| Plan Reviews | $2,438.00 |
| Inspection | $230,375.00 |
| **Total Other Fees** | **$242,813.00** |
| **TOTAL DEVELOPMENT SERVICES & PERMIT FEES** | **$285,411.56** |

### UTILITY FACILITY FEES

#### Residential Water Meters:
- **1 inch**
  - Total: $5,548.00
- **2 inch**
  - Total: $20,954.00
- **Residential 55 Meters**:
  - 1 inch: $19,237.00
  - 2 inch: $32,094.00
- Transportation: $40,995.00 Peak

**Total Residential Utility Facility Fees**: $225,274.00

### REDMOND TAX & ASSESSMENTS REVENUES

- **Total King County Levy**: $11,126,777
- **Total Redmond Levy**: $4,410
- **Milano Post-Stabilization Tax Value (20 units)**: $25,950,800.00
- **Total Est. Future Tax Revenues**: $2,288,740 Annual
- **Est. Future Redmond Tax Revenues**: $114,440 Annual
- **Est. Future King County Tax Revenues**: $174,330 Annual
- **Stormwater Rate**: $1,858 Annual
- **Monthly Water Rate**:
  - $28.42 + $1.72 per 100 CU FT Water
  - **Total Other Redmond Utility Tax Revenues**: $6,973 Annual

**Total Redmond Requiring Tax/Assessment Revenues**: $242,779

### ONE-TIME PRE-OCCUPATION REVENUES

- **Total One Time Revenues**: $217,178.20
- **Total Development Service Fees**: $289,411.56
- **Total Utility Facility Fees**: $129,479.00

**Total Project Pre-Occupation Revenues (1-time)**: $735,663.76

### ANNUAL PROJECT RELATED RECURRING REVENUES

- **M&O & SS Utility Charges**: $8,631
- **Other Utility Tax Revenues (Cable, Phone, Garbage, Electric, Other)**: $13,143
- **City Property Tax**: $114,449

**Total Project Annual City Revenues**: $136,012.77

### MILANO @ BEAR CREEK COST BENEFIT ANALYSIS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Redmond 2018 Budget - General Fund Total Expenditures</td>
<td>$198,200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmond General Fund Total Expenditures Per HH</td>
<td>$8,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milano Est. Annual Recurring Revenues (20 units)</td>
<td>$136,017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milano One-Time Revenues Amortized 10 yr</td>
<td>$73,586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milano Total Est. Annual Recurring Revenues</td>
<td>$209,603.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milano Est. General Fund Expenditures Per Unit</td>
<td>$8,085</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milano Est. General Fund Total Annual Expenditures Per Unit</td>
<td>$161,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Est. Milano Annual Net City Revenues</strong></td>
<td><strong>$47,900.03</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**MILANO AT BEAR CREEK**  
Attachment Two - Economic Analysis

**Project Data:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Area</th>
<th>1.36 ac</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Apts.</td>
<td>20 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Population</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redmond Demographics:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010 Pop</td>
<td>67678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017 HH Units</td>
<td>24514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pop Per HH</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Residential Building Data:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Residential Townhomes</th>
<th># Units</th>
<th>TOTAL POST-STABILIZATION TAX VALUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4/3 Units (2700 sf)</td>
<td>35100 SF</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Value _ $250 PSF</td>
<td>$ 12,285,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Value _ $150 PSF</td>
<td>$ 5,265,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Value</td>
<td>$ 17,550,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3/3 Units (2400 sf)</td>
<td>6800</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement Value _ $350 PSF</td>
<td>$ 5,880,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Value _ $150 PSF</td>
<td>$ 2,930,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Value</td>
<td>$ 8,400,000.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total # Units</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL SF</td>
<td>51900 SF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**REDMOND MF IMPACT FEES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># UNITS</th>
<th>TOTAL IMPACT FEES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT FEES _ SCHOOLS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Impact Fees (Northshore District)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total School Impact Fees</td>
<td>$ 36,360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT FEES _ FIRE</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fire Impact Fees</td>
<td>$ 4,101.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT FEES _ PARKS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Park Impact Fees</td>
<td>$ 65,766.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT FEES _ TRANSPORTATION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Transportation Impact Fees</td>
<td>$ 98,455.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT FEES _ SCHOOLS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Units</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total School Impact Fees</td>
<td>$ 12,480.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL REDMOND IMPACT FEES</td>
<td>$ 217,178.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**DEVELOPMENT SERVICE FEES & PERMIT FEES**

- **Building Permit Fees:**  
  - $977.29 for first $200K + $3 per $1000  
  - Total Project Biq SF 51900 SF  
  - Total Ave. Unit SF 2596 SF  
  - Total Est. Unit Construction Value | $ 250.00 PSF  
  - Total Est. Per Unit Value | $ 648,750  
  - Total Permit Value Per Unit | $ 2,293.15  
  - Total Project Permit Value Per Unit  

Other Fees:  
- Comp. Plan/Zoning Map Amendment  
- Site Plan Approval  
- Subdivision | $ 11,985.56
(ii) The proposal is not best addressed as an individually docketed item. The proposal should be considered during the City’s Housing Action Plan (HAP) which encourages all cities planning under the Growth Management Act (GMA) to adopt actions to increase residential building capacity. Outcomes of the Plan could potentially support the Applicant’s proposal.

(v) Council, PC and staff will not have sufficient information necessary in the docket year to analyze, recommend, and make informed decisions until the anticipated 2Q 2021 Housing Action Plan completion date.

(vi) The State Growth Management Act requires that amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code be closely aligned with a City’s overall vision. The proposal is not aligned with City policies and plans which reflect a preferred land use pattern for focused, high-density growth in the two urban centers and the Marymoor local center. Implementation of this Comprehensive Plan vision is well underway through adopted policies, codes, functional plans, and neighborhood plans.

Further, the proposal does not meet all the criteria of policy LU-36 which provides guidance for high-density residential neighborhoods requiring the site: be in or near Downtown or Overlake, near employment and commercial nodes, and where high levels of transit is or is likely to directly adjacent to an arterial.

5. Height Overlay: Amend Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code

Applicant: Natural and Built Environments LLC

Analysis and Technical Committee Recommendation:
The Applicant proposes a new policy in the Downtown Neighborhood Element:

DT-xx 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.

The Technical Committee does not recommend including this proposal as part of the 2019-20 docket. In applying the seven criteria under RZC 21.76.070(J)(2)(b) to determine if the Applicant’s request should be given further consideration as a docketed item, the Technical Committee finds that the proposal does not meet four out of seven criteria for the following reasons:
to be supported by existing Comprehensive Plan policies HO-46 through HO-49, as well as by the preceding text within the Comprehensive Plan.

**Proposed RZC Revisions:**
The Technical Committee recommends proposed amendments to regulations and procedures that encourage affordable housing development by the private sector be referred to Alternate City Processes (Exhibit A).

3. Affordable Commercial – a package of policy and code amendments. Applicant proposes to amend (a) the Comprehensive Plan by adding one new economic vitality policy and (b) two amendments to the Redmond Zoning Code, to support the retention of local businesses by creating opportunities for more affordable commercial space. Specifically, the Applicant requests expanding RZC definitions of mezzanine and retail services.

*Applicant: Robert Pantley, Natural and Built Environment LLC*

**Analysis and Technical Committee Recommendation:**
The Technical Committee recommends including the Applicant’s proposed housing policy, modified by the Technical Committee, on the docket for further consideration.

Proposed new Economic Vitality Element policy (modified):

*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.*

In applying the seven criteria under RZC 21.76.070(J)(2)(b) to determine if the Applicant’s request should be given further consideration as a docketed item, the Technical Committee finds that the proposal, as amended, meets the applicable criteria.

**Proposed amendments to the definitions of mezzanine and retail services:**
The Technical Committee recommends proposed amendments to the definitions of mezzanine and retail services be referred to Alternate City Processes (Exhibit A).

4. Comprehensive plan text amendment and rezone for 1.3 acres in Bear Creek.
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.

*Applicant: Hossein Khorram, Milano Townhomes of Bear Creek*

**Analysis and Technical Committee Recommendation:**
The Technical Committee does not recommend including this proposal as part of the 2019-20 docket. In applying the seven criteria under RZC 21.76.070(J)(2)(b) to determine if the Applicant’s request should be given further consideration as a docketed item, the Technical Committee finds that the proposal does not meet three out of seven criteria for the following reasons:
Private Sector Requests

12. Keller Property Amendment. An amendment requesting Comprehensive Plan and Development Guide changes for the purposes of rezoning a property in Bear Creek, located between NE Union Hill Road and Avondale Road NE, from Semi-Rural (RA-5) and Single-Family Urban (R-6) to Bear Creek Design District. Would also involve development of a master plan for the property.

13. WestPark Business Center Amendment. An amendment requesting revision of Comprehensive Plan policies LU-48 and LU-57, and associated text, to clarify and expand the range of permitted uses for the Business Park land use designation for WestPark Business Center. Revisions to two sections of the Community Development Guide, Definitions and Business, Manufacturing and Industrial Zones, are also proposed.

14. Bottrell Amendment. A requested amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and Development Guide for the purpose of rezoning a property in Education Hill, located on the west side of Avondale Road north of Novelty Hill Road, from Single-Family Urban (R-6) to Multi-Family Urban (R-12).

15. Washington Cathedral Amendment. A requested amendment to the Comprehensive Plan and Development Guide for the purpose of rezoning a property in North Redmond, located south of NE 124th Street on the east side of Redmond-Woodinville Road, from Single-Family Constrained (R-1) to Neighborhood Commercial (NC-2).

16. Nintendo Amendment. A requested amendment to Comprehensive Plan Map N-OV-3 to remove the Green Street designation from the north side of NE 51st Street (between SR 520 and 148th Avenue NE) in the Overlake neighborhood.
TECHNICAL COMMITTEE REPORT
TO THE HEARING EXAMINER

Proposal Name: Bear Creek Cottages Preliminary Plat
Proposal Location: 10007 Avondale Road

Description: 12-lot Preliminary Plat including subdivision of a 1.36-acre site with the R-6 zoning district into 12 lots, pursuant to RCDG 20C.30.62, Innovative Housing Demonstration Projects.

File Number(s): L090444 - Preliminary Plat
L090445 – SEPA
PRE080040

Applicant: Bottrell Pacific Investment Company
3518 Fremont Avenue N., #454
Seattle, WA 98103

Applicant's Representative: Terry Phelan, Living Shelter Design
320 Newport Way NW
Issaquah, WA 98027

Staff Contact: Jeff Churchill, Senior Planner
425-556-2492
jchurchill@redmond.gov

SEPA Threshold Determination: Determination of Non-Significance
Date Issued: November 19, 2009

Decision Type: Preliminary Plat, Type III (RCDG 20F.30.40)

Recommendation: Approval with Conditions
Public Hearing Date: January 6, 2010

Conclusion in Support of Recommendation: The Technical Committee has found the proposal to be in compliance with the Redmond Community Development Guide (RCDG), Redmond Comprehensive Plan, Redmond Municipal Code, and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), as conditioned within this report.

JAMES L. ROBERTS
Deputy Director
Department of Planning and Community Development

DAVID K. ALMOND
Development Services Manager
Department of Public Works
ILLUSTRATION 1 CONCEPT SITE PLAN

Request Findings Summary:

The amendment and zoning is consistent with the city's and state growth management act and Redmond's Use Plan as documented by Question Two of this application. It provides for needed medium density housing along the Avondale Road arterial and next to R-12 MF properties. The land is suitable for MF development in that it does not contain any environmentally sensitive areas and steep slopes. There are no potential impacts to sensitive natural resources. The site is available to the full range of city infrastructure, utilities and public services. The site's proposed MF buildings will adjoin similar MF uses to the south, and will be located and placed at a lower topographic elevation to the north adjoining Hidden Ridge SF neighborhood. Adjoining properties will be separated and buffered by topographic grade, setbacks, landscape buffers and tree preservation; with a dedicated driveway access there will be no incompatible thru-traffic impacts. Through these best site planning practices the amendment and zoning is compatible with the neighborhood. The amendment adds to city housing inventory, and thus is consistent with Policy HO-17 No Net Loss of Housing Capacity. The project has a net positive economic impact for the city. The project will have a net annual economic benefit to Redmond, estimated at $47,855 annually. Finally, as per the TSI 09/19 Traffic Impact Statement, the amendment and zoning will not measurably impact intersection and traffic operations at major intersections in the vicinity. With 9 peak hour trips, it does not trigger Redmond's SEPA evaluation thresholds.
Zoning Map

Milano Townhomes at Bear Creek

North Bear Creek
A 1.36 ac. Awoods Rd.
The Milano Site -
Along Awoods Road
MF Housing
Typical Medium Density

Neighborhood

Education Hill
Thus, rather than imposing a greater burden on local governments, higher density developments like apartments are actually more fiscally prudent than traditional suburban sprawl.

**Traffic**

Does compact development really cause an increase in traffic congestion and parking problems, as opponents often claim? To residents of the neighborhood where such development might take place, an increase in congestion seems self-evident – but only by comparing an apartment development to the status quo (i.e., no development). The proper comparison, however, is to the impact on congestion of an equal number of new single-family units.

On average, apartment residents own fewer cars than single-family homeowners: the latter average two cars per household compared with only one for the former. Beyond that, single-family housing generates more automobile trips per household, as evidenced in the table below.

| **Automobile Trips Per Housing Unit** |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|
| **Single-family detached** | **Apartment** | **Difference** |
| Weekday            | 9.57            | 6.72            | 42%          |
| peak AM hour       | 0.77            | 0.55            | 40%          |
| peak PM hour       | 1.02            | 0.67            | 52%          |
| Saturday           | 10.10           | 6.39            | 58%          |
| peak hour          | 0.94            | 0.52            | 81%          |
| Sunday             | 8.78            | 5.86            | 50%          |
| peak hour          | 0.86            | 0.51            | 69%          |


On weekdays, a single-family detached house generates 42 percent more trips than does a unit in an apartment. The difference is even greater on the weekend: 58 percent more trips on Saturdays, and 50 percent more trips on Sundays. This large difference is seen not only in the

---

and Metropolitan Policy, March 2004. The authors take note of possible countervailing costs, such as the higher load placed on roads and sewer lines in more densely populated areas. See also Richard M. Haughey, *Higher-Density Development: Myth and Fact.* Washington, DC: Urban Land Institute, 2005.

LU-36 Multifamily Urban Purpose — Provide for high-density residential neighborhoods that are urban in character. Provide for neighborhoods of multifamily residences, small lot single-family homes, and attached single-family (multiplex) homes on lands suitable for these intensities. Focus high-density housing in the following locations:

- In or near the Downtown, Overlake, or the Marymoor Local Center in support of Redmond's centers;
- Near other employment and commercial nodes; and
- Where high levels of transit service are present or likely, or where there is adequate access to an arterial.

Allowed Uses. Implement this designation through zones that allow densities of 12 to 30 dwelling units per gross acre. Permit multifamily residences and, in suitable locations, detached or attached single-family homes.

- RESPONSE - the amendment and zoning's R-12 district request is located along and has direct access to Avondale Road. As such it is located 1.5 miles from Redmond's Downtown Urban Center and has immediate access to mass transit (see SEPA #14 Transportation). The project is located less than 1.5 miles from the Union Hill/188th Ave. employment center. Hence, the project is consistent with LU-36 and is ideally located for a small MF infill project.

ILLUSTRATION 10 MULTIFAMILY LOCATION & LU-36 POLICY COMPLIANCE
Figure 3. Categorization of Gothenburg participants’ answers to the question, “In your professional opinion, what is important to have located near places of residence?” The model was called “the Flower” by participants. The term “main points” concerns central Gothenburg and six areas in the region. These are important nodes in the public transport system due to their surrounding mixed land-use areas, meant to be developed through densification [20].

In the workshop exercise, proximity was measured in terms of time, as we wanted to represent the view of proximity people normally use when scheduling everyday activities, taking constraints of time and space into consideration. We also avoided prescribing what means of travel to use to provide access (e.g., by foot or car). Consequently, an immediate question and recurring theme of discussion was what means of transport should be used to measure travel time. The main response to this was that activities central to daily needs and routines should be reachable within 10 min by walking or cycling from the home. This was also in line with current municipal goals of accessibility in the planning documents of, for example, Gothenburg [20].
Negotiating Proximity in Sustainable Urban Planning: A Swedish Case

Ana Gil Solá* and Bertil Vilhelmson

Unit for Human Geography, Department of Economy and Society, School of Business, Economics and Law, University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg 40530, Sweden; bertil.vilhelmson@geography.gu.se
* Correspondence: ana.gilsola@geography.gu.se

Received: 22 November 2018; Accepted: 12 December 2018; Published: 21 December 2018

Abstract: In striving for sustainability, urban policy and planning increasingly emphasize proximity ideals in order to go beyond established mobility- and speed-oriented accessibility strategies. Yet, proximity is a fluid concept with many contextualized meanings, cutting across most sectors of urban planning. When proximity is realized in actual planning, clarity and communicability are therefore required. Here we explore how urban planners in different fields of expertise understand and apply the proximity concept. Furthermore, we tested a collaborative tool enabling transparent discussion and fostering a joint basis for further application. Qualitative data were collected via six semi-structured, focus-group workshops with 35 planners of various competencies working in three western Swedish municipalities. The results indicated that planning goals of proximity were negotiated according to three understandings: One derived from the established understanding of transportation and land-use integration, relying on planners’ expert views; a second emphasizing the local community understanding, highlighting the social context of neighborhoods; and a third comprising the personal environment understanding of the individual’s closest physical space at a detailed scale level. Collaborative exercises resulted in the development of a communicative tool for negotiating perceived understandings of proximity, as well as planning goals.

Keywords: collaborative tool; planning; spatial proximity; sustainable accessibility; understanding; workshop method

1. Introduction

Proximity (or geographic nearness, propinquity) is an influential concept and a buzzword in current urban planning. Increased proximity is believed to enhance individuals’ quality of life, boost neighborhoods, and promote environmental, social, and economic sustainability. The concept is central to discourse on how to reduce energy-consuming and polluting travel [1,2], foster local social ties, trust, and capital [3,4], and promote economic activity and innovation [5,6]. Ideas of nearness lie at the heart of visions to revitalize and make cities vibrant and attractive via greater densification, land-use mixing and filling, and the co-location of various activities and facilities.

This proximity turn essentially represents an ongoing—or anticipated—shift in urban planning away from transport-dominated urban development [7,8]. Policy has shifted from viewing car transport as the ultimate norm and means by which citizens reach daily activities to more emphasis put on transport needs and reduced travel distance, local living, and the promotion of walking, cycling, and public transit [9–11]. Densification, land-use mixing, and slow mobility thus belong to a set of key notions in a redefined understanding of urbanity [10,12–14] that goes beyond the established planning principles of 20th-century modernity [15], largely associated with speed, areal differentiation, energy-consuming transport, highway connectivity, and sprawl. Still, it must be remembered that mobility-based approaches de facto still dominate transportation planning in most countries [16–18].