

Redmond Zoning Code Threshold Criteria Applied to Proposed Amendments for Inclusion on the 2019-20 Docket Section 21.76.070(2)(b)

<p>RZC CRITERIA</p> <p>PROPOSED AMENDMENTS</p>	<p>(i) Amending the Comprehensive Plan is the most appropriate mechanism available</p> <p><i>Alternative options: regulatory, budgetary or programmatic measure</i></p>	<p>(ii) Proposal is best addressed as an individually docketed item</p> <p><i>For instance, is there another planning process already available that could address this proposal?</i></p>	<p>(iii) Proposal is consistent with existing local, state, and federal laws</p>	<p>(iv) Proposal is timely with respect to other City and community initiatives, and planned public and private development</p>	<p>(v) Council, PC and staff will have sufficient info necessary to analyze, recommend, and make informed decisions within the docket year</p>	<p>(vi) Consistent with overall vision, policies, and adopted functional plans</p>	<p>(vii) Not considered or rejected in last 2 years</p>	<p>Recommendation</p>
<p>NEW Privately-Initiated Proposals (6)</p>								
<p>1. Amend Comp Plan and Zoning Code to expand retail marijuana uses to five additional land use designations and corresponding zoning districts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. Neighborhood Commercial (NC-1) ii. Neighborhood Commercial (NC-2) iii. Street-facing location in Business Park (BP) iv. Manufacturing Park (MP) and v. Industry (I) <p>Privately-initiated: Jenny Carbon, The Grass Is Always Greener, LLC</p>	<p>YES.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Amending the Comprehensive Plan is the appropriate mechanism to address the applicant’s desired outcome. • Applicant requests amendments to existing policies in 3 elements: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land Use • Neighborhoods • Economic Vitality 	<p>YES.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This proposal is best addressed as an individually docketed item. 	<p>YES.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff has not identified any conflict to local, state, or federal laws. 	<p>YES.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal is best addressed as an individually docketed item as no other efforts are underway to assess new uses in the proposed zoning districts. 	<p>YES.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council, PC and staff will have sufficient info. necessary to analyze, recommend, and make informed decisions in the docket year. 	<p>YES, in part.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposal requests expansion of retail marijuana to 5 additional zoning districts, two of which are not consistent with existing policies that guide the intent of and uses within the leand use designations for these zones. NC-1 and NC2 	<p>NO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not submitted as a docket proposal in the last 2 years 	<p>YES.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Committee recommends this proposal be included on the docket for further consideration for three of the five proposed zoning districts – BP, MP and I. • The Purpose and Designation Criteria do not preclude consideration of these 3 zoning districts for inclusion.

Redmond Zoning Code Threshold Criteria Applied to Proposed Amendments for Inclusion on the 2019-20 Docket Section 21.76.070(2)(b)

<p>RZC CRITERIA</p> <p>PROPOSED AMENDMENTS</p>	<p>(i) Amending the Comprehensive Plan is the most appropriate mechanism available</p> <p><i>Alternative options: regulatory, budgetary or programmatic measure</i></p>	<p>(ii) Proposal is best addressed as an individually docketed item</p> <p><i>For instance, is there another planning process already available that could address this proposal?</i></p>	<p>(iii) Proposal is consistent with existing local, state, and federal laws</p>	<p>(iv) Proposal is timely with respect to other City and community initiatives, and planned public and private development</p>	<p>(v) Council, PC and staff will have sufficient info necessary to analyze, recommend, and make informed decisions within the docket year</p>	<p>(vi) Consistent with overall vision, policies, and adopted functional plans</p>	<p>(vii) Not considered or rejected in last 2 years</p>	<p>Recommendation</p>
<p>2. Affordable Workforce Housing: Amend Comprehensive Plan and RZC</p> <p>Proposed new policy HO-56: “Craft regulations and procedures that encourage the private sector to create more affordable housing, acknowledging that housing affordability is a crisis both in Redmond and the region and that the nonprofit sector cannot solve the great need alone.”</p> <p>Proposed RZC revisions: Amend regulations and procedures that encourage affordable housing development by the private sector. Privately-initiated: One Redmond</p>	<p>YES, in part.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Amending the Comprehensive Plan to include the reference to the <i>affordable housing crisis</i> does provide a nuance to existing policies addressing affordable housing. Refer amending regulations and procedures that encourage affordable housing development by the private sector to be considered under the <i>Housing Action Plan</i> currently underway. 	<p>YES.</p> <p>The reference to the affordable housing crisis does provide a nuance to existing policies addressing affordable housing.</p>	<p>YES.</p> <p>Staff has not identified any conflict to local, state, or federal laws.</p>	<p>YES.</p> <p>Aspects of the proposal address areas of study in the <i>Housing Action Plan</i>. Outcomes of the plan will likely include policy updates in the Housing Element to facilitate affordable housing.</p>	<p>YES.</p> <p>Regarding a change to a policy to reference “affordable housing crisis” Council, PC and staff will have sufficient information necessary to analyze, recommend and make informed decisions in the docket year.</p>	<p>YES.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No identified conflict with adopted functional plans. Also, the proposed policy language is supported by existing Comprehensive Plan policies HO-46 through HO-49, as well as in the preceding text. 	<p>NO.</p> <p>Not submitted as a docket proposal in the last 2 years.</p>	<p>YES.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Although this language does not provide any new or significant policy change in the Comprehensive Plan, the reference to the affordable housing crisis is a useful addition. Technical Committee recommends a <u>modified version</u> of the proposed new policy: “Craft regulations and procedures that encourage the private sector to create more affordable housing, acknowledging that housing affordability is a crisis.” Refer amending regulations and procedures that encourage affordable housing development by the private sector to be considered under the <i>Housing Action Plan</i> currently underway.

Redmond Zoning Code Threshold Criteria Applied to Proposed Amendments for Inclusion on the 2019-20 Docket Section 21.76.070(2)(b)

<p>RZC CRITERIA</p> <p>PROPOSED AMENDMENTS</p>	<p>(i) Amending the Comprehensive Plan is the most appropriate mechanism available</p> <p><i>Alternative options: regulatory, budgetary or programmatic measure</i></p>	<p>(ii) Proposal is best addressed as an individually docketed item</p> <p><i>For instance, is there another planning process already available that could address this proposal?</i></p>	<p>(iii) Proposal is consistent with existing local, state, and federal laws</p>	<p>(iv) Proposal is timely with respect to other City and community initiatives, and planned public and private development</p>	<p>(v) Council, PC and staff will have sufficient info necessary to analyze, recommend, and make informed decisions within the docket year</p>	<p>(vi) Consistent with overall vision, policies, and adopted functional plans</p>	<p>(vii) Not considered or rejected in last 2 years</p>	<p>Recommendation</p>
<p>3. Affordable Commercial: Amend Comprehensive Plan and RZC</p> <p>Applicant proposes one new policy and two revised RZC definitions.</p> <p>Proposed new policy: EV-xx Support the retention of local businesses by creating opportunities for more affordable commercial space through: The expansion of mezzanines to 50-100% of the floor area.</p> <p>Privately-initiated: Natural and Built Environments LLC, Robert Pantley</p>	<p>YES.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A modified EV-xx policy that reads, <i>Support the retention of local businesses by creating opportunities for more affordable commercial space</i> would provide a focus that does not conflict but supplements existing policies. 	<p>YES.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed new policy is best addressed as an individually docketed item. 	<p>YES.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> For both - staff has not identified any conflict to local, state, or federal laws. NO. The proposed RZC amendments are not best addressed as individually docketed items. 	<p>YES. – for modified policy; timely with respect to recent efforts to increase awareness among existing/potential employers and employees of City’s vibrant and innovative business environment.</p>	<p>YES, but for only for a portion of the proposed new policy language:</p> <p>EV-xx Support the retention of local businesses by creating opportunities for more affordable commercial space.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 	<p>YES.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> But only for the modified policy <i>Support the retention of local businesses by creating opportunities for more affordable commercial space</i> would provide a focus that does not conflict but supplements existing policies. 	<p>NO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> None have been submitted as a docket proposal in the last 2 years. 	<p>YES.</p> <p>Technical Committee recommends including the following revision to the Comprehensive Plan on the 2019-2020 Docket:</p> <p><u>Modified</u> per staff: EV-xx Support the retention of local businesses by creating opportunities for more affordable commercial space.</p> <p>Refer the expansion of mezzanines proposal to Alternate City Process (see below)</p>

Redmond Zoning Code Threshold Criteria Applied to Proposed Amendments for Inclusion on the 2019-20 Docket Section 21.76.070(2)(b)

<p>RZC CRITERIA</p> <p>PROPOSED AMENDMENTS</p>	<p>(i) Amending the Comprehensive Plan is the most appropriate mechanism available</p> <p><i>Alternative options: regulatory, budgetary or programmatic measure</i></p>	<p>(ii) Proposal is best addressed as an individually docketed item</p> <p><i>Is another planning process already available?</i></p>	<p>(iii) Proposal is consistent with existing local, state, and federal laws</p>	<p>i.(iv) Proposal is timely with respect to other City and community initiatives, and planned public and private development</p>	<p>(v) Council, PC and staff will have sufficient info necessary to analyze, recommend, and make informed decisions within the docket year</p>	<p>(vi) Consistent with overall vision, policies, and adopted functional plans</p>	<p>(vii) Not considered or rejected in last 2 years</p>	<p>Recommendation</p>
<p>4. Comprehensive plan text amendment and rezone for 1.3 acres in Bear Creek.</p> <p>Applicant seeks a land use designation change from SF to MF and a rezone from R-6 to R-12 to develop a 20-unit townhome community at 10007 Avondale Rd. NE.</p> <p>Parcel was previously rezoned R-12 in 2005 for the express purpose of cottage development for the City’s Innovative Housing Program, however, this project was not developed.</p> <p>Privately-initiated Hossein Khorram, Milano Townhomes of Bear Creek</p>	<p>YES.</p> <p>Amending the Comprehensive Plan is the appropriate mechanism to address the applicant’s desired outcome.</p>	<p>NO.</p> <p>The proposal is not best addressed as an individually docketed item.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposal should be considered during the City’s <i>Housing Action Plan (HAP)</i> which encourages all cities planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA) to adopt actions to increase residential building capacity. <p>Outcomes of the Plan could potentially support the Applicant’s proposal.</p>	<p>YES.</p> <p>Staff has not identified any conflict to local, state, or federal laws.</p>	<p>YES.</p> <p>The proposal is timely with respect to the <i>City’s Housing Action Plan (HAP)</i> currently underway. This proposal would best be addressed by consideration during the Housing Action Plan rather than by making incremental changes to the RZC and Comp Plan to accommodate this request.</p>	<p>NO.</p> <p>Council, PC and staff will not have sufficient info. necessary in the docket year to analyze, recommend, and make informed decisions until the anticipated 2Q 2021 <i>Housing Action Plan</i> completion date.</p>	<p>NO.</p> <p>The State Growth Management Act requires that amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code be closely aligned with a City’s overall vision.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The preferred land use pattern is for focused, high-density growth in the two urban centers and the Marymoor local center. .Proposal does <u>not</u> meet all the criteria of policy LU-36 which provides guidance for high-density residential neighborhoods requiring: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the site be in or near Downtown or Overlake, - near employment and commercial nodes, <u>and</u> where high levels of transit is <u>or</u> is likely to be present. <p>the site is directly adjacent to an arterial.</p>	<p>NO.</p> <p>Not submitted as a docket proposal in the last 2 years.</p>	<p>NO.</p> <p>Technical Committee does not recommend for further consideration for the docket.</p> <p>Rather, Technical Committee recommends land use policies effecting this proposal be considered during the work currently underway in the <i>Housing Action Plan</i> and evaluate the proposal in light of the Plan’s resultant actionable strategies to meet current and future housing needs.</p> <p>During the HAP work consider evaluating LU-6 (infill); LU-36 (MF Urban requirements); definition of “near”</p>

Redmond Zoning Code Threshold Criteria Applied to Proposed Amendments for Inclusion on the 2019-20 Docket Section 21.76.070(2)(b)

<p>RZC CRITERIA</p> <p>PROPOSED AMENDMENTS</p>	<p>(i) Amending the Comprehensive Plan is the most appropriate mechanism available</p> <p><i>Alternative options: regulatory, budgetary or programmatic measure</i></p>	<p>(ii) Proposal is best addressed as an individually docketed item</p> <p><i>For instance, is there another planning process already available that could address this proposal?</i></p>	<p>(iii) Proposal is consistent with existing local, state, and federal laws</p>	<p>(iv) Proposal is timely with respect to other City and community initiatives, and planned public and private development</p>	<p>(v) Council, PC and staff will have sufficient info necessary to analyze, recommend, and make informed decisions within the docket year</p>	<p>(vi) Consistent with overall vision, policies, and adopted functional plans</p>	<p>(vii) Not considered or rejected in last 2 years</p>	<p>Recommendation</p>
<p>5. Height Overlay: Amend Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code</p> <p>Proposed new policy DT-11 to ensure that building heights in the Downtown respect views of tree lines and adjacent hillsides and contribute to the development of an urban place that feels comfortable for pedestrians. Achieve this by limiting building heights to five and six stories in general and by allowing exceptions for additional height in a portion of the Town Center zone and elsewhere when accompanied by exceptional public amenities, with a minimum height limit of five stories throughout the Urban Center Zones.</p> <p>Privately-initiated: Angela Rozmyn, Natural and Built Environments LLC</p>	<p>YES. Some Considerations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update the following sections (not inclusive) to provide consistency: <p>DT-37 Consider allowing add'l bldg. height to 4 stories and additional residential densities for redevelopment of retail centers into urban village form.... ... Additional building height can transition gracefully from nearby lower density neighborhoods;</p> <p>DT-25 Ensure that development and redevelopment in Old Town retain this area's historic village character and complement the character and scale of existing historic buildings. Maintain height limits appropriate to this character and the pedestrian environment.</p> <p>DT-41 Regulate building height, design, and open space to provide transitions between Downtown zones and to minimize impacts on adjacent residential or lower-scale zones.</p> <p>OV-52 Allow building heights up to five stories for mixed-use developments throughout Overlake Village....</p>	<p>YES.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proposal proposes a change in the comprehensive plan not currently provided for. 	<p>NO. Multiple Regulatory Updates would be required.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> This proposal would call for regulatory updates related to minimum height requirements in multiple zones and height incentives for transfer of development rights and Green Building Incentives. 	<p>NO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Staff is in the planning stages for the following projects: <p>Comprehensive Plan – and Urban Center Visioning – In this process we will be evaluating building heights and working with the public and economic development firm to determine the appropriate land uses and urban forms for TOD and Urban Center areas, including evaluating impacts of changes to minimum and maximum heights to the environment, infrastructure and public services.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Temporary Construction Dewatering Project is evaluating building heights among other variables that impact the Critical Aquifer Recharge Area (CARA). Factors considered: economic impacts; impacts to water quality, and environmental protection. 	<p>NO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple sections of the comp plan and zoning regulations will need to be reviewed and updated to implement this change. Including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> DT-37 DT-35 DT-41 Additionally, multiple sections of development regulations would have to be reviewed and updated – particularly sections of the zoning code where height is used as an incentive to achieve Transfer of Development Rights, and Green Building standards. 	<p>NO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Requirements for minimum height greater than what is currently allowed would have to be evaluated for impacts to infrastructure and services. 	<p>NO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not submitted as a docket proposal in the last 2 years. 	<p>NO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Technical Committee recommends not including this item. <p>Minimum and maximum building heights will be informed by the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> King County Growth Targets (June) Community developed vision for the Urban Centers and TOD areas (2020) Recommendations provided as part of the Temporary Construction Dewatering Study

Redmond Zoning Code Threshold Criteria Applied to Proposed Amendments for Inclusion on the 2019-20 Docket Section 21.76.070(2)(b)

No New City-initiated proposals submitted

Redmond Zoning Code Threshold Criteria Applied to Proposed Amendments for Inclusion on the 2019-20 Docket Section 21.76.070(2)(b)

<p>RZC CRITERIA</p> <p>PROPOSED AMENDMENTS</p>	<p>(i) Amending the Comprehensive Plan is the most appropriate mechanism available</p> <p>Alternative options: regulatory, budgetary or programmatic measure</p>	<p>(ii) Proposal is best addressed as an individually docketed item</p> <p>Is another planning process already available?</p>	<p>(iii) Proposal is consistent with existing local, state, and federal laws</p>	<p>(iv) Proposal is timely with respect to other City and community initiatives, and planned public and private development</p>	<p>(v) Council, PC and staff will have sufficient info necessary to analyze, recommend, and make informed decisions within the docket year</p>	<p>(vi) Consistent with overall vision, policies, and adopted functional plans</p>	<p>(vii) Not considered or rejected in last 2 years</p>	<p>Recommendation</p>
<p>Proposals Referred to Alternate City Processes</p>								
<p>1. LEED Gold Requirement. Amend Comprehensive Plan and development regulations.</p> <p>Add new policy HO-xx, Promote Environmental sustainability in housing by requiring all new residential properties over 10,000 square feet to achieve LEED Gold, Build Green V, or equivalent.</p> <p>Privately-initiated: Angela Rozmyn, Natural and Built Environments LLC</p>	<p>NO. Proposal is more suggestive of a regulatory amendment. Existing policies would not prevent this from being considered as a regulatory amendment.</p>	<p>NO. Proposal is more suggestive of a regulatory amendment and should be considered as part of the Green Building Incentive Program Review - 2020.</p>	<p>YES. Staff has not identified any conflict to local, state, or federal laws.</p>	<p>YES. This proposal should be considered as part of the Green Building Incentive Program Review-2020.</p>	<p>NO. Council, PC and staff will not have sufficient info. necessary in the docket year to analyze, recommend, and make informed decisions until the Green Building Incentive Program Review-2020 is completed.</p>	<p>YES. Staff has not identified any conflict with adopted functional plans, but the proposal should be considered as part of a host of design considerations called out in the Comprehensive Plan, namely in:</p> <p>Community Character and Historic Preservation CC-18</p> <p>Natural Resources Element NE-12</p> <p>Land Use Element LU-4</p>	<p>NO. Not submitted as a docket proposal in the last 2 years.</p>	<p>NO. Technical Committee recommends not including this item on the docket.</p> <p>This item should be first considered as part of the City’s Green Building Incentive Program Review -2020, and then upon evaluation and positive recommendation should be considered as a regulatory amendment.</p>

Redmond Zoning Code Threshold Criteria Applied to Proposed Amendments for Inclusion on the 2019-20 Docket Section 21.76.070(2)(b)

<p>RZC CRITERIA</p> <p>PROPOSED AMENDMENTS</p>	<p>(i) Amending the Comprehensive Plan is the most appropriate mechanism available</p> <p>Alternative options: regulatory, budgetary or programmatic measure</p>	<p>(ii) Proposal is best addressed as an individually docketed item</p> <p>Is another planning process already available?</p>	<p>(iii) Proposal is consistent with existing local, state, and federal laws</p>	<p>(iv) Proposal is timely with respect to other City and community initiatives, and planned public and private development</p>	<p>(v) Council, PC and staff will have sufficient info necessary to analyze, recommend, and make informed decisions within the docket year</p>	<p>(vi) Consistent with overall vision, policies, and adopted functional plans</p>	<p>(vii) Not considered or rejected in last 2 years</p>	<p>Recommendation</p>
<p>2. Actively support King County’s proposal to the legislature to extend the MFTE to 20 years and when enacted adopt in Redmond.</p> <p>Privately-initiated: Natural and Built Environments LLC, Robert Pantley</p>	<p>NO. The proposal has been forwarded to the Mayor’s Office for their information as the item addresses a proposal to the State Legislature. The following language was adopted in the City of Redmond’s Legislative Agenda:</p> <p><i>Redmond is actively working to increase the level of housing affordability. The City is developing a Housing Action Plan to identify the actions most needed to improve housing affordability in the Redmond community. Meanwhile, the City supports the following legislative proposals:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>Extend and expand the Multi-Family Property Tax Exemption (MFTE).</i> <i>Allow existing affordable housing funding to be spent on a broader array of income levels, ranging from 0-30% area median income (AMI) to workforce housing.</i> <p><i>Authorize local option funding tools to address affordability; any county-imposed funding shall be allocated to the communities where funds are generated for investment in affordable housing.</i></p>	<p>NO. Proposal addresses the City of Redmond’s Legislative Agenda.</p>	<p>Staff has not identified any conflict to local, state, or federal laws.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>NO. Not submitted as a docket proposal in the last 2 years.</p>	<p>NO. Technical Committee recommends not including this item on the annual docket.</p> <p>Refer proposal to the Mayor’s Office as the item addresses a proposal to the State Legislature.</p>

Redmond Zoning Code Threshold Criteria Applied to Proposed Amendments for Inclusion on the 2019-20 Docket Section 21.76.070(2)(b)

<p>RZC CRITERIA</p> <p>PROPOSED AMENDMENTS</p>	<p>(i) Amending the Comprehensive Plan is the most appropriate mechanism available</p> <p>Alternative options: regulatory, budgetary or programmatic measure</p>	<p>(ii) Proposal is best addressed as an individually docketed item</p> <p>Is another planning process already available?</p>	<p>(iii) Proposal is consistent with existing local, state, and federal laws</p>	<p>(iv) Proposal is timely with respect to other City and community initiatives, and planned public and private development</p>	<p>(v) Council, PC and staff will have sufficient info necessary to analyze, recommend, and make informed decisions within the docket year</p>	<p>(vi) Consistent with overall vision, policies, and adopted functional plans</p>	<p>(vii) Not considered or rejected in last 2 years</p>	<p>Recommendation</p>
<p>3. Reduce construction costs by 1% by adopting selective changes that we will identify in city standards and processes.</p> <p>Privately-initiated: Natural and Built Environments LLC, Robert Pantley</p>	<p>NO. A Comprehensive Plan Amendment is not required to initiate a review of current business practices and permit review processes.</p>	<p>NO. Identified improvement proposals can be reviewed with City staff as part of the One Redmond Permitting Process Survey effort.</p>	<p>Staff has not identified any conflict to local, state, or federal laws.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Staff has not identified any conflict with the overall vision, policies, and adopted functional plans</p>	<p>NO. Not submitted as a docket proposal in the last 2 years.</p>	<p>NO. Technical Committee recommends not including this item on the annual docket.</p> <p>As part of the One Redmond Permitting Process Survey efforts, identified process improvements can be reviewed with City staff.</p>

Redmond Zoning Code Threshold Criteria Applied to Proposed Amendments for Inclusion on the 2019-20 Docket Section 21.76.070(2)(b)

<p>RZC CRITERIA</p> <p>PROPOSED AMENDMENTS</p>	<p>(i) Amending the Comprehensive Plan is the most appropriate mechanism available</p> <p>Alternative options: regulatory, budgetary or programmatic measure</p>	<p>(ii) Proposal is best addressed as an individually docketed item</p> <p>Is another planning process already available?</p>	<p>(iii) Proposal is consistent with existing local, state, and federal laws</p>	<p>(iv) Proposal is timely with respect to other City and community initiatives, and planned public and private development</p>	<p>(v) Council, PC and staff will have sufficient info necessary to analyze, recommend, and make informed decisions within the docket year</p>	<p>(vi) Consistent with overall vision, policies, and adopted functional plans</p>	<p>(vii) Not considered or rejected in last 2 years</p>	<p>Recommendation</p>
<p>4. Allow up to 10% more units within the building envelope without changing additional unit-based impact and connection fees.</p> <p>Privately-initiated: One Redmond</p>	<p>This request does not necessitate a Comprehensive Plan Amendment. Any regulatory changes would include a discussion about alternative means of funding public facility improvements in accordance with RCW 82.02.060 which provides the state regulatory framework for the assessment of impact fees including the conditions for exceptions.</p> <p>Several Comprehensive Plan Policies provide opportunities for this to be considered subject to criteria.</p> <p>HO-49 Offer exemptions or reduced impact fees for construction of affordable housing units in qualifying developments.</p> <p>CF-14 Follow the principle that growth shall pay for the growth-related portion of capital facilities. When imposing impact fees on new development, the City will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impose fees only for system improvements that are reasonably related to growth. <p>Redmond Municipal Code City permit, connection, and impact fees are approved and adopted by City Council and updated annually in accordance with the Redmond Municipal Code.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RMC Chapter 13.11 WATER AND SEWER CONNECTION CHARGES • RMC Chapter 3.10 IMPACT FEES <p>Redmond Zoning Code Impact fees are also addressed in the Redmond Zoning Code.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RZC 21.17.010: Adequate Public Facilities and Services Required 	<p>This proposal will be considered as a request for inclusion in the PCD code amendment work program and the budgetary implications of any recommended code amendment would be reviewed as part of the annual impact fee adoption process.</p>	<p>Staff has not identified any conflict to local, state, or federal laws.</p>	<p>NO. This proposal will be reviewed and considered along with other affordable housing incentives for inclusion in the implementation plan associated with the Housing Action Plan</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>NO. Not submitted as a docket proposal in the last 2 years.</p>	<p>NO. Technical Committee recommends not including this item on the annual docket.</p>

Redmond Zoning Code Threshold Criteria Applied to Proposed Amendments for Inclusion on the 2019-20 Docket Section 21.76.070(2)(b)

<p>RZC CRITERIA</p> <p>PROPOSED AMENDMENTS</p>	<p>(i) Amending the Comprehensive Plan is the most appropriate mechanism available</p> <p>Alternative options: regulatory, budgetary or programmatic measure</p>	<p>(ii) Proposal is best addressed as an individually docketed item</p> <p>Is another planning process already available?</p>	<p>(iii) Proposal is consistent with existing local, state, and federal laws</p>	<p>(iv) Proposal is timely with respect to other City and community initiatives, and planned public and private development</p>	<p>(v) Council, PC and staff will have sufficient info necessary to analyze, recommend, and make informed decisions within the docket year</p>	<p>(vi) Consistent with overall vision, policies, and adopted functional plans</p>	<p>(vii) Not considered or rejected in last 2 years</p>	<p>Recommendation</p>
<p>5. Match code parking ratio requirements to actual need – but, require a forward thinking, cost effective Transportation Mgt. Plan that requires all residents to park on site, not on the streets.</p> <p>Privately-initiated: Natural and Built Environments LLC, Robert Pantley</p>	<p>NO. This proposal is suggestive of a regulatory update that would be informed by multiple planning studies and current initiatives.</p> <p>Parking goals and policies are addressed throughout the Comprehensive Plan. Specifically, Section E of the Transportation Element, provides multiple parking policies that encourage reductions in parking ratios under special circumstances most specifically when there are corresponding opportunities for access to transit.</p>	<p>NO. This proposal will be reviewed and considered for inclusion as part of the implementation plans associated with the following studies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Housing Action Plan • Downtown Parking Management Strategic Plan • Comprehensive Plan Update/TMP Update 	<p>YES. Staff has not identified any conflict to local, state, or federal laws.</p>	<p>NO. The following City initiatives, already underway, will consider updates to parking regulations as a mechanism to achieve desired program outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Downtown Parking Management Strategic Plan - upcoming implementation measures in 2020 • Housing Action Plan review of parking ratios in light rail station areas • Overlake Neighborhood Plan and Transportation Master Plan and Comprehensive Plan update. 	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>NO. Not submitted as a docket proposal in the last 2 years.</p>	<p>NO. Technical Committee recommends not including this item on the annual docket.</p> <p>Refer proposal to current work plans: Downtown Parking Mgt Plan, Housing Action Plan, Overlake Neighborhood Plan, TMP, and Comprehensive Plan updates</p>

Redmond Zoning Code Threshold Criteria Applied to Proposed Amendments for Inclusion on the 2019-20 Docket Section 21.76.070(2)(b)

<p>RZC CRITERIA</p> <p>PROPOSED AMENDMENTS</p>	<p>(i) Amending the Comprehensive Plan is the most appropriate mechanism available</p> <p>Alternative options: regulatory, budgetary or programmatic measure</p>	<p>(ii) Proposal is best addressed as an individually docketed item</p> <p>Is another planning process already available?</p>	<p>(iii) Proposal is consistent with existing local, state, and federal laws</p>	<p>(iv) Proposal is timely with respect to other City and community initiatives, and planned public and private development</p>	<p>(v) Council, PC and staff will have sufficient info necessary to analyze, recommend, and make informed decisions within the docket year</p>	<p>(vi) Consistent with overall vision, policies, and adopted functional plans</p>	<p>(vii) Not considered or rejected in last 2 years</p>	<p>Recommendation</p>
<p>6. Provide a “bonus” half floor of market rate housing within workforce housing projects if they have 100% lot coverage and are designed to LEED Gold standards.</p> <p>Privately-initiated: Natural and Built Environments LLC, Robert Pantley</p>	<p>NO. This proposal is more suggestive of a regulatory amendment where affordable housing incentives are addressed.</p> <p>Current Redmond Comprehensive Plan provides the following goals and policies in support of LEED standards.</p> <p>CC-18 Use design standards and design review to accomplish the following: Promote environmentally friendly design and building techniques such as LEED for the construction or rehabilitation of structures; ... NE-12 Encourage environmentally friendly construction practices, such as Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED), King County Built Green, and low impact development. ... Currently, RZC 21.67– Built Green has no incentive for LEED (Gold, Silver or Platinum) built multi-family development; only for non-residential development. An assessment of Redmond’s Built Green standards is a priority for Development Review Division’s 2020 workplan.</p>	<p>NO. This proposal will be considered as a request for inclusion in the Planning and Community Development code amendment work program.</p>	<p>Staff has not identified any conflict to local, state, or federal laws.</p>	<p>NO. This proposal will be reviewed and considered along with other affordable housing incentives for inclusion in the implementation plan associated with the Housing Action Plan</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>NO. Not submitted as a docket proposal in the last 2 years.</p>	<p>NO. Technical Committee recommends not including this item on the annual docket.</p> <p>Refer for inclusion in Planning and Community Development’s code amendment work program.</p>

Redmond Zoning Code Threshold Criteria Applied to Proposed Amendments for Inclusion on the 2019-20 Docket Section 21.76.070(2)(b)

<p>RZC CRITERIA</p> <p>PROPOSED AMENDMENTS</p>	<p>(i) Amending the Comprehensive Plan is the most appropriate mechanism available</p> <p>Alternative options: regulatory, budgetary or programmatic measure</p>	<p>(ii) Proposal is best addressed as an individually docketed item</p> <p>Is another planning process already available?</p>	<p>(iii) Proposal is consistent with existing local, state, and federal laws</p>	<p>(iv) Proposal is timely with respect to other City and community initiatives, and planned public and private development</p>	<p>(v) Council, PC and staff will have sufficient info necessary to analyze, recommend, and make informed decisions within the docket year</p>	<p>(vi) Consistent with overall vision, policies, and adopted functional plans</p>	<p>(vii) Not considered or rejected in last 2 years</p>	<p>Recommendation</p>
<p>7. Proceed to action with a sense of urgency and with consistent oversight.</p> <p>Privately-initiated: Natural and Built Environments LLC, Robert Pantley</p>	<p>NO. This request does not propose a Comprehensive Plan Amendment.</p> <p>The Mayor sets the strategic vision for the City, and the Chief Operating Officer manages internal operations and department work programs to ensure alignment with that vision. The <i>Community Strategic Plan</i>, adopted on Oct.15, 2019, includes Housing Choices as a City priority that will be reflected in applicable department work programs, planning initiatives and development of the biennial budget.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>NO. Not submitted as a docket proposal in the last 2 years</p>	<p>NO. Technical Committee recommends not including this item on the annual docket.</p> <p>Refer to processes already in place: Mayor sets City’s strategic vision, and Chief Operating Officer manages internal operations and department work programs to ensure alignment with that vision.</p> <p>The <i>Community Strategic Plan</i>, adopted on Oct.15, 2019, includes Housing Choices as a City priority that will be reflected in applicable department work programs, planning initiatives and development of the biennial budget.</p>

Redmond Zoning Code Threshold Criteria Applied to Proposed Amendments for Inclusion on the 2019-20 Docket Section 21.76.070(2)(b)

<p style="text-align: center;">RZC CRITERIA</p> <p style="text-align: center;">PROPOSED AMENDMENTS</p>	<p>(i) Amending the Comprehensive Plan is the most appropriate mechanism available</p> <p><i>Alternative options: regulatory, budgetary or programmatic measure</i></p>	<p>(ii) Proposal is best addressed as an individually docketed item</p> <p><i>Is another planning process already available?</i></p>	<p>(iii) Proposal is consistent with existing local, state, and federal laws</p>	<p>(iv) Proposal is timely with respect to other City and community initiatives, and planned public and private development</p>	<p>(v) Council, PC and staff will have sufficient info necessary to analyze, recommend, and make informed decisions within the docket year</p>	<p>(vi) Consistent with overall vision, policies, and adopted functional plans</p>	<p>(vii) Not considered or rejected in last 2 years</p>	<p>Recommendation</p>
<p>8. Workforce: HO-xx In order to encourage more affordable housing to be built beyond inclusionary zoning:</p> <p>a) Allow for 10% more units within the same building footprint without additional impact fees.</p> <p>b) Support the extension of the MFTEs to 20+ years</p> <p>c) Reduce costs through streamlined city standards and processes including SEPA and transportation concurrency.</p> <p>d) Analyze permit and connection fees in the Urban Centers and adjust for reduced impacts</p> <p>e) Establish minimum parking ratio requirements consistent with actual demand.</p> <p>f) Allow for an additional half floor of height with LEED Gold designation.</p> <p>Update provided by Natural and Built Environment, Robert Pantley on 2/4/2020</p>	<p>NO.</p> <p>The following sections provide support for new affordable housing regulations and incentives sufficient to support the suggested regulatory and process amendments:</p> <p>HO-37 Provide incentives and bonuses intended to minimize or eliminate any additional costs to the developer/builder associated with providing housing that is affordable to low- and moderate-income households.</p> <p>HO-46 Pursue creative methods within existing programs, such as the City’s transfer of development rights (TDR) program, impact fee waivers, ARCH Housing Trust Fund, and state enabling legislation for property tax relief, as a means to provide direct assistance to builders and leverage funds for construction of affordable housing.</p> <p>HO-48 Minimize unnecessary housing development costs through regulations and standards contained in the Zoning Code and other City regulatory documents that are balanced with and maintained in concert with public safety considerations and all other goals of the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code</p> <p>HO-49 Offer exemptions or reduced impact fees for construction of affordable housing units in qualifying developments.</p>	<p>NO. Proposal provides no new policy guidance not currently provided for in the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>All other specific components are more suggestive of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • regulatory amendments, • fee amendments, • process improvements, or • are currently under consideration by the state legislature. 	<p>PARTIAL. Staff has not identified any conflict local, state, or federal laws with the exception of the MFTE extension which is still under review by the state legislature</p>	<p>NO. Staff is in the planning stages for the following projects:</p> <p>Green Building Incentive Program Review 2020 Evaluate proposals as part of the City’s Green Building Incentive Program currently under review.</p> <p>Housing Action Plan Currently in development, will review regulatory and process barriers to affordable housing and make recommendations for improvements.</p> <p>Downtown Parking Management Strategic Plan - upcoming implementation measures in 2020</p>	<p>NO.</p> <p>Proposals provide significant regulatory changes that would require research and public input that is currently underway in other processes.</p>	<p>YES- staff has not identified any conflict with adopted functional plans</p>		<p>NO. Technical Committee recommends not including this item on the annual docket.</p> <p>Proposal provides no new policy guidance not currently provided for in the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>All other specific components are more suggestive of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • regulatory amendments, • fee amendments, • process improvements, or • are currently under consideration by the state legislature. <p>For further detail see, Exhibit A, Section E -- Referred to Alternate City Process</p>

Redmond Zoning Code Threshold Criteria Applied to Proposed Amendments for Inclusion on the 2019-20 Docket Section 21.76.070(2)(b)

<p>RZC CRITERIA</p> <p>PROPOSED AMENDMENTS</p>	<p>(i) Amending the Comprehensive Plan is the most appropriate mechanism available</p> <p><i>Alternative options: regulatory, budgetary or programmatic measure</i></p>	<p>(ii) Proposal is best addressed as an individually docketed item</p> <p><i>Is another planning process already available?</i></p>	<p>(iii) Proposal is consistent with existing local, state, and federal laws</p>	<p>(iv) Proposal is timely with respect to other City and community initiatives, and planned public and private development</p>	<p>(v) Council, PC and staff will have sufficient info necessary to analyze, recommend, and make informed decisions within the docket year</p>	<p>(vi) Consistent with overall vision, policies, and adopted functional plans</p>	<p>(vii) Not considered or rejected in last 2 years</p>	<p>Recommendation</p>
<p>9. Proposed RZC revisions:</p> <p>Expand the definition of mezzanine from less than 33% to a range of 50% - 100%.</p> <p>Expand definition of retail and services to include all parts of daily needs including nonprofit services.</p> <p>Privately-initiated: Natural and Built Environments LLC, Robert Pantley</p>	<p>NO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A broadened definition of retail is suggestive of a regulatory amendment. Economic Vitality Element generally addresses retail • The proposed regulatory updates should be evaluated as potential implementation components of the Applicant’s proposed EV-xx policy and during two current planning processes listed in criterion iv. 	<p>NO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed RZC amendments are not best addressed as individually docketed items. 	<p>YES.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For both - staff has not identified any conflict to local, state, or federal laws. 	<p>NO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed expansion of mezzanines, should be reviewed in the following processes. <p>v. Comprehensive Plan – and Urban Center Visioning – In this process staff will evaluate building heights and work with the public and an economic development firm to determine the appropriate land uses and urban forms for the TOD and Urban Center areas.</p> <p>vi. During the Temporary Construction Dewatering Project staff will evaluate building heights among other variables in its recommendations that consider impacts to the CARA.</p>	<p>NO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Council, PC and staff will not have sufficient information necessary to analyze, recommend and make informed decisions on this proposal in the docket year. 	<p>NO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The RZC proposals are not consistent with overall vision, policies, and adopted functional plans but can be considered with the following processes underway and described in (iv) 	<p>NO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • None have been submitted as a docket proposal in the last 2 years. 	<p>NO.</p> <p>Technical Committee recommends not including these items on the annual docket.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The proposed regulatory updates should be evaluated as potential <i>implementation</i> components of the Applicant’s proposed EV-xx policy and during two current planning processes listed in criterion iv. • A broadened definition of retail is suggestive of a regulatory amendment. Economic Vitality Element generally addresses retail

Redmond Zoning Code Threshold Criteria Applied to Proposed Amendments for Inclusion on the 2019-20 Docket Section 21.76.070(2)(b)

<p>RZC CRITERIA</p> <p>PROPOSED AMENDMENTS</p>	<p>(i) Amending the Comprehensive Plan is the most appropriate mechanism available</p> <p><i>Alternative options: regulatory, budgetary or programmatic measure</i></p>	<p>(ii) Proposal is best addressed as an individually docketed item</p> <p><i>Is another planning process already available?</i></p>	<p>(iii) Proposal is consistent with existing local, state, and federal laws</p>	<p>(iv) Proposal is timely with respect to other City and community initiatives, and planned public and private development</p>	<p>(v) Council, PC and staff will have sufficient info necessary to analyze, recommend, and make informed decisions within the docket year</p>	<p>(vi) Consistent with overall vision, policies, and adopted functional plans</p>	<p>(vii) Not considered or rejected in last 2 years</p>	<p>Recommendation</p>
<p>10. Proposed RZC revisions: Amend regulations and procedures that encourage affordable housing development by the private sector. Privately-initiated: One Redmond</p>	<p>NO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer amending regulations and procedures that encourage affordable housing development by the private sector to be considered under the Housing Action Plan currently underway. 	<p>NO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The proposed RZC amendments are not best addressed as individually docketed items. 	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>NO.</p>	<p>NO.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer amending regulations and procedures that encourage affordable housing development by the private sector to be considered under the <i>Housing Action Plan</i> currently underway.