide. The separate listing in the Development Guide is unnecessary and may cause confusion when fees are revised.

RECOMMENDATION: Amend 20C.20.030 as follows:

Delete: 20C.20.030(10)(f) and 20C.20.030(15)(c)

Change: 20C.20.030(15)(d) to 20C.20.030(15)(c)

RATIONALE: Unnecessary confusion is eliminated. All references to fees should be included only on the Application Fees Chart instead of incorporated into the Development Guide. Therefore, if fee schedules change, conflicts will not result.

---

25. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): 20C.20.030(15) Day Care Centers; page C-31.

PROBLEM: Paragraph (d) specifies a minimum lot size for day care centers no less than 20,000 square feet. This regulation has not been applied in the City Center zones where joint wall construction and multiple tenant buildings are prevalent.

RECOMMENDATION: 1. Amend 20C.20.030(15)(d) as follows:

(d) The minimum lot size shall be 20,000 square feet in all residential zones.

RATIONALE:

1. The minimum lot requirement was intended to help buffer day care centers from surrounding homes in residential areas.
2. This requirement is not practical and has not been applied in the City Center zones due to the prevalence of joint wall construction and multiple tenant buildings.

26. SECTION(S) AND PROBLEM(S): 20C.20.060(10) Floodway Flood Restrictions;  
page C-33

PROBLEM: Title of this section is confusing and uses incorrect terminology.

RECOMMENDATION: Change title of Section 20C.20.060(10) page C-33 as follows:

Existing: 20.060(10) Floodway ((Flood)) Restrictions

Proposed: 20.060(10) Floodway Fringe Restrictions

RATIONALE: The regulations in this section pertain to the entire floodway fringe as identified in the graphic on page C-33. The current title is confusing.

PROBLEM: Private parties arbitrarily trimming street trees.

RECOMMENDATION: Add wording to the end of Section 20C.20.090(35) Street Trees which reads:

Street trees shall be cut or pruned only under the supervision of Redmond Parks Department.

RATIONALE: Street trees are public property and therefore should be maintained by the City, not arbitrarily pruned or removed by private parties.

28. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): Section 20C.20.230(35)(a), Banners on Redmond Way Railroad Overpass, page C-61.

- PROBLEM:
1. Current language does not include governmental entities in those groups that can utilize this space for temporary signs.
  2. Existing language includes a requirement that that applicant obtain public liability insurance; the City Attorney as rendered an opinion that this activity presents little potential liability and therefore the insurance requirement is burdensome and unnecessary.

RECOMMENDATION:

Replace current language of Section 20C.20.230(35)(a) to read as follows:

(a) Banners on Redmond Way railroad overpass - sign banners may be displayed on the Burlington Northern railroad bridge Redmond Way overcrossing on a temporary basis for a period not to exceed fourteen (14) days providing the following criteria are met:

1. The banner shall not exceed 100 square feet in area;
2. The sign message must promote a governmental, charitable or civic activity sponsored by a governmental entity or private non-profit organization;
3. The sign banner shall be of a light weight, plastic, fabric or durable paper material and shall not be constructed of wood, metal or any other such heavier material which could present a hazard if the banner became detached from the overpass.
4. Permits for overpass signs shall be issued and administered by the Director of Public Works or the Director's designee. A fee in an amount sufficient to cover the cost of processing a permit application shall be charged for each permit.

RATIONALE:

1. Modified language will allow the City, and other governmental bodies, to advertise or announce civic events.
2. New language drops unnecessary requirement for liability insurance.



29. SECTION(S) AND PARAGRAPH(S): 20C.20.230(35)(c), Permitted Temporary Signs - Celebration Displays, page C-61

PROBLEM: Proliferation of large, helium filled promotional balloons not currently addressed by this section of the Code. The intent of this section was to allow promotional advertising but not as a loophole for billboard size advertising inconsistent with Section 20C.20.230(30), Sign Requirements Per Zoning District Chart.

RECOMMENDATION: Section 20C.20.230(35)(c)

Add: Large celebration displays are not allowed to project above the building with which they are associated and must be outside all site distance triangles noted in Section 20C.20.220(20).

RATIONALE: The intent of this section is to allow localized, temporary advertising related to a special event. It was never intended to allow large-scale promotional displays visible on a regional scale. These displays should not dominate smaller scale, permanent signage which is permitted.

30. SECTION(S) AND PARAGRAPH(S): 20C.20.245(25)(d) Allowed Temporary Uses, page C-74.

PROBLEM: Fireworks stands require a permit under both Chapter 9.26 of the Redmond Municipal Code, and Section 20C. Temporary Uses, which duplicates City staff effort.

- RECOMMENDATION:
1. Delete Section 20C.245(25)(d), Allowed Temporary Uses on page C-74 which reads as follows:
    - (d) "Fireworks stands which are also subject to Chapter 9.26 "Fireworks" of the Redmond Municipal Code.
  2. Add to Section 20C.245(30) Exemptions on page C-75 an additional paragraph S as follows:
    - (S) Fireworks stands which comply with Chapter 9.26 "Fireworks" of the Redmond Municipal Code and shall meet the following requirements:
      - . Only one sign is allowed
      - . Signage must be attached to the firework stand
      - . No "sandwich" board type signs are allowed
      - . All firework stand operations and sales must take place outside of landscaped areas and public right-of-ways.

RATIONALE: This change clarifies that firework stands are governed specifically by Chapter 9.26 of the Redmond Municipal Code, in conjunction with the specific requirements noted in the new language instead of the general requirements of the Temporary Use section.

31. SECTION(S) AND CODE(S): 20C.20.245(30)(n) Exceptions (Temporary Uses); page C-75

PROBLEM: It is difficult to justify staff or applicant time and expense required to process a temporary use permit for an activity, vendor or booth associated with a City sponsored/authorized special event such as the Redmond Bike Classic. The code already exempts those activities associated with Redmond Derby Days; a fairly intensive two day event in downtown Redmond. The current requirements have resulted in vendors associated with the Bike Classic to either defy the code and set up a few hours anyway on the day of the race or simply not participate because they didn't have the time to file an application.

RECOMMENDATION: Amend 20C.20.245(30)(n) as follows:

1. Delete current wording.
2. Create a new (n) which reads:

(n) Activities, vendors and booth associated with City of Redmond sponsored or authorized special events such as the Redmond Derby Days or Redmond Bike Classic.

RATIONALE: It is not the intent of the code to prohibit activities, vendors and booths in association with special events in downtown Redmond.

City expense and staff time can not be justified in terms of services to the public required under the current code in order to process a temporary use permit for only a one or two day special event.

32. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): New Section, 20F.20.055 entitled Processing Inconsistent or Concurrent Applications, page F-11

PROBLEM: At their 2/17/87 meeting the City Council expressed unanimous concern regarding:

1. Accepting permit applications which are not consistent with existing zoning, and
2. Processing concurrent applications (example: Hearing Examiner or Council consideration of a Zoning Map Amendment and associated Special Development Permit) for the same project.

Both practices raise questions of whether the legislative process is being abridged.

RECOMMENDATION: Add new Section 20F.20.055 to read as follows:

No hearing or deliberation upon an application for a special development permit, subdivision, variance, planned unit development, site plan approval, shoreline permit, or similar quasi-judicial or administrative action which are inconsistent with the existing zoning map shall be scheduled for the same meeting at which the required zoning map amendment will be considered by the Hearing Examiner or the City Council. This section is intended to be a "procedural requirement" applicable to such actions as noted in RCW 58.17.070.

RATIONALE: This new section responds to City Council concern regarding processing concurrent applications by ensuring that joint applications that are not consistent with the existing zoning map are first considered on the basis of the zoning map amendment criteria and then on the merits of the proposed development. Distinguishing between the broader impacts of a change in zoning and the more site specific impacts of the development proposal is often difficult when both items are considered at the same hearing.

33. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): 20F.20.070(15)(a) Notice of Hearings and Filings: page F-17 and Notice Requirements chart 20F.20.070(15)b on page F-18.

PROBLEM: Conflict exists between the notice period identified in the text on page F-17 for shoreline permits, short subdivisions and General Development permits, and that which is identified in the chart on page F-18. The chart specifies 10 days and the text calls for either two weeks and 30 days.

RECOMMENDATION: 1. Section 20F.20.070(15)(a) Notice of Hearings and Filings on page F-17 should be amended as follows:

"...A notice of filing shall contain the date of filing; the item being considered and the action being sought; if applicable a legal description of the property; a statement that indicates that written comments and requests for a copy of the final action taken may be made thirty days of the last newspaper notice for shoreline permits and ten (10) days ((two (2) weeks)) for short subdivisions and other General Development Permits; and how and where additional information may be obtained.

2. Notice Requirements Chart, Section 20F.20.070(15)(b) on page F-18 should be changed as indicated below:

20F.20.070(15)(b) NOTICE REQUIREMENTS

TYPE OF APPLICATION	NOTICE REQUIREMENTS									
	WHEN	FIRST CLASS MAILING		NEWSPAPER PUBLICATION			POSTING			
	30 days prior to hearing or action	20 days prior to hearing or action	10 days prior to hearing or action	subject owners	subject & adjacent* property owners	Once	Once a week for two consecutive weeks	Post Off. City Hall Library 3 sites on or near property	Post Off. City Hall Library 1 site on or near property	Special Rqmts. **
General Development Permit:										
Short Sub-division/Other			X	X	0	X		0	X	X
Shoreline Permit	X		X	X	0	0	X	0	X	

RATIONALE: The additional column will correct the current discrepancy between the text and chart and conform to RCW 90.58.140 of the Shoreline Management Act.

35. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): 20F.20.110 (05) FINAL ORDER; page F-19

PROBLEM: 20F.20.110(05) Final Order requires that all approvals require final approval orders be signed. This has not been the practice. The City does not require that this be done for site plan approval.

There is also a requirement that the final approval order be signed within 30 days with no explanation of what happens if they don't.

RECOMMENDATION: Amend 20F.20.110(05) as follows:

1. Delete: All reference to the 30 day time limit on the signing of the final approval order. The new section should read as follows:

20.110(05) Final Order - Upon final approval of the application, a Final Approval Order that describes the proposed action, contains any conditions of approval, and is signed by the approval authority shall be placed in the Planning Department's file ((entered into the record)). A copy shall be forwarded to the applicant who shall sign and return it ((within 30 days of transmittal)) to the City, acknowledging that the applicant understands ((indicating agreement with)) the terms and conditions of the preliminary or final approval and the requirements of the Development Guide. Until the final approval order has been signed by the applicant, the application does not have final approval and is not complete.

2. Add: A new section exempting site plan approvals from the final approval signing requirements. The new section should read as follows:

20.110(25) Exemptions - The following approvals of applications are exempt from the signing of a Final Approval Order:

(a) Site Plan Approvals

RATIONALE: Clarification is in order and the above changes are recommended by the City Attorney. Final approval orders are not required as a matter of practice since the Technical Committee approval letter performs this function.

The 30 day requirement has no meaning since all approvals have one year from the date approval was granted before they expire in accordance with 20F.20.110(10), and the Final Approval Order must be signed within that year.

36. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): 20F.20.150(30); Short Subdivisions --  
Procedures; page F-21

PROBLEM: The Development Guide does not indicate how short subdivisions will be prepared. The application instructions (counter hand-outs) state that the short plat be prepared by a licensed land surveyor. This is not only inconsistent, but it allows a short plat to be applied for without the benefit of a survey.

RECOMMENDATION: Add language to above section, paragraph 30, as follows:

20.150(30) Short Subdivision Procedures -- The processing of short subdivisions shall follow the procedures of the General Development Permit, Section 20F.20.030, "Development Permits and Procedures. Short Subdivisions shall be surveyed and prepared by a Washington State licensed land surveyor.

RATIONALE: Ensures that division of land is performed accurately and that recorded documents are completed professionally.

37. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): 20F.20.240 DEVELOPMENT GUIDE AMENDMENTS;  
page F-26a

PROBLEM: Above section is confusing.

RECOMMENDATION: Amend Section 20F.20.240 as noted below:

1. Change 20.240(05) to read as follows:

20.240(05) Purpose - the purpose of this section is to provide the procedures and requirements for amending the Development Guide. The term "Development Guide Amendment" means a revision, addition or deletion to the Redmond Community Development Guide except as exempted in Section 20.C20.240(15).

2. Change 20.240(10) to read as follows:

20.240(10)Scope - All Development Guide Amendments, including amendments and additions to the text, maps and charts of the Redmond Community Development Guide shall follow the process set up in Section 20F.20.030 titled Development Permit Procedures and Responsible Authority.

3. 20.240(12) Amendment Criteria - All amendments to the Development Guide processed under this section shall be in conformance with title 20B.00.000 "Goals, Policies and Plans" including the locational criteria specified in Section 20B.90.030 where applicable. Inclusion of this paragraph will ensure that review of a Development Guide Amendment include review of all goals, policies and plans included in Section 20B.20.000 with specific reference to Section 20B.90.030 LAND USE CATEGORIES AND LOCATIONAL CRITERIA where appropriate.

4. Change 20.240(15) Exemptions as follows:

20.240(15) Exemptions - ((Property owner is initiated)) Amendments to the Zoning Map shall follow the procedures...



NOTE: As a result of the change proposed in paragraph 2, further clarification should be made on the chart on page F-12 entitled, DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PROCEDURES AND RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY. An asterisk should be added under the far right hand column entitled "ZMA", and row entitled "Public Hearing", and language included below in the legend, to indicate that if a zoning map amendment requires a land use change that it will be processed as a Development Guide Amendment with the public hearing held before the Planning Commission instead of the Hearing Examiner. Please see chart below:

20F.20.030 DEVELOPMENT PERMIT PROCEDURES AND RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY													
MAJOR STEPS IN PROCESSING APPLICATION		TYPE OF APPLICATION											
		PP	SDP	GDP	SP	SS	VA	RV	CU	A	DGA	ZMA	
Pre-Application Conference	20F.20.040	TC	TC	TC	TC	TC	TC	TC	TC	TC	CC	TC	TC
Filing of Application	20F.20.050	DPCD	DPCD	DPCD	DPCD	DPCD	DPCD	DPCD	DPCD	KCA	DPCD	DPCD	DPCD
Staff Review, SPR & Environmental Assessment	20F.20.060	TC	TC	TC	TC	TC	TC	TC	TC	TC	TC	TC	TC
Public Hearing (Recommendation)	20F.20.070	HE	HE					HE	CC	RKC	CC	PC	HE*

Use of the Chart - Sections 20F.20.040 through 20F.20.140 explain procedural steps, and Sections 20F.20.150 through 20F.20.260 explain each application. The sections describing the individual applications may contain paragraphs that modify or add special requirements to the procedures indicated on the chart. Procedural steps may be combined for projects requiring one or more applications where feasible, at the discretion of the Technical Committee. \* ZMA's requiring a change to the Land Use Plan are processed as a DGA

RESPONSIBLE AUTHORITY:

TC: Technical Committee    HE: Hearing Examiner    PC: Planning Commission    CC: City Council  
DPCD: Dept. of Planning & Community Development    RKC: Redmond-King County Council's Committee  
KCA: King County Assessor    AD: Appropriate City Department

LEGEND:

PP - Subdivision; SDP - Special Development Permit; GDP - General Development Permit; SP - Shoreline Permit;  
SS - Short Subdivision; VA - Variance; RV - Right-of-Way Vacation; CU - Current Use Tax; A - Direct  
Petition Annexation; DGA - Development Guide Amendment; ZMA - Zoning Map Amendment

F-12

**RATIONALE:** Rewording is recommended by the City Attorney in an attempt to clarify and make this section easier to interpret.

PROBLEM: Above section is confusing.

RECOMMENDATION: Amend Section 20F.20.250 ZONING MAP AMENDMENTS as noted below:

1. Change 20.250(10) to read as follows:

20.250(10) Scope - ((This section shall apply to property owner initiated amendments to Section 20C.10.030, "Zoning Map", including amendments for newly annexed territory.)) All Zoning Map Amendments to Section 20C.10.030 "Zoning Map" shall follow the process set up in Section 20F.20.030 titled Development Permit Procedures and Responsible Authority. No amendments to the Zoning Map shall be made that are not in conformance with Article 20B.00.000, "Goals, Policies and Plans."

2. Change Section 20.250(15) as follows:

20.250(15) Exemptions - All zoning map amendments covered by Section 20F.20.240, "Development Guide Amendments," are exempt from this Section 20F.20.250, "Zoning Map Amendments," except for those criteria noted in Section 20F.20.250(30) Amendment Criteria.

3. Amend 20.250(30) Amendment Criteria - The following factors are to be taken into account by the Hearing Examiner, Planning Commission, and the City Council when considering a map amendment:

1. Compliance with Title 20B.00.000, "Goals, Policies and Plans".
2. Changes in conditions which would warrant the amendment
3. Mistake in map designation
4. Comparison to zoning of surrounding area ((adjacent use districts))
5. Comparison to surrounding ((adjacent)) land uses
6. The demonstrated need for additional zoning as the type proposed

1. Conformance of proposed development, if any, with applicable goals, policies, plans and regulations ((and any speculative interest by the applicant)).

RATIONALE:

1. Clarify the wording of the section.
2. Present consistency between this Section and Section 20F.20.240 Development Guide Amendments.
3. Eliminate paragraph 15, Exemptions, since all Zoning Map Amendments must be covered by Section 20F.20.250 "Zoning Map Amendments."
4. Update Amendment Criteria as recommended by the City Attorney.

39. SECTION(S) AND PAGE(S): Appendix G Construction Specification and Design Standards for Streets and Access; page G-2, #4 under C. Location and Number of Driveways.

PROBLEM: This Appendix is in conflict with Section 20C.10.250(50)(d) Front, Rear and Side building Setbacks on page C-21, which allows improvements under 30 inches above grade (including driveways) to be built to the property line.

RECOMMENDATION: Delete Appendix reference noted above.

RATIONALE: Eliminate contradiction between Code sections, and eliminate unnecessary contradiction in Development Guide.