

**Table 1. First Draft Land Use Element Planning Commission Question / Comment Matrix.**

Comment #	Submitted By	Comment/Question	Staff Response
PC-1	Michael Murphy	<p>There appears to be opposition to more residential density in the Town Center, yet there is also antipathy from a vocal minority to any increased density in the SF zones. Moreover, the refusal to even consider allowing minor density increases in the SF zones, such as townhomes, does nothing to contribute to the statewide housing shortage. The notion that a few high-end townhomes would destroy our SF neighborhoods is not credible. Allowing some townhome style developments in SF neighborhoods would give the City a greater ability to focus on commercial development in the Town Center, while still meeting or exceeding our housing growth goals under GMA. See Goals 15 &amp; 16.</p>	
		<p>IV. Land Use Issues  <i>“(1) The Town Center land designated for commercial retail, service and office uses is much larger than the local population can support. This has contributed to a historical pattern of relatively low private investment in downtown properties.”</i>                      This statement conflicts with the recent adoption of the Town Center code amendments. On the one hand, we are saying that preservation of existing patterns is not sustainable, then we adopt a code designed to achieve that result. See also Goal 2, 2.2 (page 14) and Goal 14, 14.10 (page 20).</p>	<p>This land use issue appears to be outdated. Striking this issue is appropriate.</p>
		<p>Goal 7, 7.1: <i>“7.1 All Town Center streets should provide for safe and convenient multi-modal access to existing and future development in the Town Center.”</i> Use of “all” here is unrealistic.</p>	<p>Planning Commission can decide whether to amend this goal as proposed, see second draft.</p>
		<p>Goal 12: “Encouraging” public spaces is inadequate. This needs to be stronger: we need to be strongly incentivizing the creation/dedication of such spaces and their acquisition.</p>	<p>Staff recommended amendment to Policy 12.2 is strengthen the public spaces language is included in the Second Draft of the element.</p>
		<p>Add a new paragraph to Goal 16 as follows:  <i>“16.7 Eliminate unnecessary barriers and create exceptions and/or variance options to regulations that would otherwise prevent improvements to existing homes to allow owners to enjoy the full utility of existing lots, preserve value, and avoid the incentive to remove and replace existing homes.”</i></p>	<p>Planning Commission can decide whether to amend this policy as proposed in the comment or staff alternative, see second draft.</p>
		<p>Goal 1 . Modify 18.1 as follows:  <i>“18.1 The City of Mercer Island shall protect environmentally sensitive lands such as <u>natural</u> watercourses, geologic hazard areas, steep slopes, shorelines, wildlife habitat conservation areas, and wetlands. Such protection should continue through the implementation and enforcement of critical areas and shoreline regulations.”</i></p>	<p>Planning Commission can decide whether to amend this goal as proposed, see second draft.</p>
<p>Goal 1 . Modify 18.4 as follows:  <i>“18.4 The ecological functions of <u>natural</u> watercourses, wetlands, and habitat conservation areas should be maintained and protected from the potential impacts associated with development.”</i></p>	<p>Planning Commission can decide whether to amend this goal as proposed, see second draft.</p>		
PC-2	Adam Ragheb	<p>Text edits to introductory text on page 2.</p>	<p>Edits recommended for clarity were made to the second draft.</p>
		<p>Why are the data about pax car travel and building energy consumption removed? Do the car travel data include those transiting through MI along I-90, e.g. while on a trip from Bellevue to Seattle, or are the data only for O&amp;D trips to/from MI? [page 5]</p>	<p>These paragraphs are proposed to be struck because the information on climate change planning will be out of date once the Climate Action Plan is adopted. The climate change section will be updated if needed after the Climate Action Plan is finished. Staff recommends waiting to make substantive edits to this text until the Climate Action Plan work is concluded.</p>
		<p>2024 periodic review....were amended? Did this already happen? If so, when was the 2024 periodic review (confusing since 2024 is in the future)? [page 5]                      update notes too when new data arrive from PSRC [Table 1, page 6]</p>	<p>The 2024 periodic review is referred to in the past tense because it will have occurred by the time the Land Use Element is adopted during that same periodic review.                      This comment will be addressed once the new data are provided from PSRC.</p>

Comment #	Submitted By	Comment/Question	Staff Response
		Are these still current as of 2022? If so, I would say it is worth mentioning the date. [Table 2, page 7]	The date the data are current is implicit in the adoption date of the element. The area of each zone has not changed since 2014 and is not expected to change during the periodic review. As a result, the areas in Table 2 will be current as of adoption in 2024.
		maybe add a reference to the final figure in the document (the one that currently shows office space at south end QFC) [page 8, comment 1]	Figure 1. Land Use Map at the end of the Land Use Element designates areas for <i>future</i> land uses as opposed to describing existing land use. The text on page 8 is summarizing the <i>existing</i> land uses throughout the City. The text in this section does not need to match the future land use map because the map and text describe different things.
		Is this sentence still necessary? After COVID appeared, the importance of high-capacity transit systems I would argue declined as more people WFH or have hybrid work environments. [page 8, comment 2]	The sentence in question is explaining that the City is designated a “High-Capacity Transit” (HCT) jurisdiction in the Puget Sound Regional Council (PSRC) <i>Vision 2050</i> planning document. The City is still categorized as an HCT jurisdiction in <i>Vision 2050</i> . No change is recommended.
		When did the amending process begin? Can we provide a reference to the report? If data through end of 2019 were used and analyzed over 2020 and released in 2021, that is a problem. If models were adjusted in late 2020 early 2021 to account for COVID trends, that is good. More details on their data assumptions needed or at least a link to them in my opinion. [page 8, comment 3]	<p>The text citation to the Urban Growth Capacity Report and King County Countywide Planning Policies in the Land Use Element should suffice. Adding links to reports in the Land Use Element is not recommended because these links can become out of date.</p> <p>The City is required to use the Countywide Planning Policies, including growth targets, and the analysis of development capacity from the Urban Growth Capacity Report for the purpose of determining whether there is sufficient development capacity to accommodate the projected growth through 2044. COVID was a major disruption to the economy, including development, but its lasting effects on development capacity are unclear and may not be as significant in the twenty-year planning period considered in the Comprehensive Plan. The 2021 Urban Growth Capacity Report is a point in time projection of development capacity given the amount existing development, zoning regulations, environmental conditions, and development in the pipeline. The COVID pandemic may have slowed the completion of development in the pipeline but does not change the amount of units in the pipeline or decrease the supply of developable land, zoning capacity, or environmental conditions.</p>
		Should we note that this does not account for any limitations of our utility infrastructure such as water and/or electricity? Would accommodating these new units push more intersections into needing to be upgraded to meet minimum levels of service? [page 10, comment 1]	Utility capacity is considered in the Utilities Element. Capital facility capacity is considered in the Capital Facilities Element. Transportation capacity is considered in the Transportation Element. The capacity analyses included with these elements, including level of service analysis, must be based on the same land use assumptions in the Land Use Element. These topic-specific comprehensive plan elements are the best place to get into the granular detail of accommodating growth and address the capacity impacts. All three elements will be updated during the periodic review.
		Perhaps worth noting that there are ongoing discussions/concerns about current Town Center parking to support local commerce. [page 10, comment 2]	<p>The text on page 10 is describing the housing capacity in zones throughout the City, including Town Center. Discussion of parking in Town Center could be added elsewhere in the document, possibly the Town Center Land Use Issues list on page 13 of the Land Use Element. It may not be as important to include this in the Land Use Element for two reasons: (1) parking in Town Center as it relates to local businesses can be addressed in the Economic Development Element, and (2) the current discussions of Town Center parking are likely to be resolved by the time the 2024 periodic review is adopted.</p> <p>The upcoming Economic Development Element is expected to address parking as it relates to businesses in commercial zones like Town Center. The Economic Development Element will have specific policies for the City in regard to supporting local businesses.</p>

Comment #	Submitted By	Comment/Question	Staff Response
		<p>May also be worth mentioning that existing or future statewide blanket laws may impact this number of units too (e.g. where our state representatives engaged in "not good public policy" on HB 1782 and SB 5670 per Mayor Nice's letter) despite City's best planning efforts. [page 11, comment 1]</p>	<p>It is possible that changes to the state law can affect City housing policies. If those changes amend our housing growth target before the 2024 periodic review, the target will need to be updated before the update is adopted. It is unlikely that the legislature will make changes to the state law that would affect the growth target during the 2024 periodic review, given that many cities and counties are already working on this update. Change would likely affect later periodic reviews.</p> <p>The City will be getting an affordable housing target in the coming months, as required by E2SHB 1220. This will probably be addressed primarily during the work on the Housing Element. The Planning Commission is expected to start working the Housing Element early next year, after the Housing Work Group has completed a draft of the Housing Element. More information on the affordable housing target will be provided at that time.</p>
		<p>Assumptions in projection? Date projections were made? [page 11, comment 2]</p>	<p>This comment is on the PSRC housing data section, which will be updated once the data are available from PSRC. This comment will be addressed at that time.</p>
		<p>is "typical suburban sprawl-like" a technical term? If not, it does not sound very objective to me (implies low density w/large parking lots is not desirable and we should build build build). [page 13, comment 1]</p>	<p>The text of Town Center Land Use Issue 1 can be amended. Michael Murphy's comment (PC-1) proposes striking this issue from the list. Given the changes in Town Center since the last time this list was update, it may be appropriate to strike this issue from the list.</p> <p>Sprawl is a nebulous term, but the Growth Management Act (GMA) has a stated goal of reducing sprawl. See Statewide Planning Goal 2 in RCW 36.70A.020(2):</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">“(2) Reduce sprawl. Reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development.”</p> <p>The GMA does not establish a definition of sprawl in RCW 36.70A.030. Sprawl being poorly defined and is a poor descriptor of the relatively-dense Town Center, striking this land use issue seems prudent.</p>
		<p>suggest edit: "disrupting the character as much" renting out ADUs will still affect the residential character as there will likely be more vehicles parked on the roads and more churn of residents.</p>	<p>Planning Commission can decide whether to amend this policy as proposed, see second draft.</p> <p>It is worth noting that the development standards for accessory dwelling units (ADUs) established in <a href="#">Mercer Island City Code (MICC) 19.02.030</a> have parking standards to limit the likelihood of ADU residents using street parking and an owner-occupancy requirement. The impacts listed in this comment are addressed in the development code.</p>
		<p>Do these transit connections now exist? I personally haven't had any issues and have observed significant transit development recently. [page 13, Outside Town Center Land Use Issue 7]</p>	<p>Land Use Issue 7 is pointing to the lack of pedestrian and transit connections between areas outside of Town Center and Town Center. There are existing connections between these places, but it would be challenging to get from many places in the City to Town Center without taking a car. This issue seems to still be something the City ought to focus on, especially as we continue to reduce vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse-gas-producing single-occupant car trips.</p>
		<p>Isn't restaurant seating the subject of more detailed conversations? Suggest marking this for review to ensure it is consistent with any upcoming detailed discussions. [page 17, Goal 7]</p>	<p>Outdoor dining on sidewalks in Town Center is currently allowed by an interim ordinance. It is likely that outdoor dining will continue to be allowed on sidewalks in Town Center after the City adopts permanent regulations in the next year. Permanent outdoor dining regulations are expected to come before the Planning Commission early next year.</p>

Comment #	Submitted By	Comment/Question	Staff Response
		Do we have a definition of CCHs? [page 21, Policy 15.2]	The question is where “compact courtyard homes” are defined. Compact courtyard homes are not currently defined in the plan or development code. Compact courtyard homes are typically a cluster of smaller scale homes (sometimes called cottages) centered around a landscaped communal space. These typically occur at a higher density than five dwellings per acre.
		reword to articulate that this C/O zone has already been added, right? I read this as last time document was updated the C/O zone was a new addition? [page 21, Policy 15.3]	Planning Commission can decide whether to amend this policy as proposed in the comment or the staff alternative, see second draft.
		Why accommodate the projected share as determined by the County? Why not respond to actual demand and MI residents' wishes/preferences? [page 21, Policy 16.2]	Coordination of comprehensive plans at both the regional and County level is a GMA requirement ( <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.100</a> ). Through the Countywide Planning Policies, King County coordinates growth projections for cities and towns within the County. The City is involved with the Growth Management Planning Council (GMPC) growth target allocation process, allowing the City a seat at the table when the County allocates growth. The City must accommodate the projected growth as decided through the statewide, regional (PSRC), and Countywide (GMPC) processes, see <a href="#">RCW 36.70A.115</a> . The Mercer Island community, through its elected officials, can respond to the growth targets in deciding how to respond to the allocated growth.
		These [ADUs] have already been promoted by now, right? [page 21, Policy 16.4]	The City has adopted development regulations for accessory dwelling units (ADUs). A policy like 16.4 is useful for describing the policy direction for ADUs. If the City eventually amends the ADU development code, this policy will help provide direction for how that code might be amended.
		15.3 on page 21 above defines this as "C/O," not CO. Ensure consistency and defining the acronym only the first time between 15.3, 17.2, 17.3, and the graphic/diagram. [page 22, Policy 17.2]	The recommended approach is to remove the acronym from the policy language. It is unnecessary to include the acronym when naming the zone, and removing it will eliminate potential inconsistencies.
		area or areas'? [page 23, Policy 18.5]	Striking the ‘s’ from “areas” would be better grammar. Planning Commission can decide whether to amend this policy as proposed, see second draft.
		Is this still being pursued, has it been achieved, tabled, or abandoned? [page 26, Policy 20.12]	These leases have already been procured. This policy can be struck, see attached draft.  Similar policies are already included in other park-specific plans. The City will continue to pursue lease agreements to develop trails consistent with those park plans. Including this policy is unnecessary.
		Consistent with Arts Council? [page 27, Goal 23]	This goal as written in the existing Land Use Element should be consistent with the Arts Council work. No change is needed.
		If we are collecting GHG data annually, then why were the data in transportation element removed? Makes sense to remove if a pointer to the annual GHG emissions data is added...maybe add the pointer since the data will be updated annually and the Transportation and Land Use documents are updated much less frequently? [page 29, Policy 26.1]	The data can be removed from the elements because it will be updated more frequently (annually) than either the Land Use or Transportation Elements. Adopting the Climate Action Plan by reference in the Land Use Element should create the linkage with other climate planning efforts the City is and will be undertaking. As noted in the first draft, the climate change policies will be reviewed once the City has completed the Climate Action Plan and before the 2024 Periodic Review is adopted.
		This is continue to partner with, right? I see a lot of K4C signs etc. [page 29, Policy 26.2]	Yes, in this policy “partner” implies a continuation of the existing partnership with King County Climate Change Collaboration (K4C).
		here, yes, we articulate growth may have infrastructure and utility limitations - can these words be copied to up above where growth targets are talked about to clarify that targets do not account for these limitations? [page 31, Policy 29.6]	See response to page 11, comment 1 above.

Comment #	Submitted By	Comment/Question	Staff Response
		keep consistent with references in 15.3 and 2x in 17....CO or C/O [page 32, comment 1]	Here the acronym should be "C-O" to be consistent with the acronym used in the zoning code. This is a zoning district, not a land use designation (land use designations are shown on Figure 1 – Land Use Map) and should be consistent with the acronym used in the zoning code. Where applicable, staff proposes removing the abbreviation and just spelling out Commercial Office.
		is this the previously-mentioned C/O or CO...or is this different from Commercial Office? (am guessing it is the same...if so, make consistent w/earlier references) [page 32, comment 2]	See response to page 32, comment 1 above.
		Update diagram to reflect correction as discussed during briefing - south QFC/Starbucks area is not commercial office. [page 33, Figure – Land Use Map]	<p>The land use designations shown on Figure 1 – Land Use Map are descriptors of the future land use that area is designated for, rather than a description of the current land use.</p> <p>Figure 1 was last updated in 2022. Due to a scrivener's error, the Figure 1 in the first draft the Planning Commission received in July did not reflect the 2022 update. Figure 1 in the attached second draft has the updated version. The correct version of Figure 1 shows the land use designation for the south end shopping area is "Neighborhood Business."</p>

**Table 2. First Draft Land Use Element Public Question / Comment Matrix.**

Comment #	Submitted By	Comment/Question	Staff Response
PUB-1	Stroum Jewish Community Center C/O Amy Lavin	17.4 Social and recreation clubs, schools, and religious institutions are predominantly located in single family residential areas of the Island. Development regulations <del>should reflect</del> shall support the desire to <u>modernize and</u> retain viable and healthy social, recreational, educational, and religious organizations as community assets which are essential for the mental, physical and spiritual health of Mercer Island	Planning Commission can decide whether to amend this policy as proposed, see second draft.  The proposed amendment would make this policy more proscriptive by replacing “should reflect” with “shall support.”