

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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

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 • Broaden the variety of housing types throughout the City including for improved accessibility and affordability. <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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>B-3. Rezone R-1 Zoning Districts (Public Comment)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p>9/22: Mr. Yoder’s comment is included in the Planning Commission’s September 22, 2021 continue public hearing material.</p> <p><i>WAC 365-196-800 Relationship between development regulations and comprehensive plans includes the following: (1) Development regulations under the act are specific controls placed on development or land use activities by a county or city. <u>Development regulations must be consistent with and implement comprehensive plans adopted pursuant to the act.</u></i></p> <p>Rezoning may only occur consistent with the city’s land use pattern. Therefore, staff recommends deferring discussion regarding this request to the Redmond 2050 project.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p> <p>9/22: Bob Yoder provided written comment on September 20, 2021 requesting rezoning of R-1 zones to allow for increased affordable housing and diversity. He noted public input for Vision (Redmond) 2050 involving development of duplex triplex housing.</p>	<p>Opened 9/22</p>
C. Nonresidential Allowed Uses		
<p>C-1. Relationship of Zoning, Allowed Uses, and HOA Rules (Rajpathak)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p>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></p> <p>8/25: Staff described that Homeowners’ Association (HOA) Covenants Conditions & Restrictions (CC&Rs) would remain in effect and enforceable.</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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<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>C-2. Special Regulations for Nonresidential Use Classes in Overlake (Public Comment)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 9/22: Staff agrees with the need for clarification as described by Ms. Kendall. The following are recommended as refinement to the Technical Committee’s recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify that “C. Limited to less than 75,000 square feet gross floor area in a single use” applies to the Retail Sales use class. • Identify that “Requires a conditional use permit if greater than 150,000 SF GFA. See RZC 21.76.070.K, Conditional Use Permit” applies to the Retail Sales use class. <p>Staff also agrees with the opportunity to streamline and clarify the definitions for Business and Service; Retail Sales; and Transportation, Communication, Information, and Utilities. However, staff would like to continue reviewing the requested refinements for additional opportunity to streamline and clarify the definitions. Staff recommends including the updated refinements in the Commission’s subsequent issues matrix.</p>	<p>Opened 9/8</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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><u>Public Comment</u> 9/22: Katie Kendall Partner of McCullough Hill Leary submitted additional comments on September 17, 2021 regarding the following definitions for Allowed Nonresidential Uses. The comment letter is included in the Planning Commission’s material for its September 22, 2021 continued public hearing. These were provided in conjunction with her additional comments regarding Floor Area Ratio (FAR), listed in Issue E-4 below.</p> <p>Proposed Definitional Changes We propose to change the following three definitions for clarity. In addition, we recommend, as an overall comment, removing the Building Code Occupancy classifications that are provided throughout the proposed new definitions. We are concerned the occupancy classes could end up restricting, and possibly contradicting, the land use definitions. We recommend removing it throughout the definition section. If the City wants to keep in the occupancy class, however, we recommend some edits regarding occupancy classes below. These proposed changes are in addition to other changes proposed to provide clarity and flexibility to the definitions.</p> <p><u>Business and Service.</u> The Business and Service use class, under the General Sales or Services use category, is a use that provides administrative, professional, or service-type transactions, including storage of records and accounts, comprises the former use classes Finance and Insurance; Real Estate Services; Professional Services; Administrative Services; Services to Buildings or Dwellings; Travel Arrangement and Reservation Services; Investigation and Security Services; as well as the home businesses and mobile businesses and services providing these services.</p> <p>Business and Service represents a portion of the the Business Group B occupancy class of the Redmond Building Code and includes, among others, the use of a building or structure, or a portion thereof, for office, professional or service type transactions, including storage of records and accounts.</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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><u>Retail Sales.</u></p> <p>The Retail Sales use class, under the General Sales or Services use category, includes, among others, the display and sale of merchandise, and involves stocks of goods, wares or merchandise incidental to such purposes and accessible to the public, comprises the former use classes of General Sales or Service; Automobile Sales, Rental, or Service Establishment; Heavy Consumer Goods Sales, Rental, or Service; Durable Consumer Goods Sales, Rental and Service; Consumer Goods, Other; Membership Wholesale/ Retail Warehouse; Grocery, Food, Beverage, or Dairy Sales; Health and Personal Care; Convenience Store; as well as the vending cart businesses and mobile businesses providing these services.</p> <p>Retail Sales represent <u>a portion of</u> the Mercantile Group M occupancy class of the Redmond Building Code, and includes, among others, the use of a building or structure or a portion thereof for the display and sale of merchandise, and involves stocks of goods, wares or merchandise incidental to such purposes and accessible to the public.</p> <p><u>Transportation, Communication, Information, and Utilities</u></p> <p>In this land use category, an establishment cannot always be distinguished by a single physical location as it can in most other land use categories. To classify land in this category, other factors are needed for deciding which land serves a particular establishment. In most cases, the type of establishment in this category is easily deduced from the type of structures and activities on the land. The remaining difficulty is deciding how significant a structure or activity is necessary for the land to be associated with an</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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>establishment type. For example, it would not be realistic to classify all land with telephone lines under telephone communications; however, land with more important telephone communication facilities may be classified here.</p> <p>Transportation, Communication, Information and Utilities uses encompass several sub-categories of uses. The following provides additional information for the sub-categories typically associated with this land use category:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Transportation establishments serve passengers and cargo movements and are grouped by the modes of transportation. They use transportation equipment as a productive asset although many may have service and repair facilities (railroads or airlines). • Communication and information establishments produce or distribute information. Information can be broadly differentiated by the medium through which it flows. <u>Every other industry sector is in some way or another either a producer or consumer of "information" — alluded to terms like "information economy" and "global economy."</u> However, the establishments in communication and information sub-category pertain to those that transform information into a commodity, <u>such as but not limited to courier, messenger, and postal services, motion pictures and sound recording, software development and publishing, newspaper, books, and other publishing, libraries and archives, and radio, television, cable networks, and distribution.</u> <u>Many of the uses in this class represent a portion of the Business B Group Occupancy Class, the Occupancy Class, or the Occupancy Class of the Redmond Building Code.</u> • Utility establishments provide utility services, such as electric power, natural gas, steam supply, water supply, and sewage removal. This sub-category does not include waste management services, which collect, treat, and dispose of waste materials, and do not directly use or operate utilities. <p>This land use category also includes truck and freight transportation services; courier, messenger, and postal services; motion pictures and sound recording; newspaper, books, and other publishing; libraries and archives, and radio, television, cable networks and distribution.</p> <p>9/8: Katie Kendall, Partner of McCullough Hill Leary submitted the following in a comment letter dated August 23, 2021. This letter is included in the Commission’s meeting packet for September 8, 2021.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The City is amending the use typologies to break out general sales and services into several categories such as business services and retail services. See https://www.redmond.gov/DocumentCenter/View/20228/21_12-Overlake-Chapters. We agree that breaking up the general sales and services use into separate, clearer uses will allow for greater clarity moving forward. 	

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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>However, there is an existing note in the Overlake Village use tables that limit use 75,000 s.f. See Table 21.12.040B for OV-1, Table 21.12.070B for OV-4, and Table 21.12.080B for OV-5 (“C. Limited to less than 75,000 square feet gross floor area in a single use.”). This has always been understood and interpreted to apply to retail uses only. When the use categories get broken down into subcategories of uses, such as retail services and business services, the 75,000 s.f. limitation now inadvertently applies more clearly to all use classes. This is contrary to the original intent of the 75,000 s.f. limitation and would greatly affect proposed office development that has relied on the City’s interpretation. I understand that the genesis of the 75,000 s.f. limitation is to limit larger “big box” stores and was not created to limit office and other similar uses. If that was indeed the original intent of this size of use limitation, we would ask the Code be clarified that the 75,000 s.f. size of use limitation be tied to retail sales uses only and to make clear that this size limitation does not apply to business services class of uses.</p> <p>In addition, the tables for OV-2 and OV-3 have similar language that “Requires a conditional use permit if greater than 150,000 SF GFA. See RZC 21.76.070.K, Conditional Use Permit.” See Table 21.12.050B for OV-2 and Table 21.12.060B for OV-3. Again, if this limitation was not intended to encompass business and service uses, we would ask that the note be tied to retail sales uses only.</p>	
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>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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><u>Public Comment</u> None</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>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>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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
D-3. Setback Provisions for Accessory Dwelling Units (Rajpathak)	<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; • 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>	Opened 8/25, Closed 8/25
D-4. Accessory Dwelling Unit Occupancy and	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p>	Opened 9/22

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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
Parking (Public Comment)	<p>9/22: The MBAKS comments are included in the Planning Commission’s material for its September 22, 2021 continued public hearing.</p> <p>Staff understands these requests and appreciates the information cited in the MBAKS comments. Staff recommends deferring discussion regarding Accessory Dwelling Units to Redmond 2050, Housing Action Plan implementation, and the Redmond Zoning Code ReWrite subsequent phases. This approach would allow for additional analysis and conversation with project stakeholders, the community, and staff.</p> <p>In addition, staff continues to monitor the annual legislative agenda that in 2020 and 2021 included updates to relevant state laws. Updates resulting from the annual agenda are also addressed by the City’s Annual Code Cleanup.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> 9/22: The Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties (MBAKS) submitted comments on September 21, 2021 regarding Accessory Dwelling Unit (ADU) occupancy and parking requirements. In summary, the MBAKS request the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remove homeowner occupancy requirements for ADUs <short-term rentals>; and • Relax on-street parking requirements to accommodate ADUs on more site-specific case-by-case basis and consider shared parking arrangements with adjacent land use during certain days/hours. 	
E. Strategic Revisions		
E-1. Parking Standards in the Downtown (East, Nichols) <i>Note: this question also refers to the Overlake and Marymoor Village</i>	<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></p>	Opened 7/14, Closed 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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p><i>Bridge Amendments</i></p>	<p>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 (DPMSP): Implementation Plan was approved by City Council on September 15, 2020 (link to plan). The Implementation Plan includes the following implementation steps:</p> <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> <p><u>Public Comment</u></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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	None	
<p>E-2. Town Center Zoning District Incentive Provisions (Varadharajan, Public Comment)</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>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; 	<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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 • 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>	

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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>The recommendation changes how this policy is implemented in the RZC by updating the “exceptional public amenities” that would qualify for additional building height. The focus is 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>9/22: Staff agrees with the following comments provided by Katie Kendall, listed below under Public Comment on 9/8. These are recommended for refinement in the Technical Committee’s recommended amendments to the Zoning Code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comment a. Allowance for additional above grade parking in areas with high water tables 21.10.050 – C.1(b) • Comment b. Affordable housing Table 21.10.050 # (1) <p>Staff agrees in part or recommends an alternative approach for each the following for each of Ms. Kendall’s remaining comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For comment c. Local Commercial Table 21.10.050 # (4), staff recommends refinement to read: 10% of <u>new ground level</u> commercial space <u>or a total of 7,000 square feet of total commercial space to be</u> dedicated to local commercial. • For comment d. Parking Ratio 21.10.050 # (8), staff recommends refinement to read: Parking ratio of 2.5 or below for office uses and <u>accessory uses/area of other non office uses for the floor area of development that is devoted to administrative services, cafeteria, and similar accessory uses typically provided as support for the primary use. In the case of a mixed use project or where parking spaces within the new development are allocated to adjacent non-office uses (via a shared parking agreement with a defined term), compliance with this incentive shall be calculated based on the applicable new office and accessory uses.</u> The parking stalls 	

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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p style="color: red;">dedicated exclusively to those uses (i.e., parking dedicated to retail uses, either new or existing, or parking being constructed to replace existing surface stalls dedicated to existing retail uses that are being demolished as part of the new development project and which will remain dedicated to retail uses), will not be included in this ratio calculation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding comments e.1 and e.2 below, staff recommends maintaining references to the 1995 Master Plan at this time. The remaining references support other portions of the TWNC code chapter such as those portions that address public benefits. These should be maintained until the district’s policy and code are addressed comprehensively. • For comment e.3 below, staff recommends replacing “Pedestrian Generating” with “Pedestrian-Oriented” for clarification and alignment with the RZC 21.78 Definition: Pedestrian-Oriented Uses. <i>Includes but is not limited to retail, restaurants, cultural or entertainment uses, hotel lobbies, travel agencies, personal service uses, parcel and mail services, copy centers, the customer service portion of financial institutions, or other businesses that are intended to be pedestrian attracting or pedestrian generating in nature as determined by the Administrator.</i> This definition supports the flexibility of use classes described by Ms. Kendall. • Regarding comment e.4 below, staff agrees with the use of geographic boundaries as listed by Ms. Kendall. However, maps will not be updated within the zoning district until a later date. Some references to subareas such as the retail core will remain necessary for the short term. • Comment e.5 below has relevance regarding design standards. Refinements to design standards are proposed during the third phase of the RZC ReWrite. Because the standards are inter-related and should be addressed comprehensively, staff recommends maintaining the code provisions for the short term. In the interim, applicants are welcome to submit for administrative design flexibility (RZC 21.58.020.E., Administrative Design Flexibility) <p><u>Public Comment</u> 9/8: Katie Kendall, Partner of McCullough Hill Leary submitted the following in a comment letter dated August 23, 2021. This letter is included in the Commission’s meeting packet for September 8, 2021.</p> <p>a. Allowance for additional above grade parking in areas with high water tables 21.10.050 – C.1(b): We agree with the substance of the proposed change, but would like the language to more clearly indicate a structure with office uses may exceed 9 stories when not all of the parking to achieve</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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>minimum parking ratios can be accommodated below grade. In some cases, some below grade parking may be feasible, but not enough to meet minimum requirements. Our proposed language is intended to address that nuance, so the code does not just provide an all or nothing approach to below grade or above grade parking. Here’s the proposed change in red line:</p> <p>A maximum total of nine (9) stories of office may be developed. Structures with office uses may exceed nine (9) stories in areas where sufficient subterranean parking to achieve minimum parking ratios is infeasible or detrimental to natural resources. In those cases, the maximum number of stories may be exceeded to accommodate minimum parking ratios in above-grade structured parking. The maximum number of additional stories beyond the height maximum is three (3) stories. A geotechnical report demonstrating the infeasibility of providing all required parking below-grade and compliance with this code section is required for proposals seeking to exceed nine (9) stories.</p> <p>b. Affordable housing Table 21.10.050 # (1): As with other similar sections in the Code, it would be helpful to confirm that compliance with existing City policy can be used to meet a portion of this incentive. Here’s our proposed text.</p> <p>The greater of 10% or 50 units designated affordable at 60% AMI and the greater of 10% or 50 units designated for 80% AMI. Compliance with the City of Redmond’s affordable housing requirement of 10% designated for 80% AMI can be used to meet a portion of this incentive.</p> <p>c. Local Commercial Table 21.10.050 # (4) This proposed change is to clarify that the requirement relates to new commercial space that is at ground level. 10% of new ground level commercial space dedicated to local commercial.</p> <p>d. Parking Ratio 21.10.050 # (8) The proposed changes below clarify how the parking ratio is calculated. As written, it is unclear whether the calculation of stalls dedicated to existing or new retail uses, which require a higher parking ratio, would be used as part of the parking ratio for the building.</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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>Parking ratio of 2.5 or below for office uses and accessory uses/area of other non office uses. In the case of a mixed use project or where parking spaces within the new development are allocated to adjacent non-office uses (via a shared parking agreement with a defined term), compliance with this incentive shall be calculated based on the applicable new office and accessory uses. The parking stalls dedicated exclusively to those uses (i.e., parking dedicated to retail uses, either new or existing, or parking being constructed to replace existing surface stalls dedicated to existing retail uses that are being demolished as part of the new development project and which will remain dedicated to retail uses), will not be included in this ratio calculation.</p> <p>e. Further, we offer the following additional edits and clarifications to the following sections of the base zoning code for RZC 21.10.050.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. 21.10.050(A) – Purpose: The last sentence in this paragraph continues to reference back to the 1995 Master Plan. Recommend removing this reference. 2. Table 21.10.050(B) – Multiple references to the original Master Plan remain in the Notes and Exceptions column. Recommend removing these references. 3. Further, in Table 21.10.050(B), in the notes and exceptions regarding Maximum FAR without TDR’s, we recommend that you clarify the goals of "pedestrian generating uses." While we appreciate that there is not a list of prescriptive allowable uses, it would be helpful to have some clarity on the end goals for such a use and where it is required on the Town Center site. As you know, certain locations of the TWNC zone are primarily retail, while others are more naturally oriented towards residential or office uses. We recommend maintaining and focusing the pedestrian-generating energy on the retail area as much as possible. For example, as written, all new uses on the ground floor level must be pedestrian-generating, which may not account for lobbies and office or other amenity spaces. 4. 2(a)(H) – When referencing the scale of building in the retail core, please provide some clarification as to the extent of the retail core area. Does this only refer to the area along 	

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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>74th Street between 164th and 166th?</p> <p>5. With respect to the Pedestrian Guidelines, we recommend removing (C)(1) in this section, requiring complimentary treatment of Arcades and Colonnades within a single area. This requirement also references "areas" which have been removed. The goal is to encourage diversity of high quality design which complement each other but is not the same; a real neighborhood rather than a suburban retail or office campus.</p>	
<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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
E-4. Floor Area Ratio Simplification (Public Comment)	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 9/22: <i>Staff completed additional analysis in response to Katie Kendall’s September 17, 2021 comment. The following is submitted as an update to the previous recommendation included below.</i></p> <p>Staff recommends the addition of “per use class” to Table RZC 21.12.090 OV Floor Area. This code provision has not been interpreted consistently over time and has been the source of staff and applicant confusion. While the change that Ms. Kendall requests would represent a departure from the original intent of the code as documented in the 2007 Overlake FSEIS and implementing development regulations, it would have the following benefits:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It would support housing choices and access to jobs, goods, and services in an urban center. • It would support flexible economic diversity among the remaining floor area ratio up to the maximum combined FAR (Mixed Use). • It would allow for maintenance of other relevant portions of the OV districts regulations including incentive programs related to FAR. • It would not increase the maximum amount of non-residential floor area allowed under the Overlake Planned Action. <p><i>The following was originally submitted as staff’s recommendation on September 17, 2021.</i></p> <p>Staff understands the concerns listed below, as expressed by Katie Kendall. The two responses below are recommended for the Commission’s consideration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regarding item <u>a. Phase 1 changes to [Floor Area Ratio] FAR</u>, staff recommends maintaining the Technical Committee’s recommendation regarding FAR. The 2007 FSEIS and the resulting regulations 	Opened 9/8

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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status																																				
	<p>that implement the preferred alternative do not support an additive approach. Staff researched the historic record to assess Ms. Kendall’s comments and to develop this recommendation:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Non-residential FAR should be calculated for all non-residential uses combined, not in an additive fashion. This is the clear direction of the environmental analysis and supporting regulations adopted in 2007 for Overlake. ○ Basing the amount of non-residential FAR on the number of land use categories (the “additive” approach) leads to the situation where separating or collapsing land use categories changes the allowed non-residential FAR. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Taking this position implies that max FAR was multiplied many times over when the RCDG Rewrite resulted combining the land use and FAR tables. That would have been contrary to the RCDG Rewrite purpose. ▪ Having allowed FAR increase and decrease based on how specific the land use categories are is not typical practice, and the impacts of doing so have not been studied. ○ The City may have applied the code using the additive approach to non-residential FAR in the past; such actions do not change the code or underlying policies and environmental analysis. ○ Using the additive approach to non-residential FAR would not increase the total amount of commercial square footage allowed under the Planned Action, but could have a significant impact on design of individual projects, where allowed FAR would increase from 0.55 to between 2.68 and 4.01, far in excess of how the regulations were originally structured. <table border="1" data-bbox="737 1024 1675 1373" style="margin-left: auto; margin-right: auto;"> <thead> <tr> <th>Zone</th> <th>Max Res FAR</th> <th>Max Total FAR</th> <th>Min Res %</th> <th>Min Res FAR to reach Max Total FAR, ignoring all other limits</th> <th>Max Implied Non-Residential FAR, ignoring all other limits</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>OV1</td> <td>4.0</td> <td>5.35</td> <td>50%</td> <td>2.68</td> <td>2.68</td> </tr> <tr> <td>OV2</td> <td>4.0</td> <td>5.35</td> <td>25%</td> <td>1.34</td> <td>4.01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>OV3</td> <td>4.0</td> <td>5.35</td> <td>25%</td> <td>1.34</td> <td>4.01</td> </tr> <tr> <td>OV4</td> <td colspan="5"><i>Development Agreement governs entire zone</i></td> </tr> <tr> <td>OV5</td> <td colspan="5"><i>Entire zone has been recently redeveloped</i></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Zone	Max Res FAR	Max Total FAR	Min Res %	Min Res FAR to reach Max Total FAR, ignoring all other limits	Max Implied Non-Residential FAR, ignoring all other limits	OV1	4.0	5.35	50%	2.68	2.68	OV2	4.0	5.35	25%	1.34	4.01	OV3	4.0	5.35	25%	1.34	4.01	OV4	<i>Development Agreement governs entire zone</i>					OV5	<i>Entire zone has been recently redeveloped</i>					
Zone	Max Res FAR	Max Total FAR	Min Res %	Min Res FAR to reach Max Total FAR, ignoring all other limits	Max Implied Non-Residential FAR, ignoring all other limits																																	
OV1	4.0	5.35	50%	2.68	2.68																																	
OV2	4.0	5.35	25%	1.34	4.01																																	
OV3	4.0	5.35	25%	1.34	4.01																																	
OV4	<i>Development Agreement governs entire zone</i>																																					
OV5	<i>Entire zone has been recently redeveloped</i>																																					

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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In addition to maintaining the Technical Committee’s recommendation for amendment to the Zoning Code, the City should reconsider FAR in Overlake globally as part of the Redmond 2050 Phase 1. ● Regarding items <u>b. Definitions</u> and <u>c. Additional Comments</u>, staff encourages additional comments to be submitted as verbal or written comments in advance of or during the Commission’s public hearing continuation on September 22, 2021. <p><u>Public Comment</u> 9/22: Katie Kendall, Partner of McCullough Hill Leary submitted additional comments on September 17, 2021 regarding Floor Area Ratio (FAR). The comment letter is included in the Planning Commission’s material for its September 22, 2021 continued public hearing. These were provided in conjunction with her additional comments regarding Allowed Nonresidential Use definitions, listed above in Issue C-2.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">PROPOSED CHANGES FOR OVERLAKE ZONING CHANGES AND RZC DEFINITIONS</p> <p>As we noted in our August 23, 2021 comments, we have significant concerns regarding the proposed changes to RZC Table 21.12.090. Below we provide two recommended code changes that we believe must work together to maintain consistency with prior interpretations of this Code, which has been approved by the City Attorney and the City Council for the Seritage Project, and ensure that the proposed code changes align with the plain language of the current code and the Comprehensive Plan and Overlake Neighborhood Plan goals, as adopted. The following proposed code changes fall into two categories. The first category of proposed amendments addresses our concerns regarding how nonresidential FAR has been, and should be, calculated in the Overlake Village Zones. We provide two options for amending the code to address our concerns that the FAR should be additive.</p> <p>The second category of amendments addresses our concerns regarding definitions. We believe our proposed changes to the definitions provide clarity and flexibility and would be necessary no matter which solution staff accepts to address nonresidential FAR for RZC Table 21.12.090</p> <p>OPTION 1 FOR OVERLAKE ZONING CHANGES</p> <p>This option rolls all the FAR into a base combined FAR and a maximum combined FAR, which aligns with how the Code is written and has been interpreted for past projects, and aligns with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan and the Overlake Neighborhood Plan, as adopted in the Comprehensive Plan.</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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes				Status																								
	<table border="1" data-bbox="548 315 1346 574"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 315 814 391">Use Types</th> <th data-bbox="814 315 1079 391">OV 1/2/3/5</th> <th data-bbox="1079 315 1346 391">OV</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 391 814 467">Base Combined FAR (Mixed Use)</td> <td data-bbox="814 391 1079 467">3.7^{1, 2, 3}</td> <td data-bbox="1079 391 1346 467">2.9^{1, 2, 3}</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 467 814 574">Maximum Combined FAR (Mixed Use)</td> <td data-bbox="814 467 1079 574">5.35</td> <td data-bbox="1079 467 1346 574">5.2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p data-bbox="548 574 1877 643">¹ Residential use may exceed 2.5 FAR by obtaining additional floor area through use of TDP, GBP, or incentives under RZC 21.12.170.</p> <p data-bbox="548 643 1877 711">² Each non-residential use per use class may exceed 0.36 FAR by obtaining additional floor area through use of TDP, GBP, or incentives under RZC 21.12.170.</p> <p data-bbox="548 711 1877 779">³ Hotel uses may exceed 1.2 FAR by obtaining additional floor area through use of TDP, GBP, or incentives under RZC 21.12.170.</p> <p data-bbox="548 899 667 927">OPTION 2</p> <p data-bbox="548 932 1877 1105">This option maintains the FAR per use class but provides the necessary clarity that the FAR limits for nonresidential uses are per use class, and are not combined as a total amount of allowable nonresidential uses. Again, the proposed change aligns with how the Code is written and has been interpreted (and approved by the City Council) for past projects, and aligns with the goals of the Comprehensive Plan and the Overlake Neighborhood Plan, as adopted in the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="548 1143 1877 1360"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5" data-bbox="548 1143 1877 1182">Table RZC 21.12.090 OV Floor Area</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="548 1182 814 1325">Use Types</th> <th data-bbox="814 1182 1079 1325">OV 1/2/3/5 Base FAR</th> <th data-bbox="1079 1182 1346 1325">OV 1/2/3/5 FAR w/ TDR or GBP FAR w/ Incentive</th> <th data-bbox="1346 1182 1610 1325">OV 4 Base FAR</th> <th data-bbox="1610 1182 1877 1325">OV 4 FAR w/ TDR or GBP FAR w/ Incentive</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="548 1325 814 1360">Residential</td> <td data-bbox="814 1325 1079 1360">2.5</td> <td data-bbox="1079 1325 1346 1360">N/A 4</td> <td data-bbox="1346 1325 1610 1360">2.5</td> <td data-bbox="1610 1325 1877 1360">N/A 4</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>				Use Types	OV 1/2/3/5	OV	Base Combined FAR (Mixed Use)	3.7 ^{1, 2, 3}	2.9 ^{1, 2, 3}	Maximum Combined FAR (Mixed Use)	5.35	5.2	Table RZC 21.12.090 OV Floor Area					Use Types	OV 1/2/3/5 Base FAR	OV 1/2/3/5 FAR w/ TDR or GBP FAR w/ Incentive	OV 4 Base FAR	OV 4 FAR w/ TDR or GBP FAR w/ Incentive	Residential	2.5	N/A 4	2.5	N/A 4	
Use Types	OV 1/2/3/5	OV																											
Base Combined FAR (Mixed Use)	3.7 ^{1, 2, 3}	2.9 ^{1, 2, 3}																											
Maximum Combined FAR (Mixed Use)	5.35	5.2																											
Table RZC 21.12.090 OV Floor Area																													
Use Types	OV 1/2/3/5 Base FAR	OV 1/2/3/5 FAR w/ TDR or GBP FAR w/ Incentive	OV 4 Base FAR	OV 4 FAR w/ TDR or GBP FAR w/ Incentive																									
Residential	2.5	N/A 4	2.5	N/A 4																									

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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes					Status
	Non-Residential Per Use Class	0.36	0.41 0.55	0.4	0.47 1.0	
	Hotel/Motel/ Other Accommodation Services	1.2	N/A 1.35	0.4	0.47 1.0	
	Maximum Combined FAR (Mixed Use)	5.35	5.2			
	<p>9/8: Katie Kendall, Partner of McCullough Hill Leary submitted the following in a comment letter dated August 23, 2021. This letter is included in the Commission’s meeting packet for September 8, 2021.</p> <p>a. Phase 1 changes to FAR: https://www.redmond.gov/DocumentCenter/View/20225/21_08_Multiple-Floor-Area-Ratio-OV-and-MDD.</p> <p>Unfortunately, when the City rolled up all the uses into a summary table of the FAR limits as part of these Phase 1 changes, it created the unintended result of reducing the available amount of <u>all</u> nonresidential FAR (except hotels) in the Overlake zone to 0.55 FAR total. This change conflicts with the plain language of RZC 21.12.090 and the City’s current interpretation on how to calculate FAR in the Overlake Village zones. The proposed change also directly conflicts with the intent of the Comprehensive Plan vision for the Overlake Neighborhood as a mixed-use neighborhood where people live, work, shop, and recreate. Each Overlake policy focuses on creating a true mixed-use neighborhood but OV-7 is particularly relevant given the goals to “[p]romote mixes of residential and commercial uses located either in a mixed-use building or among single- use buildings on a mixed-use site where appropriate.” It would be difficult to meet this goal if the Code Amendment is approved as written.</p> <p>RZC 21.12.090 provides that “[t]he FAR for nonresidential and residential uses within a given development are individually calculated and may be added together for a cumulative total,</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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status																														
	<p>provided that the respective maximum FAR for each use is not exceeded.” This provision has been interpreted by the City (for more than one project) to mean that each nonresidential use is additive (utilizing both 0.55 FAR for communications and information use and 0.55 for general sales and services, for example). This interpretation makes sense and aligns with the plain language of the Code. Otherwise, a project would have to fit all nonresidential uses (health services, human services, religious uses, retail, office) into a maximum 0.55 FAR when the maximum FAR in most Overlake zones is 5.35. The City Council has approved this interpretation through past approval of a Development Agreement and Master Plan. In addition, we are aware of at least one project in Overlake that is currently under review with the City where City staff provided guidance that each nonresidential use is additive. This proposed change would significantly and negatively impact this project.</p> <p>Thankfully, there is a simple solution. We recommend that you change proposed Table 21.12.090 as follows (change in black font below). It would also be helpful to include a footnote explaining that a class of use is all uses within the “retail sales” use, for example, and uses within the “business services” use are considered a different use class.</p> <p><u>Table 21.12.090 OV Floor Area</u></p> <p><u>Applicability: This table summarizes the permitted Floor Area Ratio for different types of uses based on their OV Zone Designation.</u></p> <p><u>Base FAR = Maximum floor area ratio without any incentives applied</u></p> <p><u>FAR w/ TDR or GBP = Maximum floor area ratio with Transferred Development Rights (See RZC 21.46) or Green Building and Green Infrastructure Incentive Program (See RZC 21.67)</u></p> <p><u>FAR w/ Incentive = Maximum floor area ratio with use of incentive program (See RZC 21.12.170)</u></p> <table border="1" data-bbox="684 1084 1446 1386"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5" data-bbox="684 1084 1446 1105">Table RZC 21.12.090 OV Floor Area</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="684 1105 821 1159">Use Types</th> <th data-bbox="821 1105 984 1159">OV 1/2/3/5 Base FAR</th> <th data-bbox="984 1105 1146 1159">OV 1/2/3/5 FAR w/ TDR or GBP FAR w/ Incentive</th> <th data-bbox="1146 1105 1272 1159">OV 4 Base FAR</th> <th data-bbox="1272 1105 1446 1159">OV 4 FAR w/ TDR or GBP FAR w/ Incentive</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="684 1159 821 1206">Residential</td> <td data-bbox="821 1159 984 1206">2.5</td> <td data-bbox="984 1159 1146 1206">N/A 1</td> <td data-bbox="1146 1159 1272 1206">2.5</td> <td data-bbox="1272 1159 1446 1206">N/A 1</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="684 1206 821 1253">Non-Residential for each non-residential use class</td> <td data-bbox="821 1206 984 1253">0.36</td> <td data-bbox="984 1206 1146 1253">0.41 0.55</td> <td data-bbox="1146 1206 1272 1253">0.4</td> <td data-bbox="1272 1206 1446 1253">0.47 1.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="684 1253 821 1328">Hotel/Motel/ Other Accommodation Services</td> <td data-bbox="821 1253 984 1328">1.2</td> <td data-bbox="984 1253 1146 1328">N/A 1.35</td> <td data-bbox="1146 1253 1272 1328">0.4</td> <td data-bbox="1272 1253 1446 1328">0.47 1.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="684 1328 821 1386">Maximum Combined FAR (Mixed Use)</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="821 1328 1146 1386">5.35</td> <td colspan="2" data-bbox="1146 1328 1446 1386">5.2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Table RZC 21.12.090 OV Floor Area					Use Types	OV 1/2/3/5 Base FAR	OV 1/2/3/5 FAR w/ TDR or GBP FAR w/ Incentive	OV 4 Base FAR	OV 4 FAR w/ TDR or GBP FAR w/ Incentive	Residential	2.5	N/A 1	2.5	N/A 1	Non-Residential for each non-residential use class	0.36	0.41 0.55	0.4	0.47 1.0	Hotel/Motel/ Other Accommodation Services	1.2	N/A 1.35	0.4	0.47 1.0	Maximum Combined FAR (Mixed Use)	5.35		5.2		
Table RZC 21.12.090 OV Floor Area																																
Use Types	OV 1/2/3/5 Base FAR	OV 1/2/3/5 FAR w/ TDR or GBP FAR w/ Incentive	OV 4 Base FAR	OV 4 FAR w/ TDR or GBP FAR w/ Incentive																												
Residential	2.5	N/A 1	2.5	N/A 1																												
Non-Residential for each non-residential use class	0.36	0.41 0.55	0.4	0.47 1.0																												
Hotel/Motel/ Other Accommodation Services	1.2	N/A 1.35	0.4	0.47 1.0																												
Maximum Combined FAR (Mixed Use)	5.35		5.2																													

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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>b. Definitions: https://www.redmond.gov/DocumentCenter/View/20210/21_78-Definitions. We would like to work with staff to understand and clarify several definitions that they propose to change. The proposed changes seek to add clarity to the definitions of specific uses, but may end up conflicting with existing city interpretations of allowed uses, again impacting projects in process that have relied on the City’s interpretation of its current definitions.</p>	
F. Definitions		
<p>F-1. ITE Manual (Nichols)</p>	<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>	<p>Opened 7/14, Closed 7/14</p>
G. Maintenance Program		
There are no questions for this component as of 8/25		
H. Annual Code Cleanup		
<p>H-1. Transit Route Changes and Relationship to Parking Reductions per State Legislation (East)</p>	<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></p>	<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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>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> <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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

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></p> <p>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></p> <p>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 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 	<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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>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>	
<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>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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<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>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</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; August 25, 2021; and September 8, 2021 discussions (Revised, 9/21)

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>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>I-5. Future Proofing of Structured/Internal Parking (Captain)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 9/8: Commission Captain requested additional information regarding “future proofing” as referred to with structured-internal parking. Commissioner Captain also requested amendment to development regulations to ensure a certain number of large-sized vehicle parking stalls within the mix of required on-site parking.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 9/8: Staff described “future proofing” as an engineering and design approach to the construction of structure parking that is internal to a building. The parking portions including ceiling height and access ramps would be constructed to allow for their reconfiguration to dwellings or employment space.</p> <p>Staff also noted that the Zoning Code currently includes standards for parking stall sizing. No modifications to this code section are proposed per the scope of RZC ReWrite Phase 1.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	<p>Opened 9/8, Closed 9/8</p>