

IDYLWOOD INNOVATIVE HOUSING
Summary Notes – Neighborhood Meeting
Redmond City Hall – Council Chambers
JULY 13, 2009
7:00 p.m.

- Sarah Stiteler, Senior Planner, gave a brief overview of the Innovative Housing Demonstration program, stating that the program had begun in 2005 as a three-year program and had been extended by City Council last August, 2008 for an additional period, not to exceed five more years, or a total of 5 projects constructed, whichever came first. She stated further that the current proposal in the Viewpoint neighborhood is the fourth project that has been submitted under the Innovative Housing program; however none of the previous projects have been constructed, and are in various stages of development review.

Questions from citizens in the audience were raised:

- Is the City of Redmond neutral or an advocate of the project?
 - Ms. Stiteler responded that the City has not formed any recommendation of the project; that it had determined that the applicant's submittal met basic elements of the Innovative Housing ordinance and could go forward for initial review in a neighborhood meeting, which is the purpose of tonight's meeting.
- What is the timeline and process for review of this proposal?
 - The timeline and process for review are identified by Ordinance 2409 which stipulates that after the neighborhood meeting on a proposal is held, that the applicant has 90 days in which to submit a revised site plan, to respond to input. When the revised plan is submitted, a meeting of the Innovative Housing Review Panel will occur within 6 weeks, for review and consideration of the proposal. The Review Panel makes the decision on whether to recommend the project go forward in the development review process.
- What is the definition of affordable? Are these homes affordable by that definition?
 - The City defines "affordable" as a dwelling unit that can be purchased or rented on a monthly basis for not more than 30 percent of the total monthly household income of households earning 80% or less of the area median annual income.

- The homes proposed in the Idylwood Innovative Housing do not meet this definition of affordability.
 - What are the criteria for review to determine neighborhood compatibility? The goals list does not include all of ordinance's neighborhood compatibility measures.
 - The criteria for review of an innovative housing proposal are identified in the ordinance. Compatibility is determined by a number of elements, including bulk and lot coverage, height, density, setbacks, and open space/landscape elements.
 - How many projects to date?
 - There have been three projects that have been submitted under the program. One is in North Redmond and is on hold due to the economy. One is seeking preliminary plat approval and is located in the Education Hill neighborhood on the west side of Avondale Road. The third project is located in the Grass Lawn neighborhood and is working to resolve sewer connection issues.
 - What is the constitution of the Innovative Housing Review Panel and who is the Viewpoint Citizen Advisory Committee representative?
 - The Review Panel consists of five voting members: two members from the City's Design Review Board, one member of the Redmond Planning Commission, one member who is a representative of the City's Technical Committee and one member who is a neighborhood representative. In addition, the ordinance encourages participation by a young resident of the City or "youth advocate", which is a non-voting, advisory position. The ordinance stipulates that if there is an active Citizen Advisory Committee in the neighborhood in which the project is located, that the neighborhood representative is to be selected from that Committee. At this time, there is no representative from the Viewpoint CAC.
 - Location and size of other projects and unit count:
 - As mentioned, the other three projects are in the North Redmond, Education Hill and Grass Lawn neighborhoods. The North Redmond project contains 12 units with 4 ADUs over 2-car garages; the Education Hill project contains 12 units with 2 ADUs over garages, and the Grass Lawn proposal contains 9 detached homes. The City's Innovative Housing website contains site plans and information about all of these projects.
- Rob Gunther, the applicant for the proposal, gave an introduction to this proposal and how he had decided to consider doing a proposal under the City's innovative housing program. He stated that he believed that the project offered many positive features for future residents in terms of use of community space within the site and smaller living spaces to those who were seeking an alternative to larger homes on larger lots. He had a

previously approved short plat on the site for three homes but that they would be large, and likely expensive homes due to the land price, location and what the market could bear. He stated that he liked the idea of being able build more homes that were smaller and more “green” on this site, consistent with what he believes people are looking for in housing.

- Sally Roth introduced herself as the project architect, a Senior Associate for Johnson Architects in Seattle. She further described the elements of the proposal, the architectural features of the dwelling units as well as addressing how the project fits into the context of the neighborhood. She noted that the homes along NE 36th Street represent a variety of decades with various building styles (eclectic) as well as the variety in the sizes of homes in the area.
- Ray Johnston introduced himself as co-owner of the Johnston Architects firm, along with his wife. He noted that his firm had been involved in a number of projects having similarities with this one, in which there were issues of neighborhood compatibility and had completed them successfully, e.g., neighbors were pleased with results and the projects themselves had been recipients of architectural awards.

The following issues and questions were raised by citizens giving comments:

- Parking on 36th - The street experiences a great deal of parking and traffic especially in the summer from use by nearly Idylwood Park. The neighborhood requested assistance from the City to deal with parking – a no parking sign was installed east of 175th to the Parkway. There is still a lot of traffic, cars. Concerned with how the proposal with the proposed number of units will affect this with overflow of cars, parking onto NE 36th.
- Biking and walking lanes needed – NE 36th does not have adequate sidewalks or provision for pedestrians and bicyclists. The proposal will negatively affect this.
- Buses – there are few bus routes in the area. A project such as this should have better access to transit.
- 36th is used to get to Microsoft and to avoid 40th - NE 36th will become even more clogged with traffic.
- Can ADU's be rented? Ms. Stiteler replied that an accessory dwelling unit may be rented by the homeowner of the primary unit, or they may be used as office space, guest quarters, or room for an extended family member.
- Many comments about the number of people on the lot, additional noise that will result, traffic and parking overflow.
- Request a public hearing with the Review Panel – Ms. Stiteler replied that the Review Panel meeting would be a public meeting, a working meeting to allow review and

consideration of the proposal by the Review Panel and at which public comments would be allowed.

- Zoning at R-4 should remain R-4, not as proposed by the project.
- The project is like a condo, and there are already condos and apartments nearby within the neighborhood
- The smaller units and relatively lower prices for new units are available, within condos nearby.
- As shown, the proposal appears to be an enclave, as a “neighborhood within a neighborhood” and it is not well incorporated with the rest of the neighboring homes.
- Condo type homes are not compatible with single family detached homes.
- The lighting for this type of development will be 24/7 and the lighting on parking areas, common areas, etc, will be intrusive to other neighboring homes.
- Common open space versus backyards is not optimal for children’s play areas.
- If one Innovative Housing project locates here, it will mean more in this location.
- Why are ADU’s not considered in the density calculation. (Staff note: ADUs are allowed as *accessory* to primary homes throughout the City, e.g., on the same lot as the primary structure, with size limits and residency requirements of the primary homeowner – who must live on the lot, either in the primary or accessory dwelling).
- Renters in ADU’s – as noted, ADUs may be rented or they are often used as extra space for a family member to live, or office space.
- Will appeal to the City Council – this project is totally incompatible in this location
- Fails on five parameters of the Innovative Ordinance – which ones are being met?
- Owned housing versus all rented like condos – this is out of character with this neighborhood
- Sense of community – this project does not enhance larger community nor does it successfully create one of its own
- Public safety will be challenged with additional homes, residents
- Parking to get groceries to homes – this site plan is not practical for this
- Quality of the architecture is questionable
- Front Setbacks – applicant is requesting a “variance” of three feet, from 15 foot required setback to 12. Is this reasonable?
- Side setbacks – these are too close to adjoining properties
- Green building requirements – will the applicant have any requirements?
- Number of trips will be many more than what is appropriate for this street, location
- Number of homes is too many for this property

- Garbage with three receptacles per home – when multiplied by 9 dwelling units means 27 garbage, recycling and yard waste receptacles lined up on the street every week. This will interfere with pedestrian and other use of the street
- Wetland class and buffer – the project will affect these significant environmental features
- Binding site plan or some kind of bond to restrict expansion – can this be done under the Innovative Housing Ordinance?
- Geotechnical report – what does it say about the soils and infiltration capacity?
- Increased impervious surfaces compared to what is currently built – this will affect amount of water runoff, and negatively impact properties downhill from the site, as well as creeks, lake
- Grading plan – have not seen anything yet; how will this affect property?
- Storm vault – have not seen any plans yet for this.
- Permeable materials – retain for perpetuity and manage correctly – how can this be assured?
- Storage for residents in the homes – due to size and density, will likely not be adequate for storage, with impact to neighborhood
- Community building – what is the purpose of this?
- Relationship with neighbors when there is a high turnover rate – will diminish opportunity for creating established neighborhood relationships
- Moratorium on neighborhood until neighborhood plan is complete – approximately half or more in favor of doing this
- Transition neighborhood slowly – this is too extreme a change
- Character does not equal nine homes on one acre
- Other similar homes in a similar development are not affordable, e.g., cottages
- 128th & 105th Streets lined with cars; not using garages – a similar development
- Home sale price is likely to be quite high, or at least not extremely affordable
- Reconsider this project for the unfinished Chaffey site
- Public debate on Innovative Housing was not lengthy, very little to no public participation
- Property values for adjacent homes will be negatively affected
- ADU's – how to issue permit when the primary dwelling is not occupied?
- Car visibility – likely to be ever present with this many homes, and the likelihood that people in these homes will have to use them, due to insufficient bus service
- E.I.S. – this has not been done, and there needs to be an environmental review of the proposal
- Surface water table – quite high, the proposal will negatively affect
- Neighborhood connectivity – the proposal does not enhance this
- Walkability rating on Zillow.com – 23 units out of 100 – confirms that this neighborhood does not rate real high re: walking therefore expect that there will be excess of cars
- Roof runoff and stormwater runoff not treated before getting to lake
- Size of home for our climate and having children play – enough (winter) play space – these homes are not large, nor is outdoor area; children need larger spaces
- No more rental units and owners/renters are not maintaining them
- What is the likelihood that the property/development is sold to anyone else? (Applicant response: could partnership with someone, 50% likely, to complete project.)
- Children's safety – concern about additional traffic, cars

- City's supervision of project especially environmental protection
- Why was there a change from three homes to nine homes?
- Historical aspect and character – this proposal does not support this

- Idylwood overflow parking – already a problem, especially in the summer. This proposal will increase problem
- Communication with citizens with Innovative Housing ordinance process and update
 - Look at readdressing Innovative Housing program
- Concerns with the City and how the Innovative Housing program allows flexibility when other projects or additions cannot have the flexibility
- Where are the criteria listed?
- Notify residents of panel meetings
- Are any of the units required to be affordable and at what level? (Staff note: the Viewpoint neighborhood does not have affordability requirements, therefore this project would not be required to have defined affordable units; however, the ADUs would provide affordable options in the event they are rented).
- Who determines neighborhood compatibility? (Note: the Innovative Housing Ordinance 2409 identifies elements of what constitutes compatibility. The Review Panel is the body that reviews the proposal using these criteria/elements).
- Will the council review? The City Council would be the body to review in the event of an appeal
- Enforcing the ADU connection to the primary unit and the entire project becoming rental – how will that connection be regulated?
- How many cars below the ADU – (Garages under the proposed ADUs contain space for three cars).

Staff answered questions regarding timing, when the Review Panel will meet, and how the public will be notified of that meeting, and thanked everyone for coming to provide input. Comment forms were collected and all additional written comments were asked to be received by July 31st.

Staff Note: These are summary minutes of the neighborhood meeting held on 7/13/09 for the Idylwood Innovative Housing proposal. Audio tape for the meeting is unavailable due to computer malfunction.