

ISSUES MATRIX – MANUFACTURING PARK/BUSINESS PARK DGA
2009 Policy and Regulation Updates

Issue	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p>1. Allow Corporate Conference Centers in MP</p> <p>Wiechers-Gregory</p> <p>(Technical Committee recommendation)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u></p> <p>See Technical Committee Report, dated 2/25/09, Exhibit C, Summary of MP/BP Phase I Recommendations.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission:</u> The Planning Commission recommends that RCDG 20C.60.20-030 Permitted Uses Chart should not allow Corporate Conference Centers in MP.</p> <p><u>Discussion:</u> <i>Corporate Conference Centers accessory to primary business activity</i> is a land use that is currently allowed within the BP zone. The Technical Committee recommended that this use also be allowed within MP, for the reason that Corporate Headquarters and Regional Offices which are now allowed in both BP and MP, may wish to have Corporate Conference Centers nearby.</p> <p>Corporate Conference Centers are currently not a defined use within the RCDG; the Commission stated that due to the lack of definition, they were not comfortable with extending the use into the MP zone, and that this type of land use could possibly be more appropriate to Downtown and Overlake. Further, a Corporate Headquarters and Regional Offices use could incorporate conference space within their own business.</p>	<p>Open</p> <p>3/11/09</p> <p>Closed</p> <p>3/18/09</p>
<p>2. a. Increase Retail Area from 10% to maximum of 25%</p> <p>(Technical Committee</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u></p> <p>See Technical Committee Report, dated 2/25/09, Exhibit C, Summary of MP/BP Phase I Recommendations.</p>	<p>Closed</p> <p>3/11/09</p> <p>No further discussion on</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
recommendation)		item.
<p>2.b. Expansion of retail area in MP is proposed, not to exceed 25% of gfa for combined uses of an individual business. Should it be based per property instead of business?</p> <p>McCarthy, public comment</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u></p> <p>Staff recommendation is based on a per business percentage, consistent with Pomegranate DGA, which established the 25% concept, and which also stipulates that the allowed associated use be within the same business. It does allow the 25% to be calculated either within the same building or within the development, but under one ownership.</p> <p>The purpose of the MP zone is “to provide locations for existing and future manufacturing and industrial uses, particularly those that require significant areas for storage of materials and equipment,” and for ...”uses that are better suited for locations outside the Downtown and Overlake due to site requirements, noise impacts, transportation needs, or other considerations.” One of the issues identified by stakeholders is encroachment by other types of uses, including retail, into MP areas. If a multi-space building or development allows one tenant to be an all retail use and the 25% requirement is used, it will: 1) allow a fully retail business within an MP area contrary to the MP purpose statement within the Comprehensive Plan and, 2) possibly prevent other retail businesses from locating within that building or development, by using up the maximum 25% retail allowed. The implementation of the zoning code could therefore be perceived as inconsistent – that some retail business could be allowed and others not allowed, based on a “first come” basis.</p> <p><u>Public Comments</u></p> <p>A representative of an MP property owner requested that the 25% allowed retail be considered on a per property basis, instead of per individual business. In his case, the property in question is a multi-tenant building or development with small spaces, therefore making the 25% retail allowance more feasible if done on the entire building.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion (3/25):</u> After considering oral and</p>	<p>Open</p> <p>3/11/09</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p>written testimony on this issue, the Planning Commission supported the Technical Committee recommendation to permit an allowed use to incorporate an associated retail use, limited to 25% of the combined gross floor area of the two uses. The Commission discussed the issue of allowing the 25% to be of a <i>property</i> as opposed to a business, and felt that this would provide too much flexibility and could result in unintended consequences for MP areas.</p>	<p>Closed 3/25/09</p>
<p>3. Food and Kindred Products Petitpas, Quarry (Technical Committee recommendation)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u> See Technical Committee Report, dated 2/25/09, Exhibit C, Summary of MP/BP Phase I Recommendations. <u>Planning Commission Discussion (3/25)</u>: The Commission approved the Technical Committee recommendation as proposed, with no changes.</p>	<p>Open 3/11/09 Closed 3/25/09</p>
<p>4. Auto Sales – stand alone (Technical Committee recommendation)</p>	<p><u>See also: item #8 below</u> <u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u>: See Technical Committee Report, dated 2/25/09, Exhibit C, Summary of MP/BP Phase I Recommendations (Item 4). <u>Planning Commission Discussion (3/25)</u>: The majority of Commissioners agreed that retail sales of automobiles within the specific area identified by the Technical Committee is appropriate, and subject to the special use criteria in RCDG 20C.170.20. The majority was supportive of the proposal based on several reasons: 1) it is within a defined, limited area; 2) existing auto sale businesses within downtown are being severely challenged and need a place to go, if they choose to; and, 3) the only other area in which auto sales are allowed with outdoor storage of vehicles is in</p>	<p>Open 3/11/09 Closed 3/25/09</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p>the GC (General Commercial) zone which is very limited and mostly completed developed. Further, several Commissioners suggested that this proposal would not likely attract large regional dealerships given the location, but would provide an opportunity for the smaller, “boutique” auto businesses or specialty kinds of cars. One Commissioner was opposed to the proposal as he believed it to be in conflict with Comprehensive Plan policy LU-58 and would be incompatible with other allowed uses in the MP zone.</p>	
<p>5. Spa Uses Definition – Query (Technical Committee recommendation)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning:</u> See Technical Committee Report, dated 2/25/09, Exhibit C, Summary of MP/BP Phase I Recommendations.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion (3/25):</u> The Commission considered this proposed use and determined that as proposed by the Technical Committee, it was appropriate in the MP zone under specific conditions. First, that it is permitted only when contained within an athletic club or fitness center which are existing allowed uses, and that it be a minimum of 1,000 square feet in size but limited to no more than 25% of the floor area of the two combined uses.</p>	<p>Open 3/11/09</p> <p>Closed 3/25/09</p>
<p>6. Animal Day Care – (Kennels) Definition – Query (Technical Committee recommendation)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u> See Technical Committee Report, dated 2/25/09, Exhibit C, Summary of MP/BP Phase I Recommendations.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion (3/25):</u> The Planning Commission supports the Technical Committee recommendation to allow kennels within MP areas subject to special development criteria as described in RCDG 20D.170.15-020.</p>	<p>Open 3/11/09</p> <p>Closed 3/25/09</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p>7. Auto Repair as a Permitted Use within MP areas (Technical Committee recommendation)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning:</u> Auto repair is now allowed as a special use (“S”) within MP areas. The Technical Committee proposes that such uses be allowed as permitted uses (“P”), while maintaining the special use criteria for review of new proposals. The resulting change will be in the cost of the permit only.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion (3/25):</u> The Planning Commission supports the Technical Committee recommendation with no changes.</p>	<p>Open 3/11/09</p> <p>Closed 3/25/09</p>
<p>8. Auto Repair, <u>Auto Repair with Sales</u> and Auto Sales, stand alone (See issues #4, #7 and #8 in Technical Report, Exhibit C) Query, others</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning:</u> The Technical Committee recommends that a portion of an auto or boat repair shop may incorporate retail sales, subject to a size limitation of 25% of the two combined uses, e.g., the sales and repair areas. This is consistent with some increased flexibility for sales uses within MP areas under limited circumstances.</p> <p>See also: Technical Committee Report, dated 2/25/09, Exhibit C, Summary of MP/BP Phase I Recommendations.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion (3/25):</u> The Planning Commission supports the Technical Committee recommendation, with added wording to footnote 25 which limits the retail sales allowed to autos and motorcycles only.</p>	<p>Open 3/11/09</p> <p>Closed 3/25/09</p>
<p>9. Medical Diagnostic and Short-Term Treatment Facility Definition – Hinman (Technical Committee recommendation)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u> See Technical Committee Report, dated 2/25/09, Exhibit C, Summary of MP/BP Phase I Recommendations.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion (3/11):</u> The Commission discussed this proposed use in terms of the nature of the facility, hours of operation and the range of uses within a short-term diagnostic and treatment facility. The Commission directed that the title and definition of the use clearly identify that this is not a hospital with extended patient care, but of shorter</p>	<p>Open 3/11/09</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p>duration, less than 24 hours.</p> <p>Planning Commission Discussion (3/25): Commissioner Hinman proposed a new term for this type of use, stating that the term “Major Medical Facility” implied a hospital use, when the proposal is for a short-term medical use. Commissioner Hinman suggested the term, “Medical Diagnostic and Short-Term Treatment Facility to be used with the definition language recommended by the Technical Committee. The Planning Commission voted in favor of the new term, and approved the recommendation of the use as proposed by the Technical Committee. Staff also clarified that the use had been proposed by the Technical Committee for both the BP and MP designated areas.</p>	<p>Closed 3/25/09</p>
<p>10. Removal of story limit in MP buildings McCarthy (Technical Committee recommendation)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u></p> <p>See Technical Committee Report, dated 2/25/09, Exhibit C, Summary of MP/BP Phase I Recommendations.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion (3/25):</u> The Commission requested clarification of this item; staff responded that the proposal to eliminate the story limit in MP based on type of land use would not affect the height limit. The recommendation could result in a maximum number of stories within MP buildings of 3 versus two stories with the height limit at 45 feet. The Commission approved the Technical Committee recommendation, which is to remove the existing footnote 8 in RCDG 20C.60.25-020.</p>	<p>Open 3/11/09</p> <p>Closed 3/25/09</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p>11. Clarification of TDRs</p> <p>Clarification – Query (Technical Committee recommendation)</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u></p> <p>See Technical Committee Report, dated 2/25/09, Exhibit C, Summary of MP/BP Phase I Recommendations.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion:</u> The Planning Commission asked for clarification of this item. Staff responded that the recommended addition to RCDG 20C.60.25-020 Site Requirements would not change what was allowed but would provide more clear direction. The Commission approved the Technical Committee recommendation which is to add a new footnote to RCDG 20C.60.25-020 that directs the reader to RCDG 20D.200 on TDRs.</p>	<p>Open 3/11/09</p> <p>Closed 3/25/09</p>
Questions and Concerns		
<p>INSERT:</p> <p>ISSUES TO BE FURTHER ADDRESSED IN PHASE II:</p> <p>Chandorkar, Parnell, others</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Redmond needs to determine what kind of city it wants to be vis-à-vis support for Manufacturing, Industrial and Business Park support. - Should the City “grandfather” existing uses and actively recruit newer industries/businesses that 		<p>To be addressed further in Phase II of MP/BP Study</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p>are more suitable for our geographical and economic location?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - How can the City better integrate LID/Green Development with industrial development and uses? - Can the proposed locations for light rail be determined based on how they can be integrated with manufacturing areas? - Should the City allow greater building heights in Manufacturing Park/Business Park areas? - How can regulations which determine allowed uses be made more flexible to respond more quickly to economic circumstances? 		
<p>Additional Questions During PC Review</p>		
<p>1. What are we doing to encourage smaller, less expensive incubator spaces?</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u></p> <p>The City of Redmond is not directly involved with encouraging small business or incubator spaces, other than possibly through its current and</p>	

Issue	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
Petitpas	<p>recommended land use policies and regulations, including the additional flexibility to home businesses approved in 2008. The existence of incubator type spaces is largely a function of having older space on the market that is less expensive yet functional for new, incubator businesses.</p> <p>Within the Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update, certain zones have been expanded on a transitional basis in terms of their allowed uses. The MP/BP recommendations also generally allow additional flexibility within these areas by encouraging new, previously undefined uses or additional associated retail uses. Increased flexibility in some site requirements within MP and BP is also proposed. At the same time, the MP/BP recommendations are intended to maintain these areas overall for manufacturing and business park uses. This may also contribute to the natural evolution of some spaces into “incubator” types.</p>	
<p>2. What other recommendations were considered for MP/BP areas and either rejected or identified as appropriate for Phase II of study?</p> <p>Querry</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u></p> <p>In May, 2008, Planning Staff presented a “scoping” document to the Planning Commission regarding the division of the MP/BP Study into two major parts: Phase I was proposed as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alteration of certain site requirements to allow greater flexibility of use • Initial changes to the Permitted Land Uses Chart (RCDG 20C.60.20-030) • Applications for privately initiated Comprehensive Plan amendments already docketed (Chee & Kent requests) <p>Phase II items included possible changes to Land Use and/or zoning, either parcel or area specific, possible combining of land use designations, and possible consideration of performance zoning or other methods as</p>	

Issue	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p>part of updating the Redmond Community Development Guide.</p> <p>Thus, individual requests for land use change/rezone have been recommended to be considered within the context of Phase II.</p> <p>Other issues previously considered by staff included the removal of housing as an allowed use within the BP zone, except within a defined area (“Westpark housing overlay area”) along 154th Avenue NE, on the west side of the Sammamish River. This concept was not favored by the stakeholders.</p> <p>Also in the Westpark area, a change in Comprehensive Plan land use designation and zoning was proposed for the west side of 154th Avenue NE, from Manufacturing Park (MP) to Business Park (BP). The specific area identified was from NE 87th Street (if extended) to NE 90th Street. This proposal was not forwarded by the Technical Committee, due to stakeholder response, stating that opportunities to create housing should not be removed.</p> <p><u>PC Discussion:</u> Commissioner Query and others indicated that this item could be closed. (3/18/09)</p>	
<p>3. What kind of resources are we using to define how the nature of work is changing and how does that influence our recommendations for different space needs?</p> <p>Wiechers-Gregory</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u></p> <p>Resources consulted for the MP/BP Study and subsequent recommendations have included studies prepared by the consulting firm Urban Advisors contracted for by the Cities of Redmond (2003) and Kirkland (2005). In addition, staff has interviewed City Council staff (City of Seattle) and Planning Department staff (Cities of Bellevue and Kirkland), and has reviewed numerous written documents, newspaper articles and various cities’ websites.</p> <p>Individuals from the commercial leasing industry have contributed their expertise in this area through participation in stakeholder meetings,</p>	

Issue	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p>telephone conversations with staff and by providing data. The Redmond Chamber of Commerce has also contributed in a variety of ways.</p> <p>The staff review team included the Planning Director and senior level staff from the Planning Department as well as Code Enforcement/Business License staff.</p> <p>Information obtained from these resources and others has shaped the proposed recommendations.</p> <p>Further, with the adoption of the new budget, the Mayor and City Council have recognized the importance of economic vitality through the promotion of sustainable job creation and job retention. The Planning Department, together with other City departments and the business community will be working on a Regional Economic Strategy during 2009-2010.</p>	
<p>4. Are there lessons learned from Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update re: incubator spaces? Hinman</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u></p> <p>As noted in Issue #2 above, the City expanded the permitted land uses in certain areas of the Overlake Neighborhood on a transitional basis in 2007. Historically, some portions of these areas have functioned as incubators for new business. Expansion of allowed uses may further this goal; at the same time, however, it may also postpone the implementation of the Overlake Neighborhood vision, which promotes more active retail, restaurant or other activity generating types of uses, because space is not available for these uses or property owners choose not to lease to these uses.</p> <p>Also, new incubator space is not typically developed by the private development community, but exists as a result of a market process whereby space is turned over by various businesses as they grow and mature.</p>	

Issue	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p><u>PC Discussion:</u> Commissioner Hinman noted that there are likely other lessons to be learned from the Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update in addition to incubator space that would be applicable to MP/BP areas and those issues should be explored further, either within the current Phase 1 discussion or identified as relevant to Phase 2 of the study. (3/18/09).</p>	
<p>5. What are potential impacts to infrastructure in MP/BP areas that could result from these recommendations? How will these recommendations potentially impact freight mobility and emergency services access?</p> <p>Query</p>	<p><u>Staff Recommendation/Reasoning</u></p> <p>Environmental review of the proposed Development Guide Amendment considers potential, significant and/or adverse impacts that could result from these recommendations. Possible impacts to infrastructure could be from increased traffic or utility use, for example. No changes to parking ratios have been proposed, with one exception: a Major Medical Facility use would allow a ratio of 4.5 parking spaces per 1,000 square feet of use. Height and bulk requirements are also not proposed to change. While a limited amount of additional flexibility is proposed in terms of allowed uses, the recommendations are not anticipated to result in significant additional demands on infrastructure, cause impacts to freight mobility or hinder access to emergency vehicles. Potential impacts will be limited by the intensity (limited) of permitted land uses and site requirements.</p>	