Memorandum

To: Planning Commission

From: Jeff Churchill, AICP, Senior Planner, 425-556-2492
Kimberly Dietz, Senior Planner, 425-556-2415

Date: February 26, 2014

Subject: **Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Plan Update**

MEETING PURPOSE – FEBRUARY 26, 2014

The purpose of the Planning Commission's study session on February 26, 2014 is to continue resolving issues identified to date.

COMMISSIONER PREPARATION

In preparation for this study session, please continue to familiarize yourselves with the proposed neighborhood plan policies and review the enclosed issues matrix and let staff know if any issues are misstated or missing. Similar to last week, staff has continued to provide responses to issues and anticipates sending an updated issue matrix to Commissioners early next week. Please send any additional discussion issues or questions to staff by Monday, February 24 at 8am so that they can be included in the updated matrix.

Staff proposes resolving remaining issues related to the Northeast and Marymoor Subareas, vision, character, housing and economic vitality and then for other subareas, transportation, parks, neighborhood gathering, and natural environment. After completing the topic-based review, staff also proposes looking back through the entire plan at the policy level to ensure that the Commission's discussion has captured all questions and concerns.

NEXT STEPS

Additional study sessions are scheduled to continue to resolve issues. Staff is developing a set of proposed implementing regulations that the Commission will review starting by early spring. A second public hearing will be scheduled during the review of those regulations.

Discussion Issues

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
A. Vision		
A1. General theme of shifting housing to Marymoor Subarea and creating employment capacity in the Northeast Subarea: does the Commission concur at a high level that this is an appropriate recommendation? (Biethan)	Planning Commission Discussion 2/19: Commissioners agreed to continue studying this, and agreed that the details will be important in making a recommendation. Questions included: how will performance zoning achieve goals stated in the neighborhood plan? What kind of housing would be located in the Marymoor Subarea? How much of it would be affordable? Why not locate housing immediately adjacent to the light rail station? Comments and concerns included that this proposal could create the same issues that now exist at the north edge of Woodbridge, that perhaps housing is not needed near the light rail station, and generally wanting to understand housing vis-à-vis transit in the Marymoor Subarea. The Commission expects to keep this issue open throughout its policy discussion and to return to this issue at the end of their policy review process. Staff Response/Recommendation 2/26: Questions and issues raised by Commissioners at the 2/19 meeting are addressed elsewhere in the issues matrix, especially in sections H and K dealing with the Marymoor and Northeast Subareas, respectively. 2/12: The CAC recommendation is described in the Technical Committee Report. Public Comment	Opened 2/12
A2. Should certain policies be prioritized as a way of creating a transition to the vision? (public testimony)	Planning Commission Discussion 2/19: Commissioners requested additional information from the CAC on what items the CAC believes should be prioritized. Staff Response/Recommendation Public Comment 2/19: Howard Hillinger, CAC Co-Chair, testified in support of creating a way to transition from the existing condition to the vision by prioritizing some of the policies or projects in the	

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	proposed neighborhood plan. As examples he mentioned prioritizing buffers, added vegetation, developing Southeast Redmond Park, and improving alternative transportation routes for freight, and planning for the light rail station area. He also testified that continued dialogue is important in the neighborhood and suggested a neighborhood council composed of business and residential representatives as a forum for dialogue and resolving day-to-day issues.	
B. Character		
B1. Is there a synergy of character between the two halves (north, south of Redmond Way)? If not, what could it be? (Chandorkar)	Planning Commission Discussion 2/19: The Commission discussed staff's response, including business and transportation synergies. The Commission asked to add an issue related to a variety of transportation connections. Those have been added as part of issue M5. The Commission then closed this issue. Staff Response/Recommendation 2/19: Staff concurs with the CAC Co-Chairs' analysis as described below. Another theme that unites the two parts of the neighborhood is innovation. Businesses on both sides of Redmond Way are engaged in making new products, ranging from new gaming technology to hydraulic lifts. In fact, businesses on one side of Redmond Way are sometimes suppliers to businesses on the other side. Public Comment 2/12: The CAC Co-Chairs responded that better connections across Redmond Way would go a long way toward integrating these different parts of the neighborhood. In addition to physical connections, the Co-Chairs noted that connections between people could also have a positive impact in a neighborhood where there are a wide variety of ongoing activities.	Opened 2/12 Closed 2/19
C. Environment		
C1. How does the plan address greening the neighborhood? (joint meeting)	Planning Commission Discussion Staff Response/Recommendation **2/26 NEW:** The CAC's recommended policies as well as the Technical Committee Report address greening through a variety of techniques including site and design standards and	Opened 2/12

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	neighborhood stewardship. Specific implementation standards will be addressed in respective code. For example, performance zoning in the Northeast Subarea will identify limits and incentives that achieve an increased amount of vegetation by way of private development and as part of future mobility infrastructure. Public Comment	
C2. How do we affect and protect Lake Sammamish, the aquifer in the Marymoor Subarea, and the aquifer throughout the neighborhood as new development occurs? (Chandorkar)	Planning Commission Discussion 2/19: The Commission expanded this issue to address Lake Sammamish. Staff Response/Recommendation Public Comment	Opened 2/12
D. Land Use		
D1. How are manufacturing operations addressed in the proposed plan? (joint meeting)	Planning Commission Discussion Staff Response/Recommendation **2/26 NEW:** The Plan recommends maintaining and encouraging a variety of manufacturing operations within the neighborhood. The Central Subarea features the majority of Manufacturing Park zoning and the recommended Plan would maintain its current capacity and zoning designation. The Marymoor Subarea also maintains manufacturing operations and will do so through new performance zoning. In this area and in relation to projected business models and anticipated changes associated with the light rail station, zoning regulations would support innovative and creative types of manufacturing. These may be similar to operations that are currently in place and may take on different forms over time. The new zone would support business adaptations and encourage smaller forms of business space to provide for entrepreneurial opportunities. Additionally, the Northeast Subarea will feature allowances for manufacturing operations. These may be more similar in nature and appearance to those businesses located in the Central Subarea though could also take the form of campus-style development. Public Comment	Opened 2/12

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
D2. What are general impacts to schools of the proposed land use plan? (joint meeting)	Planning Commission Discussion Staff Response/Recommendation **2/26 NEW:** Because the planned residential density of the neighborhood plan only accommodates a small increase, staff does not anticipate impacts to local schools beyond that which has already been planned. The City regularly provides information regarding projected growth to the school district. Public Comment	Opened 2/12
D3. What is performance zoning? Provide a primer. (joint meeting)	Planning Commission Discussion Staff Response/Recommendation 2/19: A brief description of performance zoning is included in the Technical Committee Report. Details on implementation will be discussed when the Planning Commission reviews the implementing regulations for this plan update. Public Comment	Opened 2/12
D4. What building heights are being contemplated? (joint meeting)	Planning Commission Discussion Staff Response/Recommendation **2/26 NEW:** Specific building heights are not specified in proposed policies, though policies generally acknowledge that Southeast Redmond will develop at an intensity less than is expected in Downtown and Overlake urban centers. Public Comment	Opened 2/12
E. Housing		
E1. Discuss no-net-loss housing policy. Is it appropriate in this case? Where else could housing be accommodated? (Sanders,	Planning Commission Discussion 2/19: Commissioners discussed the potential options that would accommodate the City's no-net-loss policy, such as accommodating lost capacity in other neighborhoods. Discussion points included:	Opened 2/12 Closed

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
Chandorkar)	• Concern about how rezoning land in the Marymoor Subarea for housing would impact the ability of property owners to lease space. • Question of whether the proposal to shift housing capacity to the Marymoor Subarea leans too heavily on future light rail. • Concern about whether adequate connectivity exists or is planned to connect the Marymoor Subarea to the rest of Redmond. Commissioners were satisfied that staff responded to the specific question and closed the issue, noting that the larger issue of the shift in housing capacity itself (A1) was still open. <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>2/19</u>: Redmond's resident population is about 55,000 and its daytime population pushes 100,000. Redmond nearly doubles in size during the day because it is a regional jobs center. This puts an unusual burden on local infrastructure and services, especially transportation infrastructure. The Comprehensive Plan establishes housing and jobs targets for 2030. It is important to retain the limited capacity that exists for housing so that Redmond can achieve its vision of being a community where people can choose to live and work, thereby shortening commutes and associated impacts. Eroding housing capacity through rezones makes it difficult to achieve that vision. The proposed rezone of land in SE Redmond from R-12 to employment would reduce housing capacity by 700 dwellings. In terms of alternative locations, staff also considered Overlake Village though the allowed height and capacity for housing in Overlake already exceeds what developers are proposing to build at this time. Increasing that capacity may not be meaningful for some time. <u>Public Comment</u>	2/19
E2. How does the plan address having housing near family-wage jobs? What do we mean by family wage jobs? How does plan facilitate aging in place and not getting priced out of the neighborhood? (Murray, joint meeting)	<u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>2/19</u>**:** First, definitions. Redmond does not define a "family wage" nor does the term appear in the proposed neighborhood plan. It does appear elsewhere in the Comprehensive Plan, and was raised at the Planning Commission-City Council joint meeting in December 2013. One definition comes from the "2010 Northwest Job Gap Study" by the Alliance for a Just	Opened 2/12

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	Society. Its definition is quoted in the December 2012 King County Comprehensive Plan, page 9-11, as follows: "A family wage…is a wage that allows a family to meet its basic needs without resorting to public assistance and provides it some ability to deal with emergencies and plan ahead." According to the study, a family wage in King County in 2010 was $32.01 per hour, or $66,589 per year. The average wage in King County in 2010 was $27.08 per hour, or $56,326 per year. In a broad sense, all of Redmond's existing and future housing is "near" family-wage jobs. Using the definition above, thousands of such jobs exist in Downtown, Overlake, Southeast Redmond, Sammamish Valley and Willows/Rose Hill combined. In a narrower sense, shifting housing capacity to the Marymoor Subarea gives families in those homes better future options for accessing jobs. The area north of Woodbridge is at the edge of the City and is not well-served by transit. We heard anecdotes from apartment managers in the area that tenants leave for other parts of Redmond because commuting by transit is not convenient enough in Southeast Redmond. The Marymoor Subarea is not currently served by any transit, but in the future will be connected to the region's job centers via light rail. The Marymoor Subarea is also a potential growth center for jobs in new industries. Neighborhood plan policies call for zoning regulations that allow for growth, change, and adaptation in area businesses so that they can thrive as the economy changes. Those jobs would be within walking distance of new homes in the Marymoor Subarea. Having homes at a variety of price points puts Redmond within reach for more individuals and families. The neighborhood plan supports that most importantly by retaining housing capacity. Continuing to maintain capacity means more people can choose to live in Redmond near good jobs. Second, the neighborhood plan calls for a minimum amount of designated affordable housing, similar to policies and regulations in place in much of Redmond. The policies also provide for using creative incentive and regulatory approaches to achieving affordable housing. Having a supply of long-term affordable housing facilitates aging in place and reduces instances of getting priced out. <u>Public Comment</u>	
E3. What innovative housing	<u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>	Opened

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
opportunities are proposed in the plan, such as live-work options? Where have these been successful? (joint meeting)	2/19: The Commission was satisfied with staff's response and closed the issue. Staff Response/Recommendation 2/19**:** Innovative housing opportunities are emphasized in the Marymoor Subarea and in the little land that remains for single-family development. Starting with the latter, the plan encourages diversity in single-family unit type, such as by encouraging cottages, single-family attached homes and small-lot short plats ("backyard homes"). In the Marymoor Subarea the plan calls for using performance zoning. What this means for housing is that there will be less emphasis on unit type and more emphasis on ensuring that at least 700 units are accommodated in the area, and that the subarea works well as a place for people to live, work and visit. Live-work is one possibility in the Marymoor Subarea, especially along NE 65th St. where the soft edge of the housing area is planned to be. Lions Gate is a local example of live-work. Public Comment	2/12 Closed 2/19
F. Economic Vitality		
F1. Consider the complementary nature of schools and jobs, especially in the Marymoor Subarea. (joint meeting)	Planning Commission Discussion 2/19: The Commission was satisfied with staff's response and closed the issue. Staff Response/Recommendation 2/19: The following supplements the discussion of this aspect that can be found in the Technical Committee Report. Schools such as the Lake Washington Institute of Technology will be allowed uses within the Marymoor and in portions of the Northeast Subareas. Close proximity to employment areas can facilitate opportunities for active learning such as through internships and apprenticeships and could incite entrepreneurial ventures. The Southeast Redmond CAC noted their interest in such opportunities as well as for small, incubator spaces, business support systems that could be provided through economic development, and partnerships with K12 schools including Lake Washington School District's STEM school. The southern portion of the Northeast Subarea provides support for siting schools as an	Opened 2/12 Closed 2/19

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	additional component of community building. Staff concurs with the CAC's interest in using this area as a place that not only provides transition between residential and employment uses but also as a place that helps establish a sense of neighborhood place and character. Places of learning could develop in cooperation with additional residential, Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Park, and future neighborhood commercial. Similarly, proximity to employment could provide opportunities for partnership and active, enhanced learning. Public Comment	
F2. What opportunities are available for expanding higher-ed opportunities, such as LWIT? How can we expect higher-ed opportunities to growth and succeed in the Marymoor Subarea without transit service? (Murray, joint meeting)	Planning Commission Discussion Staff Response/Recommendation 2/19: Plan policies, especially LU-18, call for adopting zoning regulations that allow for educational opportunities, such as those offered at LWIT. There is currently no transit service in the Marymoor Subarea. Of course, this will change with the addition of light rail, though that is many years in the future. In the meantime, plan policies call for improving the pedestrian and bicycle environment across Redmond Way and for improving access to transit. Metro is working with the City on an alternative transit service pilot in Southeast Redmond, and we may learn from that experiment that alternative forms of transit access are viable in the neighborhood. New traditional local transit service is difficult to initiate anywhere in Metro's service area due to lack of funding. Public Comment	Opened 2/12
G. Regional Retail		
H. Marymoor		
H1. Describe how the neighborhood plan generally addresses the proposed Light Link rail station. How does the plan address more-detailed station area planning and the evolution of land uses in the area? Where is the appropriate location for	Planning Commission Discussion 2/19: The Commission was interested in more details about how housing and employment uses would be integrated in the Marymoor Subarea, especially near the station. Commissioners had the following comments: • The proposed location for housing is near the Marymoor Park air field, which could present noise issues. • Sound Transit's input on this subject would be helpful.	Opened 2/12

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
housing in the subarea? Consider a TOD at the station. (Biethan, Miller, joint meeting)	• The specifics of the performance zoning are very important in addressing how housing is integrated into the subarea. • A transit-oriented development at the station could be one place to accommodate some of the housing, and perhaps other locations as well. • It is difficult to envision what 700 homes would look like here. <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>2/26</u>: Staff is preparing visuals to better communicate what 700 homes might look like and is further investigating potential impacts of locating housing within 500 feet' of the Marymoor Park air field and fly zone (a 120' x 380' grass runway and usable airspace of approximately 600' x 1800'). The following is a portion of the Model Aircraft Field Operating Rules that are in place at the Marymoor Field: • Do NOT fly over pit, spectator, or parking areas, or beyond the flight limits shown on the flying field map. Fly only in front of the straight safety line defined by the edge of the runway and the two red and white pylon markers. • Effective mufflers are required on all engines. • All aircraft must NOT produce a sound level greater than 90dBA measured at 25 feet over grass as defined by the Club approved procedures. The Club will perform sound level tests and issue certificates. • Aircraft using gas turbine engines are NOT permitted. • No more than five aircraft are permitted in the air at any one time. Station area planning is called for in the proposed policies, which would provide more detail for the immediate station area. Staff is further considering the idea of integrating housing into a station TOD and is seeking CAC input on the idea. Proposed policy language would need to be revised to accommodate this. For additional background on station areas staff recommends reviewing Puget Sound Regional Council's People + Place Typology materials at http://www.psrc.org/growth/growing-transit-communities/people-place-typology/. As you will find, Southeast Redmond is considered a "Transform and Diversify" station area. An excerpt from the People + Place Implementation Typology follows:	

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	Transform and Diversify transit communities are neighborhoods or centers poised for transformation due to recent planning efforts that capitalize on their good access to opportunity and strong real estate markets. However, many lack the sufficient physical form and activity levels to fully support future transit-oriented growth. Key strategies should leverage stronger markets to diversify land uses, make public realm improvements and expand affordability. These communities are currently either employment nodes or single-family neighborhoods with little mixing of uses or intensity of development. They also have limited housing choice, either through lack of housing or affordability. At the same time, they have stronger markets and near-term potential to grow as equitable transit communities. Six communities are categorized as Transform and Diversify, all located in the East Corridor (with no current light rail stations). Sound Transit staff are aware that Redmond is updating the Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Plan. Sound Transit is currently updating its Long-Range Plan (http://www.soundtransit.org/Projects-and-Plans/Long-range-Plan-update). As part of that update, Sound Transit is conducting a number of technical studies of various candidate high-capacity transit corridors, including a Ballard-UW-Redmond corridor. However, Sound Transit is not advancing designs for the Southeast Redmond station beyond the conceptual design completed as part an earlier environmental review. Sound Transit does have a federal "record of decision" for the alignment from Overlake to Southeast Redmond and Downtown. 2/19**:** Generally, the neighborhood plan addresses the link light rail station by: 1) supporting light rail extension in policy, 2) providing opportunities for employment and housing within walking distance of the light rail station, 3) calling for a more-connected transportation network in the Marymoor Subarea, and 4) calling for future, more-detailed station area planning efforts in cooperation with Sound Transit. The CAC's recommendation is to accommodate about 700 new homes in the subarea, focusing on the area closest to Marymoor Park. Reasons for focusing residential growth closer to Marymoor Park include: 1) homes would be farther from freeway and light rail station noise, 2) homes would enjoy adjacency to a regional park, and 3) research indicates that people are typically willing to walk further between homes and transit than they are	

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	between work and transit (for example, see this paper from the Public Policy Institute of California: http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r_211jkr.pdf, especially starting at page 14). Public Comment	
H2. What are the consequences of shifting housing capacity from the Northeast to Marymoor Subarea? Address 1) economic vitality, 2) displacement, 3) harmonizing residential and manufacturing uses, and 4) infrastructure and amenities needed to support housing. (Miller, Chandorkar, joint meeting)	Planning Commission Discussion 2/19: Commissioners expressed that having more details related to performance zoning regulations will be helpful in making a recommendation on the shift of housing capacity to the Marymoor Subarea. The Commission kept this and other related issues open for further discussion. Staff Response/Recommendation 2/19**:** Overall, shifting housing capacity from the Northeast to the Marymoor Subarea fosters a relationship with Marymoor Park by zoning for housing directly adjacent to the Park's boundary, establishes a unique living environment that capitalizes on a more urban environment while maintaining connection with extensive open space, places density within walkable and bikable access to the neighborhood's commercial area and to Downtown by way of light rail and trails, and enables more people to live near the Lake Washington Institute of Technology. The further responses below describe anticipated consequences for the specific issues Commissioners identified. Economic Vitality: The recommended shift of capacity creates opportunity for employment in 70 acres of land that is currently zoned for residential uses. Staff has heard from OneRedmond that this type of land would be desirable for employment uses. Additional findings from outreach for the neighborhood plan update indicates interest in flexible business space. Both of these could be accommodated in the Northeast Subarea. Ultimately, the variety of employment areas maintained and recommended through the neighborhood plan support a variety of business types and sizes. Displacement: Businesses in the Marymoor Subarea could be displaced over time as a result of the change in zoning from Manufacturing Park to a zoning designation that emphasizes housing. These businesses could relocate in the Central Subarea or the Northeast Subarea.	Opened 2/12

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	Harmonizing Residential and Manufacturing Uses: The Northeast Subarea recommendation calls for a variety of strategies for transition and buffering between residential and higher intensity land uses. Regulations under development will work to establish a transition that enhances quality of life for those who live and work in the Subarea. The Marymoor Subarea recommendation calls for an urban and industrial character that supports people who live, work, and visit, including by having some convenience and community gathering amenities. Due to ingress and egress challenges, this Subarea may transition away from heavier manufacturing processes toward a variety of uses that are supportive in the proposed performance zoning. Infrastructure and Amenities: New development and redevelopment will require investment in transportation and other infrastructure and amenities. Plan policies call for a detailed infrastructure study of the Marymoor Subarea in recognition of this. <u>Public Comment</u>	
H3. Are artist lofts a realistic expectation here? (Miller, O'Hara)	<u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>2/19</u>: The Commission decided to hold this issue open to obtain Commissioner O'Hara's input on the staff response. <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>2/19</u>**:** Two perspectives encouraged the CAC's discussion regarding live-work uses or artist lofts. The first comes from Redmond's artistic community as they describe the need for small, affordable places to work and possibly live while having opportunity to showcase and sell their products. The second comes from the emerging housing trend of small, studio or single-room occupancy units being developed in Redmond's Downtown and other urban areas. Tudor Manor, Vision 5 and most recently, the Allez. Though the neighborhood plan supports this type of development, it does not specifically require such. More so, the plan provides flexibility through performance zoning for this and a variety of other forms of design and use within constrained end points such as minimum and maximum height and lot line setbacks.	Opened 2/12

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	Public Comment	
H4. How does the plan address the Marymoor Park edge and access to the park? (joint meeting)	Planning Commission Discussion 2/19: Commissioners expressed that the plan should identify new and improved motorized and non-motorized connections between the Marymoor Subarea and Marymoor Park. This issue remains open together with related issues. Staff Response/Recommendation 2/19**:** The neighborhood and then the CAC emphasized enhancing connections to and a neighborhood relationship with Marymoor Park. Staff met with King County Park planners to review the neighborhood plan and to consider this request. Their perspective was similar though with caution regarding vehicular traffic as mentioned above in H2. Primarily, the housing portion of the Subarea creates a physical and conceptual connection to and with the Park. Design and non-motorized connections will help those who live and work in the area to access and capitalize on the Park. Local trails will also help people from other portions of the neighborhood and vicinity access the Park and take advantage of regional trails such as the East Lake Sammamish Trail and the Sammamish River Trail. Per County Park staff's request, a pathway will also help people traveling by light rail connect with the central portion of the Park, thereby creating travel alternatives for those visiting the Park and its various events. Design and landscaping will also help soften and blend the transition between the Park and the Subarea's distinct uses. Public Comment	Opened 2/12
H5. Consider human services an allowed use in the Marymoor Subarea near 65th/E. Lk. Samm. Pkwy (public testimony)	Planning Commission Discussion Staff Response/Recommendation 2/26: Staff believes that Hopelink's proposal is consistent with the overall land use concept for the subarea; policy LU-18 could be modified to more specifically include the idea of	Opened 2/19

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	services. In the CAC's recommendation the property that Hopelink is considering would be in an area where housing would be transitioning to employment uses. Staff is seeking input from CAC members on Hopelink's proposal. Public Comment 2/19: Meghan Altimore of Hopelink testified that Hopelink is seeking a permanent home in Redmond. After an extensive search Hopelink is considering property near the intersection of NE 65th St. and E. Lk. Samm. Pkwy in the Marymoor Subarea. Hopelink would like to have "human services" be an allowed use when zoning regulations are prepared for the subarea. Ms. Altimore also submitted a letter.	
H6. Consider an overlay zone for the Kent parcel (public testimony)	Planning Commission Discussion Staff Response/Recommendation 2/26: If Mr. Kent were to request a rezone in the future, when he is ready to sell to one neighbor or the other, staff would review the proposal has part of the City's annual review of the Comprehensive Plan; rezoning from MP to BP has recent precedent in this area. In the absence of a strong preference from the property owner, staff recommends keeping the zoning as is and working with Mr. Kent in the future should he decide to pursue a rezone. Staff is seeking further input from the CAC on this topic. Public Comment 2/19: James Ihnot, an attorney representing Leon Kent, testified in favor of overlay zoning that would enable Mr. Kent to take advantage of both Manufacturing Park and Business Park permitted uses. Mr. Kent's property is tax parcel 1318300195 located at 6081 E. Lk Sammamish Pkwy NE. Mr. Ihnot testified that Mr. Kent is not sure to whom he will ultimately sell his property, and that his southern neighbor is in the MP zone while his northern neighbor is in the BP zone. Mr. Ihnot also submitted a letter.	Opened 2/19
I. Redmond Way		
I1. How did the overlay process develop and how are we responding to feedback from the community?	Planning Commission Discussion Staff Response/Recommendation	Opened 2/12

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
Does the proposed plan create an adequate long-term solution to the question of additional retail/ service uses along Redmond Way? (joint meeting, Murray)	**2/26 NEW:** In 2011, the City received a request through its annual docketing process from Tom Markl, representing the Nelson Real Estate Management. The request was to change zoning at the Redmond Car Care site from MP to GC. Staff recommended against this request and instead, recommended the creation of the MP Overlay. The following excerpt from the October 18, 2011 Council approval describes reasoning for establishing the overlay: • The land uses adjacent to Redmond Way in this area have historically been, and currently are, of a commercial nature. • Average weekday traffic volumes along this segment of Redmond Way are high with one of the highest traffic volumes in the City. • A defined overlay area allowing additional land uses is warranted within the MP zone in this area, as it preserves the MP zone for more traditional manufacturing uses as well as allowing flexibility in land uses. • The additional uses proposed by the applicant allow a greater variety of land uses within the defined overlay area which are compatible with existing and possible future uses. • The additional office, retail and service uses provide more opportunities to nearby residents and those traveling through the area; further, these uses will increase the economic viability of businesses in the overlay. • Further evaluation of appropriate land uses in the Redmond Way corridor should occur through the Southeast Redmond neighborhood planning process. The Neighborhood Plan recommends maintaining the current boundary of the Map Overlay and more so, not extending it beyond these boundaries. Staff believes additional opportunity for discussing this item will come through future research by OneRedmond. This will involve a more comprehensive and Citywide assessment of business needs, future demand, aspects of operation, and more. Therefore, staff recommends delaying changes to land use and zoning in the Redmond Way corridor. Public Comment	
I2. Privately-initiated request to extend MP Overlay to include properties at the southeast corner of	Planning Commission Discussion Staff Response/Recommendation	Opened 2/19

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
180th Avenue NE and NE 76th Street. (public hearing testimony)	2/26: The Technical Committee Report recommends against extending the MP Overlay. See especially pages 9-11 and Exhibit E2 (earlier letter from Mr. Falk), and Exhibit F (staff rationale as provided to CAC). Public Comment 2/19**:** James Anderson, on behalf of Cary Falk, provided testimony describing Mr. Falk's request for extending the MP Overlay to include his parcels. Specifically, Mr. Falk desires opportunity to lease space to businesses that have been prevented through the MP zoning designation from operating in his facility. These include real estate; consumer, heavy consumer and durable goods; health and personal care; finance and insurance; administrative, personal and professional services; pet and animal sales; and ambulatory and outpatient care services. Mr. Anderson noted challenges in filling vacant spaces with manufacturing uses and made particular reference to a previous tenant that relocated business operations to Mexico.	
J. Central		
J1. Describe how the Taylor Property fits into the proposed neighborhood plan. (Biethan)	Planning Commission Discussion Staff Response/Recommendation **2/26 NEW:** The recommended neighborhood plan maintains provisions established by the Taylor Development Agreement. Located in the Central Subarea, the current zoning of Manufacturing Park is maintained as well as the allowed siting and development of large, warehouse-style operations. The Northeastern Subarea's transitional land use and zoning plans for compatibility with these uses such as by restricting residential development in the southeastern portion of the Subarea – a significant distance from the Taylor's defined development area. Public Comment	Opened 2/12
K. Northeast		
K1. Provide additional detail about thoughts around the Cadman site and how the long-term plan fits into the	Planning Commission Discussion 2/19: Commissioner Biethan noted that he requested this item for discussion opportunities with the entire Commission. He is satisfied with the staff response and suggested leaving	Opened 2/12

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
current. What do we know about Cadman's future plans? Address the growth of Woodbridge. (Biethan, O'Hara, joint meeting)	this item open for Commissioner O'Hara's possible additional questions. <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 2/19**:** A representative of Cadman participated on the Southeast Redmond CAC and helped ensure that the plan provides ongoing support for their business and specific operations within the neighborhood over the long-term. One of Cadman's acquisition and development specialists provided input during the plan update process by attending one of three quarterly open houses, reviewing the plan's progress online, and providing feedback to staff. In keeping with amended land use patterns, existing businesses and operations are supported in place, based on current operations. The Northeast Subarea incorporates Cadman's interest in maintaining a neighborhood presence and progressively focusing its operations in the northern portion of the Subarea. Additionally, Cadman would like to reserve opportunity for master planning in response to market conditions at such time that it opts to sell portions of its land. To ensure equitable transition between existing residential uses and the northern industrial uses, the Northeast Subarea will support master planning and through performance zoning, guide uses from lower intensities in the south to higher intensities in the north. An additional 140 to 170 dwelling units will be accommodated in the southern portion and will be buffered from adjacent low-intensity employment areas through vegetation and site design. 700 dwelling units will be accommodated in the Marymoor Subarea to offset density that is currently supported north of the Woodbridge community. <u>Public Comment</u>	
K2. How have other areas dealt with similar transitions from residential to manufacturing and industrial uses? (Miller, Sanders, joint meeting)	<u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>2/19</u>: The Commission requested additional information regarding the recycling operations that are currently taking place on the Cadman property. Regarding recommended residential uses in the transitional area, Commissioner Miller asked about the basis for maintaining zoning density similar to that developed in the Woodbridge community. He noted his interest in a diversity of residential densities. Commissioner Sanders also	Opened 2/12 Closed 2/19

<table>
<tr><th>Issue</th><th>Discussion Notes</th><th>Status</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>suggested providing information for how places such as Hillsboro, Oregon manage heavy volumes of traffic that could result from the Plan's recommended land use and zoning amendments. The Commission then agreed to close this item.

<u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u>
2/19: To help the CAC consider strategies for equitable transitions between uses of different intensities, staff provided research material from online and field reconnaissance and from discussion with planning staff at case study locations. This process, as described in the Technical Report, included Fairhaven (Bellingham), Georgetown (Seattle), St. John's (Portland) and Hillsboro, Oregon. Staff also visited Southlake Union and the historic-industrial and the northern Boeing Field portions of Georgetown.

Land use, vegetation and site design including setbacks assist with transitions in these and other locations. Additional research regarding performance zoning identified examples in Fort Collins, Colorado, Harlem, New York, Gig Harbor, and Beaverton, Oregon through which combinations of these three strategies support adjacencies similar to those found currently and anticipated in Southeast Redmond.

<u>Public Comment</u></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>K3. Is shifting employment uses into the Northeast Subarea the right approach? Consider that Redmond doesn't necessarily have a surplus of manufacturing land that can be turned-over to residential uses. (joint meeting)</td><td><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>

<u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u>
2/19: The rationale for this recommendation is contained in the Technical Committee Report. The following table shows the Northeast Subarea's current land use and recommended land use by area.

<table>
<tr><th></th><th>Current Area</th><th>Recommended Area</th><th>Difference</th></tr>
<tr><td>Residential</td><td>72 acres</td><td>11 acres</td><td>- 61 acres</td></tr>
<tr><td>Business Park</td><td>37 acres</td><td>21 acres</td><td>- 16 acres</td></tr>
<tr><td>Industrial</td><td>79 acres</td><td>79 acres</td><td>No change</td></tr>
</table></td><td>Opened 2/12</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>Issue</th><th>Discussion Notes</th><th>Status</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>
<table>
<tr><td>Neighborhood Commercial</td><td>--</td><td>6 acres</td><td>+ 6 acres</td></tr>
<tr><td>Design District for employment uses</td><td>--</td><td>70 acres</td><td>+ 70 acres</td></tr>
<tr><td>Park</td><td>15 acres</td><td>15 acres</td><td>No change</td></tr>
</table>
<u>Public Comment</u></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>L. Evans Creek</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>L1. How do we protect Woodbridge from the adjacent/ nearby and less residential uses? (Biethan, Miller, Chandorkar)</td><td><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>
<u>2/19:</u> Commissioner Miller and Chandorkar asked the speakers whether they felt that the buffering and transitional strategies recommended in the neighborhood plan would help improve conditions from the perspective of the residences. The Commission asked staff to provide additional information describing the type of business operations that are currently and are proposed to be allowed in the Manufacturing Park zone.

<u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u>
<u>2/26:</u> The recommendation for the Northeast Subarea is a gradual transition by way of land use and site design from residential to industrial. The transition includes the following:
• Residential uses shall be buffered from adjacent businesses that will be in the form of campus- or similar-style business parks. In this portion of the Subarea, 192nd Avenue NE will include high-comfort pedestrian facilities and a significantly sized vegetated street edge.
• The campus- or similar-style business parks will be designed so that structures act as buffers between residential and higher intensity uses such as industrial. These structures may include manufacturing that occurs predominantly indoors. The campus and similar settings will also include a variety of landscaping treatments that help support buffering. This portion of 192nd Avenue NE will feature a moderately vegetated treatment and wider sidewalks.
• A higher-intensity portion, located north of the business parks, will also include site design and landscaping that helps buffer uses that differ in intensities. In this portion, 192nd Avenue NE will feature a cross-section similar to 188th Avenue NE and will support travel by large vehicles associated with manufacturing operations.</td><td>Opened 2/12</td></tr>
</table>

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	Street design will encourage vehicles associated with manufacturing operations to use Union Hill Road, NE 76th Street and NE 73rd Street. Access by these vehicles will be prohibited on 192nd Avenue NE, south of NE 73rd Street. • The industrial portion of the Subarea will be buffered from residential uses by way of the Subarea area portions to its south. 192nd Avenue NE will support this use by way of a cross-section that features limited vegetation, standard pedestrian and bicycle facilities, and prioritized routing to Union Hill Road and NE 76th Street. • Additionally, the Northeast Subarea requires several non-motorized connections to the Evans Creek Trail. These connections will include robust landscaping to enhance other buffering techniques. <u>Public Comment</u> <u>2/19</u>**:** Alina Lansberg and Zaffer Lalji provided testimony regarding their concerns with the proximity of industrial operations to the Woodbridge community and to Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Park. Ms. Lansberg noted positive change that has taken place in the neighborhood since she purchased her property and the negative aspects of industrial operations taking place in closer proximity to residences than previously. In response to the Planning Commission's questions, Ms. Lansberg believed the recommended transitional strategies and increasing opportunities for high-tech business in the neighborhood will help improve these conditions. Mr. Lalji spoke in similar regard, noting that industrial operations seemed to have moved approximately 300' south of their previous operation area. He added that the height of the gravel staging piles has also increased and that truck traffic and associated noise seemed to have increased since he took ownership of his property in the Woodbridge community.	
M. Transportation		
M1. Stated goal is encourage walking and bicycling to/ from light rail station, but not seeing adequate planned crossings of Redmond Way near there. (O'Hara)	<u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> **<u>2/26 NEW:</u>** Two new crossings of Redmond Way are planned: 1) a grade-separated crossing linking the Regional Retail Subarea to the Marymoor Subarea near the light rail station, and 2) the extension of NE 70th St between Redmond Way and 180th Ave NE. The latter is on the 2030 Transportation Facilities Plan, though was mistakenly omitted from the neighborhood	Opened 2/12

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	connections map provided to the Commission. Public Comment	
M2. What are the likely traffic impacts of shifting housing to the Marymoor Subarea? (Chandorkar)	Planning Commission Discussion Staff Response/Recommendation **2/26 NEW**: Staff is reviewing new transportation modeling data and will provide a response in preparation for the March 12 Planning Commission meeting. Public Comment	Opened 2/12
M3. What happens to traffic with future growth, especially NE 76th Street? (Murray)	Planning Commission Discussion Staff Response/Recommendation **2/26 NEW**: Staff is reviewing new transportation modeling data and will provide a response in preparation for the March 12 Planning Commission meeting. Public Comment	Opened 2/12
M4. How does the plan address freight mobility? (joint meeting)	Planning Commission Discussion Staff Response/Recommendation **2/26 NEW**: Proposed policies recognize the existing and future role of freight mobility in Southeast Redmond in the broader Redmond economy. Policies and maps call for improving specific intersections to facilities the movement of goods such as 185th/76th and 180th/76th, and for improving east-west circulation generally with new or improved connections. Policies also emphasize safety for all users, such as by creating separate non-motorized corridors. Public Comment	
M5. How does the plan address	Planning Commission Discussion	Opened

<table>
<tr><th>Issue</th><th>Discussion Notes</th><th>Status</th></tr>
<tr><td>connectivity, especially: 1) light rail to businesses, 2) ped-bike generally, 3) East Lake Sammamish Trail to Redmond Central Connecter, 4) between Evans Creek Subarea and the Regional Retail Subarea, 5) from the Regional Retail Subarea to light rail, and 6) within the Redmond Way corridor including pedestrian crossings between the north and south sides of the street? (Miller, Chandorkar, joint meeting)</td><td>2/19: The Commission adding the following travel routes to their anticipated discussion regarding transportation:
General existing and future transportation patterns for the Redmond Way (SR-202) corridor;
Non-motorized connections between the residential areas of the Evans Creek Subarea and the shopping opportunities in the Regional Retail Subarea;
Non-motorized connections between the Regional Retail Subarea and the light rail station area; and
Pedestrian and bicycle crossing along Redmond Way (SR-202).
Staff Response/Recommendation
2/26 NEW: The plan addresses the connectivity issues raised by Commissioners as follows:<table><tr><th>Connection</th><th>How Plan Addresses It</th></tr><tr><td>Light rail to businesses</td><td>Connections between the light rail station and businesses in the Marymoor Subarea will be via a network of new or improved streets. Connections to/from businesses on the other side of Redmond Way will be via NE 70th St., as extended to 180th Ave NE, or via NE 70th St. and Redmond Way.</td></tr><tr><td>Ped-bike generally</td><td>The plan generally focuses on improving east-west connections and creating new connections to existing or assets, such as the Evans Creek trail and Marymoor Park. Other themes include creating a pedestrian spine through the Regional Retail Subarea and improving connectivity overall in the Marymoor Subarea.</td></tr><tr><td>ELST to RCC</td><td>Plan calls for extension of ELST to meet RCC, in conjunction with extension of light rail to Downtown (see PR-6).</td></tr><tr><td>Evans Creek Subarea to Regional Retail Subarea</td><td>People walk from the Evans Creek Subarea to the Regional Retail Subarea today. It is about a one-mile walk. The neighborhood plan calls for ped-bike improvements in the NE 68th St, NE 76th St and 185th Ave NE corridors, and for creating a new east-west corridor in approximately the</td></tr></table></td><td>2/12</td></tr>
</table>

<table>
<tr><th>Issue</th><th>Discussion Notes</th><th>Status</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>
<table>
<tr><td></td><td>7000 block from 180th Ave NE to 192nd Ave NE.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Regional Retail Subarea to light rail</td><td>Plan calls for grade-separated crossing of Redmond Way to connect these two areas, and for extension of NE 70th St. to 180th Ave NE to provide another connection.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Redmond Way corridor crossings</td><td>See response immediately above. In addition, the plan calls for a pedestrian connection from 185th Ave NE and Redmond Way south to E. Lk. Samm. Pkwy.</td></tr>
</table>
<u>Public Comment</u></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>M6. What is the future of the Bear Creek park & ride with the arrival of light rail transit? (Miller)</td><td><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>

<u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u>
<u>2/26 NEW</u>: The neighborhood plan does not take a specific position on the future of the Bear Creek Park & Ride. Neighborhood and citywide policies call for making transit more accessible to more people. The Bear Creek Park & Ride is certainly important now as a transit hub, and may continue to be useful for bus transit operations (e.g. park and ride use, layover space) when the light rail station opens. Transit service planning won't happen for many years (until close to operations begin at the light rail station), and a lot could change between now and then in terms of Metro and Sound Transit priorities, funding, etc.

<u>Public Comment</u></td><td>Opened 2/12</td></tr>
<tr><td>N. Parks / Rec / Open Space</td><td></td><td></td></tr>
<tr><td>N1. How does the plan address parks and open space? (joint meeting)</td><td><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u>

<u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u>
<u>2/26 NEW</u>: In general the neighborhood plan prioritizes the development of Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Park and the completion of planned trail connections. Specific policies address creating connections to Arthur Johnson Park and Marymoor Park and connecting the East Lake Sammamish Trail and the Redmond Central Connector. The plan also calls for using parks as one way to incorporate additional green into the neighborhood and enhance stream health, the tree canopy and other natural assets.</td><td>Opened 2/12</td></tr>
</table>

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	Public Comment	
O. Neighborhood Gathering		
P. Other		
P1. Should the Keller property near Millennium be incorporated into the neighborhood? (Chandorkar)	Planning Commission Discussion Staff Response/Recommendation 2/26: Exhibit E3 in the Technical Report provides a letter from James McBride on behalf of the Keller family in this regard. The recommended Southeast Redmond neighborhood boundary incorporates this property into the neighborhood. This site, located south of Evans Creek and with access taken from NE 84th Street, has commonality with adjacent properties that are currently within the neighborhood. Public Comment	Opened 2/12

Questions

1. *What is the net change, if any, of the number of planned residential units in the new plan, compared to the current plan in place? Does the mix of housing type (multi- vs. single-family) change in the new proposed plan? (Biethan, Chandorkar)*

   2/19: The existing housing capacity in the Northeast Subarea is about 850 units. Of those, about 700 are proposed to shift to the Marymoor Subarea and about 150 are proposed to remain in the Northeast Subarea. Thus, the net change for the neighborhood overall is about zero. The existing capacity in the Northeast Subarea is zoned R-12. The future capacity in the Marymoor Subarea would be at an average closer to 20-25 units per acre. That could include a mix of townhomes and flats, with probably more flats than townhomes in order to achieve a total of 700 units.

2. *What is the level of transit service in Southeast Redmond? (Murray)*

   2/19: Please see the Redmond Transit Map for a good overview of transit service in Southeast Redmond. It can be viewed online at http://redmond.gov/common/pages/UserFile.aspx?fileId=71383.

3. *What is the size of the transition area in the Northeast Subarea? How much land? What is the scope? (Murray)*

   2/19**:** The Northeast Subarea is 222 acres and includes the following recommended land uses: Industrial (79 acres), Business Park (21 acres), Design District employment area (70 acres), Neighborhood Commercial (6 acres), Residential (11 acres), Rural Residential (20 acres) and Park (15 acres).

   Other Southeast Redmond Subarea land areas are as follows:

NAME	ACREAGE
Central	366
Evans Creek	214
Marymoor	691
Northeast	222
Redmond Way	40
Regional Retail	91

   For size comparison, Redmond Town Center is 149 acres and Marymoor Park is 640 acres.