

**ISSUES MATRIX – REDMOND GATEWAY DGA**

| Questions:  | Discussion Notes  | Issue Status                                  |
|---|---|---|
| <p><b>1. What are the permitted uses in the Design District and General Commercial designations and how do they compare?</b><br/>(All)</p>                | <p><u>Staff Response/Reasoning:</u> Design District Uses include: corporate headquarters, research and development, light manufacturing, regional retail, hotel/motels, and limited support services. For example, many professional office uses are allowed within the Design District only if the activity internally services the company of which the activity is a part and does not provide walk-in service to the general public. In addition, sit-down and carry-out restaurants are permitted, as well as employee cafeterias within buildings, but drive-through restaurants are not.</p> <p>Uses permitted within General Commercial include a broad array of retail businesses, drive-through restaurants, and a wide variety of service uses, such as financial, personal, business and professional services. Research and development, corporate headquarters and light manufacturing uses are not permitted within the General Commercial zone.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion:</u></p> | <p align="center"><b>Open<br/>6/17/09</b></p> |
| <p><b>2. How do General Commercial policies and regulations compare with those of Gateway Design District re: design and entryway considerations?</b></p> | <p><u>Staff Response/Reasoning:</u> General Commercial uses are required to adhere to a number of requirements to enhance their overall design, functionality and vehicular and pedestrian connections. These include regulations for landscape areas; the location, size and placement of ground floor windows; blank wall treatments and pedestrian standards. In addition, Special Commercial Zone Regulations address outdoor storage, Commercial Design Standards and exterior lighting regulations.</p> <p>All development on the subject properties under either land use designation would be subject to tree preservation regulations and review by the City’s Design Review Board.</p> <p>RCDG 20D.40.15 Citywide Design Standards identifies Design Contexts</p>   | <p align="center"><b>Open<br/>6/17/09</b></p> |

| Questions: | Discussion Notes  | Issue Status |
|------------|---|--------------|
|            | <p>as "...provid[ing] contextual references that can be used to encourage distinctive designs for new development and redevelopment projects." This section encourages the identification of existing neighborhood characteristics that should be enhanced or incorporated into the designs of new development projects. In addition, the standards address neighborhood compatibility and transitions between adjacent land uses, buildings and street frontages. These standards may be specifically identified as relevant to any future development of this area, which is prominently located at the intersection of Redmond Way and 180<sup>th</sup> Avenue NE.</p> <p>Gateway Design District policy N-SE-54 within the Southeast Redmond Neighborhood states, "Encourage development which is sensitive to natural features and which will enhance the entryway to the City". Regulations to further implement this policy are stated in the following manner in RCDG 20C.70.55 Gateway Design District (GDD) Zone: under 20C.70.55-060(2)(a) General Design Requirements, "Site and building design should give a sense of arriving in the City. Site planning should take into account the objective of maintaining significant natural features. Site and building design should comply with the City's design standards to result in a high-quality and attractive gateway to the City. Paragraph (c) states further: "Provide a coordinated entry theme through the use of physical improvements, containing similar elements at distinct entry point, with one entry receiving major recognition.</p> <p>Specific locations for gateways are not defined in RCDG 20D.42 Design Standards for Public View Corridors and Gateways, however it could be asserted that due to the location of this site, the design context standards discussed in RCDG 20D.40.15 should be applied in reference to architectural and site design standards within a highly visible corridor.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion:</u></p> |              |

| Questions:  | Discussion Notes   | Issue Status                          |
|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| <p><b>3. General Commercial land use and zoning allows for 4 unit residential structures as well as mixed use projects that include housing. Is this an appropriate location for residential uses?</b><br/>(McCarthy)</p> | <p><u>Staff Response/Reasoning:</u> The General Commercial Designation allows specific types of housing as noted. While it is acknowledged that other locations may be more desirable for housing, due to possible traffic, noise and lighting issues, staff would not recommend any limitation on housing uses with the proposed amendment.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission:</u> Commissioners questioned residential uses located on the subject site.</p>   | <p><b>Open</b><br/><b>6/17/09</b></p> |
| <p><b>4. What is the history of the current Design District designation and were other designations considered?</b><br/>(Querry)</p>  | <p><u>Staff Response/Reasoning:</u> The Design District land use designation was established in the mid-1990's with the creation of the SE Redmond Neighborhood Plan. Within that neighborhood, the Gateway Design District with distinct performance areas (Performance Areas 1, 2, and 3) were identified. Performance Areas 1 and 2 are large in size at approximately 35 acres each, and Performance Area 3 being considerably smaller at just over 5 acres in size. Commissioners wondered why the significant size difference between Districts. The Commission has also asked whether other land use designations, such as MP, were considered for the area.</p> <p>(Staff will research how these areas were determined)</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion:</u></p> | <p><b>Open</b><br/><b>6/17/09</b></p> |
| <p><b>5. How much land would be (likely) removed with the proposed extension of NE 70<sup>th</sup> Street?</b><br/>(Biethan)</p>  | <p><u>Staff Response/Reasoning:</u> The parcel that the proposed extension would bisect is approximately 72,745 square feet in size (1.67 acres). Approximate length of the extension is 500 feet or less, with a proposed street section of 69 feet. This area would account for approximately 34,500 square feet. Therefore, approximately half, or slightly less than half of the parcel would be used for right of way.</p> <p><u>Planning Commission Discussion:</u></p>  | <p><b>Open</b><br/><b>6/17/09</b></p> |

| Questions:   | Discussion Notes  | Issue Status                          |
|--|---|---------------------------------------|
| <p><b>6. What would the timing be for the proposed extension of N.E. 70<sup>th</sup> relative to new development proposals for the subject area?</b></p> | <p><u>Staff Response/Reasoning:</u> The proposed extension of N.E. 70<sup>th</sup> Street is on the 2022 TFP. The applicant has met with the City to discuss alignment and funding alternatives, with no specific alternatives chosen at this point.</p> <p>(Staff will research additional information re: timing and funding)</p> | <p><b>Open</b><br/><b>6/17/09</b></p> |

**Additional Questions and Information requests**

Ver.1