



NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING

Notice is hereby given that the City Council of the City of Medina will hold a Hybrid Public Hearing via Teleconference Zoom Meeting and In-Person at Medina City Hall on **Monday, September 28, 2026, at 6:00 PM** or as soon thereafter as called by the City Council, regarding the **Development Impacts Phase 1**.

The Medina City Council has moved to hybrid meetings, offering both in-person and online meeting participation.

Please see below for ways to participate and comment during the Hybrid public hearing.

Register to Speak: Individuals wishing to speak live during the Hybrid Public Hearing will need to register their request with the Acting City Clerk at 425.233.6410 or email dnations@medina-wa.gov and leave a message [before 2PM](#) on the day of the September 28 Council meeting. Please reference Public Hearing for September 28 Council Meeting on your correspondence. The Acting City Clerk will call on you by name or telephone number when it is your turn to speak.

Telephone: To listen to the meeting or speak live during the Public Hearing via telephone, please call [1-253-215-8782](tel:1-253-215-8782) and enter 891 8542 8569# when prompted.

Internet: To watch the meeting over the internet or speak live during Public Hearing, via your computer microphone, follow these steps:

Join Zoom Meeting

<https://medina-wa.zoom.us/j/89185428569?pwd=d9QwY6gFPBJ1bUzHN9GMblhciGbbn3.1>

Meeting ID: 891 8542 8569

Passcode: 489905

Written Comments: Written comments may be submitted to the Acting City Clerk at dnations@medina-wa.gov. Written comments must be received [by 2PM on September 28, 2026](#). All comments timely received will be forwarded to the Council before the meeting. A brief summary of the comments will be included in the minutes of the meeting.

Medina City Council Meeting
September 14, 2026 – 6:00 PM
Medina Ordinance #1052
Speaking Notes

Todd Bennett

I represent the property located at:

1811 NE 73rd Avenue

I wanted to comment on Ordinances 1052-1059 and the new Phase I draft code changes you reviewed earlier today.

- 1) I am in general in favor of the Phase I draft changes and I have two areas I would like to address.

II Section 16.71.010 – C(3.)d Minor Deviation - Height

Under the proposed Phase I draft changes:

The Bonus Height is potentially available in all residential zones except the R16 Zone.

We would appreciate it if the City would consider extending the potential for Bonus Height to the R16 Zone as well.

Bonus Height is discretionary and would still be under the oversight and control of the Minor Deviation process.

I personally think Bonus Height on smaller lots would be more helpful in designing non-boxy homes than on larger lots due to smaller lots having more constraints to overcome to accomplish a truly great home design.

Bonus height allows for more interesting roof lines, and this could improve the homes designed in the R16 zone.

If Bonus Height is considered for R16 zoning, the 13% restriction on site coverage would need to be addressed. This 13% restriction becomes more of a challenge as lots become small.

On a 10,000-sf lot, 13% is only 1300 sf which is a small home.

The Current City Code already imposes strict structural coverage limits in all zones, which restrict home size more than all the neighboring cities we work in.

If the City would considers allowing Bonus Height in the R16 Zone, the City could also consider removing the additional 13% structural coverage restriction for Bonus Height in the R16 zone, in favor of current existing strict Structural Coverage Ratios.

II Section 16.71.010 G (3.) Conditions of Approval

There is also a section in the Phase I draft that says, to approve a Minor Deviation,

The decision authority **may apply** any of 5 listed conditions.

I think it is intended that the decision authority has discretion to apply any number of these, from zero to all 5 but that not are required.

The way the 5 listed conditions are written is unclear to me.

- 1) Privacy landscaping **shall be** installed.
- 2) Glazing **may be** limited.
- 3) Decks **are** limited to 100 sf. on the second floor.

- 4) Lighting **will** comply
- 5) Additional mitigation may be required.

I think the wordage should be clarified that any of these conditions “May Be” required and this sb consistent across all 5.

Our particular concern to us is the limitation on Deck size on the second floor.

100 sf is small for a very expensive home.
Our planned home does have a second story deck that exceeds 100 sf.

Our site is a waterfront site with a park on one side.
We do have a larger deck than 100 sf that opens up to the waterfront and to the park and does not impact the neighbors.

We would appreciate consideration of situations like this on a case by case basis, and not have a non-flexible size limit imputed in the code for decks.