

Subject: Code Re-Write

To: <planningcommission@redmond.gov>

Hello Planning Commission -

Please consider this note my input for your Code Re-Write Hearing:

Very simply, I'd like to see the City upzone the neighborhoods from R1 in certain zones....if that's what it takes to attract more affordable housing (and diversity.) [Public input for Vision 2050 suggested](#) we give the free market a chance to develop tri-levels and duplexes in our neighborhoods. I agree, and respectfully ask you to please zone accordingly. Thank you!

Be safe, Stay healthy,

--

Bob Yoder

redmondblog.org

From: Bob Yoder

Sent: Monday, September 20, 2021 2:14 PM

To: Planning Commission <planningcommission@redmond.gov>

Subject: Fwd: Code Re-Write

External Email Warning! Use caution before clicking links or opening attachments.

ERROR - I meant Triplexes, not Tri Levels.

Thank you,

Bob

----- Forwarded message -----

From: **Bob Yoder**

Date: Mon, Sep 20, 2021 at 11:18 AM

PROPOSED CHANGES FOR OVERLAKE ZONING CHANGES AND RZC DEFINITIONS

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.

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

OPTION 1 FOR OVERLAKE ZONING CHANGES

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.

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

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.

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.

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.

OPTION 2

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.

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
Non-Residential <i>Per Use Class</i>	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	

|

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.

Business and Service.

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.

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.~~

Retail Sales.

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.

Retail Sales represent a portion of ~~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.~~

Transportation, Communication, Information, and Utilities

~~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~~

Commented [KK1]: We deleted the former use classes as I found it confusing. These definitions are either no longer in the Code, which would make it difficult for a reader to understand the scope of the use, or would require the reader to research each former use class to make sure a use is considered business and service.

Commented [KK2]: We recommend adding "a portion of the Business Group B"... as you have in other sections that reference the Group B or other group occupancies to make clear that not all group b occupancies are business and service use class.

Commented [KK3]: For the same reason above, we recommend removal of the former use classes. It is a bit confusing.

Commented [KK4]: Each of these categories is already defined in the Code and are reasonably clear. I do not know if there is much benefit to combining these somewhat disparate uses into one larger category and creating sub-categories here. We recommend keeping the current definitions of transportation facility, communication and information use, and utilities.

If the City disagrees, we recommend the following changes in the body of the document.

Commented [KK5]: This explanation is a bit confusing as part of the code definition.

~~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.~~

~~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:~~

- ~~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. 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." However, the establishments in communication and information sub-category pertain to those that transform information into a commodity, 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. 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.~~
- ~~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.~~

~~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.~~

Commented [KK6]: This is generally what is in the LBCS and in the current code, so I added it back in.

Commented [KK7]: This is a broad range of uses, and some, such as cable networks, may have a few occupancy classes. As I mentioned above, occupancy can get confusing, so it may be best to remove from land use definitions. But, if they are included, it would be helpful to outline them all here as well.

Commented [KK8]: These uses, with the exception of truck and freight transportation that is covered in transportation establishments, were pulled into communication and information uses. Otherwise, these uses may not be specifically allowed if not called out as allowed in a zone.

From: [Gina Clark](#)
To: [Planning Commission](#)
Cc: [Kim Dietz](#)
Subject: RZC ReWrite Phase 1 Comments
Date: Monday, September 20, 2021 4:14:29 PM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)
[image002.png](#)
[image003.png](#)
[image004.png](#)
[image005.png](#)

External Email Warning! Use caution before clicking links or opening attachments.

Dear Chair Nichols and Redmond Planning Commissioners.

The 2,600 members of the Master Builders Association of King and Snohomish Counties (MBAKS) are committed to providing housing supply, choice, and affordability in the Puget Sound region, and thank the Planning Commission and staff for the opportunity to provide comment on Phase 1 of the Redmond Zoning Code Re-Write.

MBAKS is appreciative of the very large and challenging task before staff and city leadership with this phased re-write, and we thank staff for remaining in open and transparent communication throughout the entire process. This is not an easy lift, and we're grateful for the numerous briefings, information sharing, and educational opportunities to ask questions, clarify, and provide input.

Because of the robust stakeholder engagement, MBAKS has only one primary concern remaining for Phase 1 around owner occupancy and parking requirements for Attached Dwelling Units (ADUs). While MBAKS appreciates staff's efforts to update ADU occupancy requirements to reflect recent amendments in state legislation, MBAKS strongly opposes home owner occupancy requirements for any duration and urges the city to eliminate parking requirements for ADUs, or, in the alternative, adopt more flexible parking requirements for ADUs.

ADUs are an essential housing component for our overall housing inventory. ADUs provide additional housing units that are compatible with the look and scale of single-dwelling development, make more efficient use of existing housing stock and infrastructure, and provide a mix of housing options for a diverse population. There are many benefits to ADUs including making it easier for first-time buyers (including BIPOC homeownership) to qualify, renting out an ADU to provide additional income or help pay for a mortgage, enabling seniors to age in place, and expanding options for multigenerational living.

ADUs can also be sustainable, taking less footprint to build, employing green construction techniques or adding walkability to neighborhoods by preferring people and housing over cars, parking, and pavement.

[AARP: The ABCs of ADUs: A Guide to Accessory Dwelling Units and How They Expand Housing Options to People of All Ages](#)

[Enterprise Housing Solutions: Overcoming Barriers to Bringing Accessory Dwelling Unit Development to Scale](#)

Home owner occupancy requirements can create several barriers to production:

- If the owner wants a relative (such as a child or parent) to live in either the primary/ ADU unit while renting the other unit to a nonfamily member without them living in one of the units, they cannot.
- They can impact appraised home values since it limits the use of the property and the owner's ability to rent the primary and ADU units under a range of scenarios, such as inheriting a single-

family home with an ADU while living in a different home.

- If an owner is relocated for a job or military service, the home owner's property rights and ability to rent are impacted, as are the renter's if forced to relocate. A tough thing to do in today's housing market.

Jurisdictions have shown for many years that ADUs can meet all applicable design guidelines to blend seamlessly into neighborhoods. Carving out specific home owner occupancy requirements for a specific type of housing like ADUs would not be asked in the inverse of surrounding single-family homes and homeowners. For decades our communities have been protecting single-family neighborhoods through exclusive policies, zoning, and lending. We've made so much progress to move forward with so many inclusive housing zoning policies and programs. Let's continue to work together to eliminate more and remove the exclusive home owner occupancy requirement on ADUs.

[Forbes: How Systemic Racism Exists in U.S. Housing Policies](#)

In addition, being particularly mindful of not always requiring one or more off-street parking spots for ADUs is essential. Parking is extremely expensive to construct and can be an incredible deterrent to the construction of secondary dwelling units, creating financial and logistical challenges to the builder. Some ADU sites are often irregularly shaped, have size limitations, or have challenging topographic or physical characteristics like trees that make on-site parking very difficult. Many ADU occupants like seniors or students do not own cars or drive, lessening the need for permanent, on-site, dedicated spots, and some ADUs remove those dedicated spots by converting garages into the living spaces themselves. Jurisdictions often find parking requirements for ADUs are excessive. Studies conducted in Portland and the Bay Area showed that ADU households own an average of 0.9 cars each, half the national average of approximately 1.8 vehicles per household.

[Sightline: ADU Parking Quotas Are Climate Killers](#)

Solutions include eliminating the on-site parking requirements all-together near transit and for low-to-moderate income households, relaxing parking requirements to accommodate ADUs on more site-specific case-by-case basis, and considering shared parking arrangements with adjacent land uses during certain days/hours.

Cities like Seattle and Tacoma, and Portland and Tigard, OR saw increases in ADU production when they eliminated barriers to ADU production, like owner occupancy and parking requirements. [Since removing the owner occupancy and parking requirements](#) in 2019, [Seattle went from](#) 224 (109 attached, 115 detached) ADU permits in 2018 to 738 (317 attached, 421 detached) in 2020, a 229% increase. [Tacoma saw 148 permit applications](#) in 2020 after its [2019 permit reform](#) to remove owner occupancy and parking requirements. If Redmond's goal is to increase housing choice, supply, and affordability, then reducing barriers to ADU production is key, as was discovered by neighboring jurisdictions.

[Sightline: West Coast Cottage Reforms Lead to Explosive Rise in Permits](#) (See reforms also in Burien and Kirkland included in this article)

Thank you for your time. If you have any questions, comments, or need additional information, please reach out. I'm happy to answer or help provide what you might be looking for.

Sincerely,
Gina

Gina Clark | Government Affairs Manager, King County

p 425.460.8224 **c** 425.268.1156
335 116th Ave. SE, Bellevue, WA 98004



mbaks.com Find us on [f](#) [t](#) [in](#) [i](#)

We aspire to be the most trusted and respected housing experts in the Puget Sound region.