

Phase 1 of Amendments to the Redmond Zoning Code as a Periodic Rewrite of Redmond’s Development Regulations (LAND-2021-00451/SEPA-2021-00452)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix – including Commission’s July 14, 2021 and August 25, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
A. Format and Organization		
<p>A-1. Zoning Code Accessibility and Readability (Varadharajan)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 7/14: Commissioner Varadharajan asked about the process for reviewing and enhancing the access and readability of the code’s language. Commissioner Varadharajan mentioned use of tools such as the Flesch–Kincaid readability tools included in Microsoft Word.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 7/14: Staff described that accessibility and readability are important aspects for improving customer service and efficiency of the zoning code. The standards and style guide that staff will develop during Phase 1 and Phase 2 of the code rewriting includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarifying and creating conciseness for all portions of the code; • Omitting errors and conflicts and avoiding creating new errors and conflicts; • Organizing the code into logical, common sections – an original approach in comparison to the current zone-based approach; • Using Universal Accessibility standard for public documents in addition to the City’s Style and Writing Guide and the King County Legislative Writing Guide; and • Employing the Microsoft Word Grammar tools including Flesch-Kincaid readability measurements. <p>Staff hopes to implement a Flesch-Kincaid Grade Level 8 or as near as possible for most portions of the code.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	<p>Opened 7/14, Closed 7/14</p>

Phase 1 of Amendments to the Redmond Zoning Code as a Periodic Rewrite of Redmond’s Development Regulations (LAND-2021-00451/SEPA-2021-00452)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix – including Commission’s July 14, 2021 and August 25, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
B. Residential Use Typology		
<p>B-1. Design for Typography (Rajpathak)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 8/25: Commissioners Rajpathak asked whether the residential typology includes amendments about the way in which development relates to the typography (hills and slopes).</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 8/25: Staff noted that the current code (<i>RZC 21.08.180 Residential Development and Architectural, Site, and Landscape Design Regulations</i>) includes site design guidelines for structures to fit the natural typography. No amendments are currently proposed to that part of the code and the provision would remain.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	<p>Opened 8/25, Closed 8/25</p>
<p>B-2. Typology’s Relationship to Density (Varadharajan)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 8/25: Commissioners Varadharajan asked how the residential typology would be applied in neighborhoods as they are regulated for certain densities.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 8/25: Staff described how the zoning and densities, as regulated by the code, would remain as is. The new residential typologies expand the understanding and transparency of what can be constructed within the established zones and density allowances though does not alter that underlying designation. Instead the typology would be organized based on low, medium, and high densities with identification of the zones in which the housing type or form could be constructed. The goals of the amendment include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarify where different residential housing types could be constructed throughout the city; • Provide transparency to the community regarding the construction of such units, particularly when described on yellow land use signs; and 	<p>Opened 8/25, Closed 8/25</p>

Phase 1 of Amendments to the Redmond Zoning Code as a Periodic Rewrite of Redmond’s Development Regulations (LAND-2021-00451/SEPA-2021-00452)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix – including Commission’s July 14, 2021 and August 25, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Broaden the variety of housing types throughout the City including for improved accessibility and affordability. <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	
C. Nonresidential Allowed Uses		
<p>C-1. Relationship of Zoning, Allowed Uses, and HOA Rules (Rajpathak)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 8/25: Commissioner Rajpathak asked how nonresidential uses apply in places involving Homeowners’ Association (HOA) Covenants Conditions & Restrictions (CC&Rs)? Would the zoning overrule the HOA CC&Rs regarding specific use of private lots?</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 8/25: Staff described that Homeowners’ Association (HOA) Covenants Conditions & Restrictions (CC&Rs) would remain in effect and enforceable.</p> <p>The CC&Rs, private rules that each private homeowner agrees to follow as a condition of purchasing a home in a particular development, can further restrict the allowance of certain activities on a privately owned lot. While the zoning districts and allowed uses address specific portions of the city, HOA CC&Rs add specificity within the development or subdivision.</p> <p>Negotiation regarding the CC&Rs would occur between the homeowner and the HOA as a civil matter. State laws regarding Homeowners’ Associations are available at Chapter 64.38 RCW.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	<p>Opened 8/25, Closed 8/25</p>

Phase 1 of Amendments to the Redmond Zoning Code as a Periodic Rewrite of Redmond’s Development Regulations (LAND-2021-00451/SEPA-2021-00452)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix – including Commission’s July 14,2021 and August 25, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
D. Accessory Dwelling Units		
<p>D-1. Occupancy Requirements for Accessory Dwelling Units and Similar Housing Types (Nichols)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 7/14: Commission Chair Nichols asked whether other forms of housing such as a duplex include occupancy requirements such as currently included in the regulations for Accessory Dwelling Units.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 7/14: Staff described that only the provisions for accessory dwelling units feature the occupancy requirement. The amendment, also reflecting new state legislation, removes the occupancy requirement for long-term (term of 12 months or more) rentals. The short-term rental occupancy requirement is recommended to remain though, also recommends allowance for the owner to occupy either the primary dwelling or the accessory dwelling unit.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	<p>Opened 7/14, Closed 7/14</p>
<p>D-2. Parking for Accessory Dwelling Units (Varadharajan)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 7/14: Commissioner Varadharajan asked whether the Rewrite amendments included any amendments addressing parking for accessory dwelling units. She also asked for clarification regarding frequent transit.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 7/14: Staff noted that amendments regarding parking for accessory dwelling units were adopted during the 2020 Annual Code Cleanup in response to Engrossed Substitute Senate Bill 6617. That portion of the code is currently recommended for relocation within the body of the RZC to a new paragraph RZC 21.40.010.D Vehicle Parking – Required Off-Street Parking - Parking Near Frequent Transit.</p>	<p>Opened 7/14, Closed 7/14</p>

Phase 1 of Amendments to the Redmond Zoning Code as a Periodic Rewrite of Redmond’s Development Regulations (LAND-2021-00451/SEPA-2021-00452)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix – including Commission’s July 14, 2021 and August 25, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>The new paragraph would include additional parking provisions based on Substitute House Bill 2343 for land uses near frequent transit:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low-Cost Affordable Housing Units – maximum of one parking space per bedroom • Housing for the Elderly and Adult Family Homes – no parking required for residents • Multifamily Structures – minimum of no more than one parking space per bedroom • Accessory Dwelling Units – relocated to this paragraph would continue to allow for no associated off-street parking when within one-quarter mile of a major transit stop unless a site-specific need is determined by the Administrator <p>Staff described frequent transit as a mass transit services that is within one-quarter mile and that provided frequent service. Staff noted that additional information regarding the Revised Code of Washington (RCW) definitions would be provided at the Commission August 25, 2021 study session.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	
<p>D-3. Setback Provisions for Accessory Dwelling Units (Rajpathak)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 8/25: Commissioner Rajpathak asked whether the amendments regarding accessory dwelling units included reductions of setbacks such as from the parcel boundary. He noted the most parcels within the city are small and reduced setbacks would support more use of these lots.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 8/25: Staff described that the Technical Committee’s recommended amendments did not include modifications to setbacks for accessory dwelling units. The amendments include modifications to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calculation of maximum size for improved clarity; • Classification of short-term and long-term rental with long-term involving a contract for 12 months or more; 	<p>Opened 8/25, Closed 8/25</p>

Phase 1 of Amendments to the Redmond Zoning Code as a Periodic Rewrite of Redmond’s Development Regulations (LAND-2021-00451/SEPA-2021-00452)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix – including Commission’s July 14, 2021 and August 25, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowance for the property owner to live in the primary dwelling or the accessory dwelling unit for short-term rentals; • Removal of occupancy requirements for long-term term rentals; and • Updates to informational material available via the City’s website and at the Development Services Center. <p>Staff also noted that additional study of accessory dwelling unit policies and regulations is anticipated in response to the Housing Action Plan and during Redmond 2050.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	
E. Strategic Revisions		
<p>E-1. Parking Standards in the Downtown (East, Nichols)</p> <p><i>Note: this question also refers to the Overlake and Marymoor Village Bridge Amendments</i></p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 7/14: Commission Vice-Chair East asked for information regarding the “net-net” of changes to parking requirements in the Downtown.</p> <p>8/25: Commission Chair Nichols asked what the definition of minimum parking is or would be and whether it is recommended for amendment or redefinition including requirement for ratios to meet “peak usage”.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 7/14: Staff described work that has been underway and is continuing to consider parking conditions and required ratios in the Downtown.</p> <p>The Downtown Parking Management Strategic Plan (DPMSMSP): Implementation Plan was approved by City Council on September 15, 2020 (link to plan). The Implementation Plan includes the following implementation steps:</p>	<p>Opened 7/14, Closed 8/25</p>

Phase 1 of Amendments to the Redmond Zoning Code as a Periodic Rewrite of Redmond’s Development Regulations (LAND-2021-00451/SEPA-2021-00452)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix – including Commission’s July 14, 2021 and August 25, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evaluate the amount of parking being constructed and utilized, particularly in frequent transit areas, to better understand parking ratios that are being used vs. planned for. • Identify the appropriate process for updating parking policies in the Redmond Zoning Code. • Evaluate City parking regulations for new developments that impact on-street parking resources such parking minimums and maximums, garage ceiling heights, and loading zones. • Dependent on study findings, recommend new parking ratios, policies, and incentive programs to balance parking needs in Downtown and requests for reduced parking requirements. • Establish on-going evaluation metrics to adjust parking requirements in the downtown as land uses and use patterns change, particularly with the arrival of light rail. <p>These steps as well as information gathered during the DPMSP will help the City analyze parking supply, demand, and trends, particularly as development continues in the urban center. Staff also noted that there are no significant changes to the parking management approach anticipated. Parking would continue to be provided by new development and in collaboration with private and publicly owned facilities such as the Art Hill located at the City campus.</p> <p>8/25: The majority of new development proposes a smaller ratio of parking such as through the King County Right-Sized Parking Calculator in multifamily and mixed-use projects. These are unique to individual sites though, the resulting residential parking ratio averages 0.7-0.85 in comparison to 1.25 as required by code. These reductions are coupled with on-street parking management.</p> <p>Staff also described how “peak usage” supports the mixing of land uses into a single structure while all mixed-use developments and sites are unique.</p>	

Phase 1 of Amendments to the Redmond Zoning Code as a Periodic Rewrite of Redmond’s Development Regulations (LAND-2021-00451/SEPA-2021-00452)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix – including Commission’s July 14, 2021 and August 25, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	
<p>E-2. Town Center Zoning District Incentive Provisions (Varadharajan)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 7/14: Commissioner Varadharajan requested additional information concerning the relationship between the Comprehensive Plan docket item for policy DT-31 and proposed Rewrite amendments for building height in the Town Center zone. Can staff clarify and provide a crosswalk of the building incentives?</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 7/14: Staff noted that the code amendment is focused on incentive provisions that apply in the Town Center zone and advancing Comprehensive Plan policies in support of transit-oriented development (TOD) and housing goals. Additional amendments for consistency with DT-31 policy direction would be provided for the Commission’s review in the future.</p> <p>9/8: The following crosswalk provides additional information and demonstrates relationships between the expired Town Center Master Plan, the recommended amendments that are before the Commission, and future policy considerations:</p> <p>Comprehensive Plan policy DT-31 is printed below. Bold blue text indicates elements of the private entitlement known as RTC Master Plan, which expired in 2005, that were incorporated into the Comprehensive Plan. It is not best practice to adopt private entitlement conditions into comprehensive plans because the former are site-specific regulatory items and the latter are high-level policy documents. The private entitlement conditions are proposed to be removed from the RZC as part of the 2021 annual clean-up, and Redmond Town Center has an item on the 2021-22 Annual Comprehensive Plan Review Docket asking that the provisions be removed from the Comprehensive Plan as well..</p>	<p>Opened 7/14</p>

Phase 1 of Amendments to the Redmond Zoning Code as a Periodic Rewrite of Redmond’s Development Regulations (LAND-2021-00451/SEPA-2021-00452)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix – including Commission’s July 14, 2021 and August 25, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>To maintain the Town Center zone’s health, vitality and attractions, ensure that continued development and redevelopment in the center:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain and protect the site’s significant natural and aesthetic features, including healthy mature trees, stream courses, and indigenous vegetation, particularly adjacent to Bear Creek and the Sammamish River; • Provide plazas, pedestrian malls, and other open spaces that promote outdoor activity and encourage pedestrian and bicycle circulation between the Town Center, the Redmond Central Connector, and the rest of Downtown; • Provide and maintain opportunities for recreation and leisure activities and programs that complement other uses in the zone and the rest of Downtown and generate pedestrian activity; • Complement and are compatible with the Old Town zone and preserve the Justice White House, the Saturday Market, and other features of community and historic significance within Town Center; • Encourage the addition and retention of after-workhours and late-evening entertainment, such as live theater and comedy, dining, dancing and live music, to provide a lively entertainment area adjacent to Old Town; • Maintain a minimum of 600,000 square feet of gross leasable area dedicated to retail uses; • Provide structured parking to minimize visual impacts and encourage pedestrian activity; • Provide for circulation, land use, and parking linkages with the existing Downtown to attract, encourage, and facilitate the movement of shoppers between Town Center and other parts of the Downtown; • Retain Bear Creek Parkway as a treelined boulevard with safe pedestrian and bicycle connections. Preserve the Bear Creek open spaces and environmentally critical areas adjacent and near Bear Creek Parkway; • Preserve at least 44 acres for use as public open space per the Town Center Master Plan; and 	

Phase 1 of Amendments to the Redmond Zoning Code as a Periodic Rewrite of Redmond’s Development Regulations (LAND-2021-00451/SEPA-2021-00452)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix – including Commission’s July 14, 2021 and August 25, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Encourage the addition of residential development. <p>The sub-bullets within DT-31 that are not shaded in blue would continue to be relevant policies for Redmond Town Center. Please note that the open space will be retained as required mitigation from the RTC EIS that was associated with the 1995 Master Plan. However, the Master Plan itself has expired and no longer regulates the site.</p> <p>Policy DT-11 supports the provision of additional height in the Town Center zone in exchange for “exceptional public amenities.”</p> <p>The policy reads: 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 <u>for additional height in a portion of the Town Center zone and elsewhere when accompanied by exceptional public amenities.</u></p> <p>Staff is proposing to change how this policy is implemented in the RZC by updating the “exceptional public amenities” that would qualify for additional building height. Staff is focused on community benefits that align with the current community priorities as documented in the Community Strategic Plan, Sustainability Action Plan, Long-term Recovery Plan and Housing Action Plan. All of these documents build upon the community vision and policies adopted in the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>At the same time, Redmond Town Center, through its 2021-22 docket item, has asked the City to consider changes to DT-11 to clarify what exceptional public amenities would merit additional building height.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	

Phase 1 of Amendments to the Redmond Zoning Code as a Periodic Rewrite of Redmond’s Development Regulations (LAND-2021-00451/SEPA-2021-00452)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix – including Commission’s July 14, 2021 and August 25, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>E-3. Administrative Design Flexibility Purpose and Process (Nichols, Shefrin)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 7/14: Commission Chair Nichols requested clarification regarding the current and proposed process and terms of Design Review Board authority. Commissioner Shefrin also asked whether the Design Review Board provided review of private development in relationship to lighting standards.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 7/14: Staff described that the process and terms of the DRB are not proposed to change. The added applicability section is meant to clarify the current process, as well as provide predictability for applicants. The DRB authority is limited by the criteria provided, and applicants are now required to show how their proposal meets those criteria by providing additional submittal materials if they wish to receive approval for an ADF. Requiring the submittal of additional clarifying materials will assist staff as well as the board in making their decisions, and recommendations.</p> <p>Staff also confirmed that the Design Review Board does provide review of lighting designs and installations for private development. Lighting standards are provided by the RZC for private development and by the City’s Standard Specification and Details for construction and design within the right of way including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Chapter 21.34 Lighting • Chapter 21.44 Signs • Chapter 21.60 Citywide Design Standards • 2019 Standard Specifications and Details <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	<p>Opened 7/14, Closed 7/14</p>

Phase 1 of Amendments to the Redmond Zoning Code as a Periodic Rewrite of Redmond’s Development Regulations (LAND-2021-00451/SEPA-2021-00452)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix – including Commission’s July 14, 2021 and August 25, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
F. Definitions		
F-1. ITE Manual (Nichols)	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 7/14: Commission Chair Nichols requested clarification of staff’s reference to the ITE Manual (The Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual).</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 7/14: Staff described that the ITE Manual is used to determine typical persons and vehicular trips generated based on land use, time period, and other variables.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	Opened 7/14, Closed 7/14
G. Maintenance Program		
There are no questions for this component as of 8/25		
H. Annual Code Cleanup		
H-1. Transit Route Changes and Relationship to Parking Reductions per State Legislation (East)	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 8/25: Commission Vice-Chair East requested additional information regarding the amendments to parking ratio reductions, per Substitute House Bill 2343, for certain land uses near frequent transit. What would occur in the event of a change to the transit route?</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 9/8: Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 36.70A.620 - Cities planning under RCW 36.70A.040—Minimum residential parking requirements provides the following:</p> <p><i>“In counties and cities planning under RCW 36.70A.040, minimum residential parking requirements mandated by municipal zoning ordinances for housing units constructed after July 1, 2019, are subject to the following requirements:</i></p>	Opened 8/25

Phase 1 of Amendments to the Redmond Zoning Code as a Periodic Rewrite of Redmond’s Development Regulations (LAND-2021-00451/SEPA-2021-00452)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix – including Commission’s July 14,2021 and August 25, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><i>(1) For housing units that are affordable to very low-income or extremely low-income individuals and that are located within one-quarter mile of a transit stop that receives transit service at least two times per hour for twelve or more hours per day, minimum residential parking requirements may be no greater than one parking space per bedroom or .75 space per unit. A city may require a developer to record a covenant that prohibits the rental of a unit subject to this parking restriction for any purpose other than providing for housing for very low-income or extremely low-income individuals. The covenant must address price restrictions and household income limits and policies if the property is converted to a use other than for low-income housing. A city may establish a requirement for the provision of more than one parking space per bedroom or .75 space per unit if the jurisdiction has determined a particular housing unit to be in an area with a lack of access to street parking capacity, physical space impediments, or other reasons supported by evidence that would make on-street parking infeasible for the unit.</i></p> <p><i>(2) For housing units that are specifically for seniors or people with disabilities, that are located within one-quarter mile of a transit stop that receives transit service at least four times per hour for twelve or more hours per day, a city may not impose minimum residential parking requirements for the residents of such housing units, subject to the exceptions provided in this subsection. A city may establish parking requirements for staff and visitors of such housing units. A city may establish a requirement for the provision of one or more parking space per bedroom if the jurisdiction has determined a particular housing unit to be in an area with a lack of access to street parking capacity, physical space impediments, or other reasons supported by evidence that would make on-street parking infeasible for the unit. A city may require a developer to record a covenant that prohibits the rental of a unit subject to this parking restriction for any purpose other than providing for housing for seniors or people with disabilities.</i></p>	

Phase 1 of Amendments to the Redmond Zoning Code as a Periodic Rewrite of Redmond’s Development Regulations (LAND-2021-00451/SEPA-2021-00452)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix – including Commission’s July 14,2021 and August 25, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><i>(3) For market rate multifamily housing units that are located within one-quarter mile of a transit stop that receives transit service from at least one route that provides service at least four times per hour for twelve or more hours per day, minimum residential parking requirements may be no greater than one parking space per bedroom or .75 space per unit. A city or county may establish a requirement for the provision of more than one parking space per bedroom or .75 space per unit if the jurisdiction has determined a particular housing unit to be in an area with a lack of access to street parking capacity, physical space impediments, or other reasons supported by evidence that would make on-street parking infeasible for the unit.”</i></p> <p>Currently, these provisions would be available to development in the Downtown, Overlake, and Marymoor Village centers based on access to light rail and bus services. Opportunity would also be available along principal arterials including Avondale Way, 148th Avenue NE, Old Redmond Road (NE 70th Street), and Redmond Way via bus services and nearby access to light rail.</p> <p>The RCW does not appear to address impacts or recommended actions in the event of a transit route or service change. Though the Metro and Sound Transit bus routes may change over time, the City’s vision supports long-term, high frequency transit in the locations listed above. Metro and Sound Transit long-term planning documents also reflect this. The land use pattern in these areas also has the potential for supporting larger portions of the city’s population such as in medium- and high-density multifamily and mixed-use development. This pattern is also anticipated to continue supporting long-term transit service.</p> <p>Source: http://lawfilesexternal.wa.gov/biennium/2019-20/Pdf/Bills/Session%20Laws/House/2343-S.SL.pdf?q=20210827094840</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	

Phase 1 of Amendments to the Redmond Zoning Code as a Periodic Rewrite of Redmond’s Development Regulations (LAND-2021-00451/SEPA-2021-00452)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix – including Commission’s July 14,2021 and August 25, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
I. Overlake (OV) and Marymoor Village (MDD) Bridge Amendments		
<p>I-1. Affordable and Local Commercial – Incentive Tier in OV and MDD zoning districts (Varadharajan, Nichols)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 8/25: Commissioner Varadharajan and Chair Nichols suggested moving the incentive for affordable and local commercial into the first versus the second tier for the Overlake (OV) and Marymoor Village (MDD) zoning districts. They noted observing a loss of small businesses and concerns regarding affordability levels and the cost of relocation for current businesses to continue operating within the City as redevelopment occurs. They emphasized opportunity for local commercial to support mixed use development as the various neighborhoods.</p> <p>Commission Chair Nichols also request staff to consider non-profit space in the provisions for affordable commercial.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 9/8: Staff recommends maintaining the Technical Committee’s recommendation as an interim and preliminary approach. Additional policy and regulatory discussions during Redmond 2050 will include the concept of affordable commercial including for non-profit uses.</p> <p>Staff’s rationale for maintaining the Technical Committee’s recommendation is:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The concept of affordable commercial is new and recommended as a pilot approach. Thus far, local governments have not established protocols for implementation. For example, a market analysis could define the program. The Overlake Neighborhood Plan Update and/or Redmond 2050 could also inform future policy, regulations, and an operational program including implementation structure for future adoption by the City. • The OV and MDD incentives tables are currently configured for the applicant to choose from one primary-level, programmatic aspect such as LEED Zero or from two mid-level 	<p>Opened 8/25</p>

Phase 1 of Amendments to the Redmond Zoning Code as a Periodic Rewrite of Redmond’s Development Regulations (LAND-2021-00451/SEPA-2021-00452)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix – including Commission’s July 14, 2021 and August 25, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>incentive (LEED and Affordable Housing). This approach was taken due to the difficulties of implementing a LEED Zero project and overburdening a developer by also providing additional affordable housing. These options support key priorities of the City. Affordable commercial, as a priority incentive, could result in significantly less developments implementing the recommended primary and mid-level incentives: affordable housing and LEED construction. This is because affordable commercial would employ ground-floor, pedestrian-oriented commercial that is already required by the code. Its implementation is anticipated to involve only shifts to the property management process and leasing plans.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Affordable Commercial/Local Business was first implemented through development agreements and has not been codified. Until additional work can be conducted, staff recommends maintaining the recommended second-tier approach and incentive program. The second-tier approach allows private developers some flexibility while they determine how to implement in their leasing program. This first step toward codification, as currently recommended, can inform future additions and refinements to policy and code. This approach also allows for community conversation during Redmond 2050 including whether the concept is further emphasized as a priority for the City as well as how it potentially relates to leasing agreements with local, non-profit organizations. <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	

Phase 1 of Amendments to the Redmond Zoning Code as a Periodic Rewrite of Redmond’s Development Regulations (LAND-2021-00451/SEPA-2021-00452)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix – including Commission’s July 14, 2021 and August 25, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>I-2. Height in Relationship to Light and Airspace (Shefrin)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 8/25: Commissioner Shefrin asked if development typically maximized its development potential and how that would relate to light access and airspace in the vicinity.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 8/25: Staff noted that it is typical of development to maximize its potential as allowed by code. Additional density is not recommended as part of this amendment and would retain consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code. The current floor area ratios (FAR) for the Overlake zoning districts would remain the same and is only recommended for reorganization, for clarity purposes.</p> <p>Overtime, developments taking advantage of above-grade, interior parking could convert parking areas to residential units provided that the amount of remaining parking continued to meet the site-specific off-street parking demand.</p> <p>The Technical Committee’s recommendation to RZC 21.12.100 OV (Overlake) Building Height for those developments taking advantage of the height transfer associated with verified high-water tables includes the requirement of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “A shadow study to identify impacts to open spaces, public areas, and neighboring developments;” <p>Staff also described that development of sites of three or more acres involve a master plan. The master plan also requires a height and shadow study.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	<p>Opened 8/25, Closed 8/25</p>

Phase 1 of Amendments to the Redmond Zoning Code as a Periodic Rewrite of Redmond’s Development Regulations (LAND-2021-00451/SEPA-2021-00452)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix – including Commission’s July 14,2021 and August 25, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>I-3. EV Charging for Above-Grade, Interior Parking (Varadharajan)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 8/25: Commissioner Varadharajan asked whether EV Charging stations could continue to be installed when parking is provided above-grade and interior to the building.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 8/25: Staff confirmed that there were no recommendations to amend nor anticipated impacts to the provisions of section RZC 21.40.030 Electric Vehicle Charging Stations (Citywide Parking Standards).</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	<p>Opened 8/25, Closed 8/25</p>
<p>I-4. Relationship of Code Amendments to Neighborhood Planning (Nichols, Varadharajan)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 8/25: Commission Chair Nichols asked what the relationship of the recommended code amendments are to the upcoming neighborhood planning process in Overlake and Marymoor Village. Commissioner Varadharajan also asked what the timeline is for the amendments, including to height, to become effective.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 8/25: Staff described how the recommended amendments function like a pilot effort, are in partnership with and supportive of the policy planning process, and help prepare the neighborhood for changes as an outcome of the neighborhood plan. The plans for Overlake and Marymoor Village are anticipated for Council action in two and three years, respectively. The recommended amendments to the code would be established and implemented during one to two years until the respective neighborhood plans became effective. The amendments to the code, currently before the Commission, are anticipated for Council action in March of 2021 and would become effective 11 days thereafter.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	<p>Opened 8/25, Closed 8/25</p>