



REDMOND 2050 COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE



DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

REDMOND 2050 COMMUNITY ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Thursday, June 10, 2021

6:00 - 7:30 p.m.

1. Roll Call

Chair Joffre called the meeting to order at 6:06 p.m.

CAC members present: Aparna, Blumenfeld, Brakke, Chandorkar, M. Coleman, Joffre, Stoner, Thompson, Wang

CAC members absent: Armstrong, Bhagwat, CK, A. Coleman, Cruz, Jacob, Koehn, Wu

Staff present: Caroline Chapman, Senior Planner; Jeff Churchill, Planning Manager; Ian Lefcourte, Planner

2. Approval of Meeting Summary for May 13, 2021

The meeting summary was approved without objection.

3. Policy Options and Alternatives: Housing, Economic Vitality

Mr. Lefcourte reviewed policy considerations related to housing, with a focus on those tension points between two or more policy considerations, where policy input from the CAC is needed.

CAC Questions and Discussion

Topic: Neighborhood Restrictions on Attached Dwelling Units ("middle housing")

- Would there be legal challenges related to density or zoning changes?
 - Staff response: all options under consideration are within accepted bounds
- R-4 to R-8 are already "more dense" - options 1 (eliminate neighborhood restrictions) or 2 (maintain neighborhood restrictions) probably would not change much; would expect lawsuits if we expanded to R-1
- Missing middle belongs in neighborhoods; mid-rise belongs Downtown. Do we have any data from Minneapolis, etc., on encouraging missing middle?

- Staff response: Unsure of Minneapolis. However, when Portland opened-up ADU's, it was modest uptick in ADU production. Gradually increased as more policy, program, and regulatory changes were implemented.
- If we change neighborhood regulations, would we need to go through entire neighborhood planning process again?
 - Staff response: we would only amend neighborhood plans/regulations to the extent necessary to eliminate conflict with citywide housing policy.
- How do these policy options tie in with growth models?
 - Staff response: the growth model scenarios consider that some of the housing unit predictions will come from an increase in building typology allowances in the neighborhoods.
- Preference for option 1; likely would happen slowly over time. Look at Capitol Hill - lots of mixing that look fine together. Will the other options create any significant amount of housing units?
- Each neighborhood plan was specific to its neighborhood, taking into account local preferences, geography. Perhaps option 2 would be a good compromise - keeps desires of neighborhood but works toward achieving housing goals. Soft preference for option 2 because R4-R8 zones are already somewhat dense.
- What about parking restrictions for multiplex DU's? Not much parking in neighborhoods now. How would parking be addressed?

Topic: Energy Efficiency and Sustainability

- Would like additional data to determine where is the threshold beyond which energy efficiency/sustainability improvements are not worth the additional cost? Interested to know the exact trade off between energy efficiency and affordability.
 - Staff response: Challenging to get a single answer because there are so many different building practices and technologies. In addition, building practices and technologies are constantly changing.
- Affordability is a higher priority, so he leans toward option 2 (prioritize affordability)
- People make choices based on cost. Sometimes the payback period for a green benefit is a long time. It's a potential criterion to consider.
- Option 1 (prioritize energy efficiency/sustainability) - strong requirements, especially for new mixed-use buildings. Energy efficiency are things that people don't see that have big impact over time. We need to get developers thinking in terms of energy efficiency and then make budget decisions about things that are easy to replace.
- Requirements should be universal; there are often options that are green that people don't even think about. Lead people down the right path.
- Apartments are built as cheap as possible, especially heating because developers don't pay the energy bills. For middle housing, green requirements keep the price point moving up, harming affordability. Leans toward encouragement and incentives to try to get both green and affordability.

Ms. Chapman reviewed policy considerations related to economic vitality, with a focus on those tension points between two or more policy considerations, where policy input from the CAC is needed.

CAC Questions and Discussion

Topic: Manufacturing Land Uses and Jobs

- Auto shops, gyms are mostly in industrial areas. Are they considered "industrial" or "commercial" from the county's point of view?
 - Staff response: will check with County staff.
 - These are not considered industrial or manufacturing land uses (but may be allowed by the zoning code). They would not count towards the baseline percent of jobs in these categories.
- If we don't preserve industrial zoning, Amazon might decide to locate in an area that the city would not prefer it to locate (Seattle example cited). Important to have industrial land available at a lower cost so those uses don't locate in places like centers.
- Ambivalent because 1) not an expert, and 2) Redmond will never become a huge manufacturing center because of geography. Therefore, restricting manufacturing land for just that will always result in pressure to change. Advantage to have a much broader economic base is land can have broader set of uses. Leaning toward option 2 (flexibility to allow more complementary uses).
- We have a lot of manufacturing in office-style buildings, so it won't look like industrial Seattle. Could have manufacturing that looks like office (Aerojet). Interested in flexibility as industry changes over time. Not looking to add Duwamish-style industrial in Redmond.
- Limit manufacturing to a certain size, to encourage smaller/artisan spaces?
- If we allow more flexibility, worried about service-oriented businesses taking over. Also recalled first home in Redmond, where neighbors worked in manufacturing. There is value in keeping those jobs around.
- Don't want to push any businesses out. The ones that have more workers or activity seem to make more sense (from a space efficiency standpoint). Makes sense to figure out where the "no" is. Keeping land available for MP/I means limiting other uses.
- Weren't we talking about Willows/90th for housing growth? How would it all fit?
 - Staff response: perhaps housing with light manufacturing in that area and pursue industrial designation for SE Redmond (as in option 1). How we want to grow in this area is still being evaluated.

General Comments

- *Future-proof plans – anticipate changes to codes, such as green codes*

4. Good of the Order

Mr. Churchill introduced Glenn Coil, Senior Planner, who recently joined the Long Range Planning group. Mr. Churchill also noted that the July CAC meeting would be devoted to transportation.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:25 p.m.