

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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
A. Format and Organization		
<p>A-1. Zoning Code Accessibility and Readability (Varadharajan)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p>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></p> <p>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></p> <p>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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
B. Residential Use Typology		
B-1. Design for Typography (Rajpathak)	<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>	Opened 8/25, Closed 8/25
B-2. Typology’s Relationship to Density (Varadharajan)	<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></p>	Opened 8/25, 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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	None	
B-3. Rezone R-1 Zoning Districts (Public Comment)	<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>	Opened 9/22, Closed 9/22
C. Nonresidential Allowed Uses		
C-1. Relationship of Zoning, Allowed Uses, and HOA Rules (Rajpathak)	<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>	Opened 8/25, 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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>8/25: Staff described that Homeowners’ Association (HOA) Covenants Conditions & Restrictions (CC&Rs) would remain in effect and enforceable.</p> <p>The CC&Rs, private rules that each private homeowner agrees to follow as a condition of purchasing a home in a particular development, can further restrict the allowance of certain activities on a privately owned lot. While the zoning districts and allowed uses address specific portions of the city, HOA CC&Rs add specificity within the development or subdivision.</p> <p>Negotiation regarding the CC&Rs would occur between the homeowner and the HOA as a civil matter. State laws regarding Homeowners’ Associations are available at Chapter 64.38 RCW.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	
<p>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></p> <p>10/27: Staff agrees with the recommended definitions provided by Ms. Kendall that refine the Technical Committee’s August 4, 2021 recommendations.</p> <p>Ms. Kendall’s also suggested omitting a portion of nonresidential use-based definitions that involve alignment with Redmond Building Code occupancy classifications. She noted that these cross-references could create inadvertent restrictions to the intended flexibility recommended by the Technical Committee. Staff also agrees with Ms. Kendall’s suggestion.</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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>For consistency across use-based definitions, the refinements below reflect the suggested omissions as well as Ms. Kendall’s requested modifications to the substantive portions of the use-based definitions:</p> <p><u>Transportation, Communication, Information, and Utilities.</u> <u>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 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.</u></p> <p><u>The following provides additional information for the Transportation, Communication, Information, and Utilities uses encompass several sub-categories of uses typically associated with this land use category:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <u>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).</u> • <u>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.</u> • <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.</u> <p><u>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,</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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>cable networks and distribution.</p> <p>Artisanal Manufacturing, Retail Sales, and Service. The Artisanal Manufacturing, Retail Sales, and Service use class, under the Manufacturing and Wholesale Trade use category, comprises businesses engaged in the independent, hand-crafted transformation of materials into finished products for the display and retail sale of those products within a building or structure, or a portion thereof. Activities include small-scale manufacturing as a result of which no impacts are imposed on adjacent uses or the City’s Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas by the retail sales of the manufactured goods or services such as repair or restoration of the manufactured goods. Example goods include books and designed paper products, musical instruments, jewelry, clothing, and textiles. Artisanal Manufacturing, Retail Sales, and Service does not include any activity relating to marijuana.</p> <p>Artisanal Manufacturing, Retail Sales, and Service represents the Mercantile Group M and Factory Group F occupancy classes of the Redmond Building Code or a combination of these occupancy classes, and a limited number of the 3000 Manufacturing and Wholesale Trade class of the Land Based Classification Standards, based on the hand-crafting activities taking place.</p> <p>Business and Service. The Business and Service use class, under the General Sales or Services use category, 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; is a use that provides administrative, professional, or service-type transactions, including storage of records and accounts, as well as the home businesses and mobile businesses and services providing these services.</p> <p>Business and Service represents 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> <p>Education Services. Establishments that offer teaching and learning activities or experiences, including preschools,</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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>grade schools, colleges and universities, and technical, trade, and other specialty schools.</p> <p>The Education use class represents Educational Group E occupancy class of the Redmond Building Code.</p> <p><u>Food and Beverage.</u> The Food and Beverage use class, under the General Sales or Services use category, comprises the former use classes of Full-Service Restaurant, Cafeteria or Limited-Service Restaurant, Bar or Drinking Place, Caterer, Food Service Contractor, as well as the drive-up stand businesses and mobile businesses providing these services.</p> <p>The Food and Beverage use class represents a portion of the Assembly Group A-2 occupancy class of the Redmond Building Code.</p> <p><u>Government Functions, Other and Administration.</u> The provision of governmental services not specifically identified elsewhere in these definitions. This definition includes military and national security functions and space research and technology when conducted by a government agency. <u>The Government and Administration use class includes the former Public Administration use class that comprised all government functions, including federal, state, and local government agencies that administer, oversee, and manage public programs or that have executive, legislative, or judicial authority; and legislative and executive offices, courts, and other government functions. This definition does not include correctional institutions, which are separately defined and regulated.</u></p> <p>The Government and Administration use class represents a portion of the Business Group B occupancy class of the Redmond Building Code.</p> <p><u>Institutional Health and Human Services.</u> A subset of Education, Public Administration, Health Care, and Other Institutions consisting of Institutional organizations providing a wide range of public health, wellness, and human services such as: Ambulatory or Outpatient Services; Nursing, Supervision, and Other Rehabilitative Services; Social Assistance, Welfare, and Charitable Services; Day Care Centers; and Family Day Care Providers.</p> <p>The Institutional Health and Human Services use class represents the Institutional Group I occupancy class of the Redmond Building Code.</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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><i>Pet and Animal Sales or and Service (Except Veterinary).</i> The retail sale of pets and other animals (except livestock) and the provision of pet or animal care services, such as grooming, training, sitting, boarding, and caretaking, <u>as well as the home businesses and mobile businesses providing these services.</u> This definition includes pet and pet supply stores but does not include veterinary services. <u>For Veterinary, refer to the Business and Service use class.</u></p> <p><u>The Pet and Animal Sales and Service use class represents the Business Group B and Mercantile Group M occupancy classes of the Redmond Building Code, based on the type of activities undertaken and services provided.</u></p> <p><i>Retail Sales.</i> <u>The Retail Sales use class, under the General Sales or Services use category, 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. 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, as well as the vending cart businesses and mobile businesses providing these services.</u></p> <p><u>Retail Sales represents 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.</u></p> <p>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. 	

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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

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

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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><u>Business and Service.</u></p> <p>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> <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 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.</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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

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. 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 <u>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 	

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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>moving forward.</p> <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</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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>months or more) rentals. The short-term rental occupancy requirement is recommended to remain though, also recommends allowance for the owner to occupy either the primary dwelling or the accessory dwelling unit.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	
<p>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>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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	
<p>D-3. Setback Provisions for Accessory Dwelling Units (Rajpathak)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 8/25: Commissioner Rajpathak asked whether the amendments regarding accessory dwelling units included reductions of setbacks such as from the parcel boundary. He noted the most parcels within the city are small and reduced setbacks would support more use of these lots.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 8/25: Staff described that the Technical Committee’s recommended amendments did not include modifications to setbacks for accessory dwelling units. The amendments include modifications to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calculation of maximum size for improved clarity; • Classification of short-term and long-term rental with long-term involving a contract for 12 months or more; • 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>	<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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>D-4. Accessory Dwelling Unit Occupancy and Parking (Public Comment)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <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></p> <p>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. 	<p>Opened 9/22, Closed 9/22</p>
E. Strategic Revisions		
<p>E-1. Parking Standards in the Downtown (East, Nichols)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p>7/14: Commission Vice-Chair East asked for information regarding the “net-net” of changes to parking requirements in the Downtown.</p>	<p>Opened 7/14, Closed 8/25</p>

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

Planning Commission Issues Matrix – including Commission’s July 14, 2021; August 25, 2021; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>Note: this question also refers to the Overlake and Marymoor Village Bridge Amendments</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> <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</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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>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> None</p>	
<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</p>	<p>Opened 7/14, Closed 9/22</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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>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; • 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. 	

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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>The sub-bullets within DT-31 that are not shaded in blue would continue to be relevant policies for Redmond Town Center. Please note that the open space will be retained as required mitigation from the RTC EIS that was associated with the 1995 Master Plan. However, the Master Plan itself has expired and no longer regulates the site.</p> <p>Policy DT-11 supports the provision of additional height in the Town Center zone in exchange for “exceptional public amenities.”</p> <p>The policy reads: Ensure that building heights in the Downtown respect views of tree lines and adjacent hillsides and contribute to the development of an urban place that feels comfortable for pedestrians. Achieve this by limiting building heights to five and six stories in general and by allowing exceptions <u>for additional height in a portion of the Town Center zone and elsewhere when accompanied by exceptional public amenities.</u></p> <p>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) 	

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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<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 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. • 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. 	

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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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></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> <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 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 style="padding-left: 40px;">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>	

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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<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 style="padding-left: 40px;">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.</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">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> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">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>	

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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<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 74th Street between 164th and 166th? 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. 	

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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

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

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

Planning Commission Issues Matrix – including Commission’s July 14, 2021; August 25, 2021; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>E-4. Floor Area Ratio Simplification (Public Comment)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p>9/22: 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.</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 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>Opened 9/8, Closed 9/22</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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status																																				
	<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="722 984 1661 1333"> <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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

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>	

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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status									
	<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> <table border="1" data-bbox="533 456 1331 716"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="533 456 800 532">Use Types</th> <th data-bbox="800 456 1064 532">OV 1/2/3/5</th> <th data-bbox="1064 456 1331 532">OV</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="533 532 800 609">Base Combined FAR (Mixed Use)</td> <td data-bbox="800 532 1064 609">3.7^{1, 2, 3}</td> <td data-bbox="1064 532 1331 609">2.9^{1, 2, 3}</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="533 609 800 716">Maximum Combined FAR (Mixed Use)</td> <td data-bbox="800 609 1064 716">5.35</td> <td data-bbox="1064 609 1331 716">5.2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	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	
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									

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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes					Status	
	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			
	<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:</p> <p>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>						

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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>“[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, 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>	

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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status																														
	<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="667 526 1430 828"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="5">Table RZC 21.12.090 OV Floor Area</th> </tr> <tr> <th>Use Types</th> <th>OV 1/2/3/5 Base FAR</th> <th>OV 1/2/3/5 FAR w/ TDR or GBP FAR w/ Incentive</th> <th>OV 4 Base FAR</th> <th>OV 4 FAR w/ TDR or GBP FAR w/ Incentive</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Residential</td> <td>2.5</td> <td>N/A 4</td> <td>2.5</td> <td>N/A 4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-Residential for each non-residential use class</td> <td>0.36</td> <td>0.41 0.55</td> <td>0.4</td> <td>0.47 1.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Hotel/Motel/ Other Accommodation Services</td> <td>1.2</td> <td>N/A 1.35</td> <td>0.4</td> <td>0.47 1.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Maximum Combined FAR (Mixed Use)</td> <td colspan="2">5.35</td> <td colspan="2">5.2</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <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>	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 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 4	2.5	N/A 4																												
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																													
F. Definitions																																
F-1. ITE Manual (Nichols)	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p>7/14: Commission Chair Nichols requested clarification of staff’s reference to the ITE Manual (The Institute of Transportation Engineers Trip Generation Manual).</p>	Opened 7/14, Closed 7/14																														

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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<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>	
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> 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 style="padding-left: 40px;"><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 style="padding-left: 40px;"><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</i></p>	<p>Opened 8/25, Closed 9/22</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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><i>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> <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>	

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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<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>	
I. Overlake (OV) and Marymoor Village (MDD) Bridge Amendments		
<p>I-1. Incentive Tier in OV and MDD Zoning Districts – Affordable Commercial, Local Commercial, and LEED Certification (Varadharajan, Nichols)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p>9/22: Commissioner Varadharajan requested refinement to references regarding Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) construction and provided supportive research and analysis to staff. She asked staff to adjust the incentives involving LEED to accommodate other industry standards, such as Living Building Challenge and Architecture 2030 Zero Code, that address operational offsets and the embodied carbon of construction material. Commissioner Varadharajan suggested that other standards could support increased alignment with the City’s Environmental Sustainability Action Plan and the Community Strategic Plan’s priorities.</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.</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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>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>10/27: Staff would like to thank Commissioner Varadharajan for her extensive research summation. It was very helpful for staff to receive additional insight into this topic.</p> <p>The bridge amendments, including the recommended updates to incentive tables, provide an interim regulatory structure. The amendments provide for near-term Overlake and Marymoor Village developments that are no longer able to occur in a manner fully envisioned by neighborhood goals and the community. Without this interim change, development of new housing and local commercial space might pause all together for two or more years, during which time Redmond 2050 and the Redmond Zoning Code ReWrite’s later phases will be underway. The bridge amendments are intended to be equal to or exceed, where possible, the current regulations, as an interim step only.</p> <p>Staff would like to clarify the intent of proposing the “LEED (or equivalent)” language. As mentioned in the previous Planning Commission meeting, LEED was used primarily for its name recognition, established standards, and its continuous evolution of updates to the program beginning in 1998. As such, the LEED program established checklists through which certification goals are met. These checklists can also be used for comparable programs with applicants/developers providing a side-by-side comparison of how the goals of any particular checklist are met or exceeded. Many of the programs that Commissioner Varadharajan provided appear to exceed LEED requirements, which is what the City’s intended goal would be. The use of LEED is not intended to be the beginning or the end of sustainable design and requirements. Its use is also not intended to limit the progress of green design or to represent all facets of sustainability. It is intended to provide a manageable and accessible framework that developers may implement and provide the City with verifiable certification.</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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>Presently, the City does not have a staff member dedicated to administering alternative or more progressive green building certification systems. Some of the alternative systems would require immediate amendment to the City’s Building Code (RBC) and are therefore, not possible at this time. Updates to the city’s green building code are in progress, though will also avoid recommending amendments that result in changes to the RBC. A more robust and permanent sustainability incentive package will be coming forward as part of the Redmond 2050 and related code amendments package in the next two years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Green building standards for Overlake will be considered in Phase 1 (adoption 2023); • Green building standards elsewhere will begin as part of the Redmond Zoning Code ReWrite Phase 2 (adoption 2024); and • Additional updates will be considered during Redmond 2050 Phase 2 (adoption 2024). <p>These upcoming efforts will include in-depth analysis of the topics and issues provided by the Planning Commission and identified in this issues matrix. The clear intent and goals, as described by Commissioner Varadharajan, will be reflected in recommended amendments to regulations and implementation techniques, as well as in resulting outcomes that help the City achieve and advanced meaningful levels of sustainability. During the next two years, the Technical Committee’s recommended amendments will continue supporting dense forms of development in the Overlake urban center and the Marymoor Design District. These will fulfill essential needs for affordable housing, strengthen economic vitality, and implement transit-oriented development.</p> <p>Commissioner Varadharajan provided additional information and clarified important aspects of intent and goals for this code section and the citywide program. Staff appreciates this extensive research and support of environmentally sustainable building construction. The following analysis represents three alternatives for the Commission’s consideration and recommendation:</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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes					Status
	Alternatives	Description	Benefits	Risks	Staff Recommendation	
	Alternative 1. Technical Committee’s Recommendation LEED Certification/Green Building Incentive	Maintain the Technical Committee’s recommendation for use of LEED Certification, Green Building Incentives, and Equivalent programs. Includes opportunity to introduce definition of <u>Green Building Rating and Certification System</u> (listed below).	Meets the intent the Environmental / Sustainability Action Plan. The recommendation ensure accessibility for the incentive structure and provides flexibility for use of alternative, equivalent programs. Introduces a definition of <u>Green Building Rating and Certification System</u> that can support the “equivalent” programs as listed in the Technical Committee’s recommendation.	Does not meet the interest expressed by the Planning Commission regarding advanced levels of environmental sustainability through the built environment. Identifies a certification system is that familiar to staff involved in development review and inspections.	Staff prefers this as an interim (short-term) approach, with recognition that additional work will be included during Redmond 2050: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Green building standards for Overlake will be considered in Phase 1 (adoption 2023) - Green building standards elsewhere will begin as part of the Redmond Zoning Code ReWrite Phase 2 - Additional green building standards elsewhere will be considered in Phase 2 (adoption 2024) 	
	Alternative 2. Proposed Refinements to Generalize Green Building Rating and Certification System	Remove references to LEED and replace with terminology shown in definition below. The onus would be on the certification system to prove that their system is effective.	Meets the intent the Environmental / Sustainability Action Plan and provides flexibility for use of equivalent programs.	Has not been vetted with project stakeholders and the community regarding the implementation approach. This might result in pausing	This alternative is not currently preferred due to the limited capacity of staff to obtain training, review related developments, and implement measures such as building inspections involving alternative programs. This is an area of focus for proposal as permanent	

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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes					Status
				development that can fulfill essential needs for affordable housing and strengthen economic vitality. Staff has not been trained or certified to support administration and promotion of programs beyond LEED.	City programming through the biennial budgeting process.	
	Alternative 3. Postpone LEED Certification/Green Building Incentive	Remove from the incentive tables rows involving LEED Certification/Green Building Incentive	Allows time for additional research and community involvement to identify certification programs and implementation approach.	Results in less construction of environmentally sustainable buildings until additional amendments are vetted and adopted into the Zoning Code.	This alternative is not preferred as it would omit opportunity for relevant construction using LEED Certification or equivalent green building incentive programs. Postponement would be anticipated until City Council’s action on Redmond 2050 during 2023.	
	<p>Staff also recommends including a new definition as follows for reference:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 21.78 Definitions shall include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Green Building Rating and Certification System. Green building rating or certification systems broaden the focus beyond the product to consider the project as a whole. Rating systems are a type of building certification system that rates or rewards relative levels of compliance or performance with specific environmental goals and requirements. Rating systems and certification systems are 					

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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status												
	<p>frequently used interchangeably. Green building rating and certification systems require an integrated design process to create projects that are environmentally responsible and resource-efficient throughout a building's life-cycle: from siting to design, construction, operation, maintenance, renovation, and demolition. While the philosophy, approach, and certification method vary across these the systems, a common objective is that projects awarded or certified within these programs are designed to reduce the overall impact of the built environment on human health and the natural environment. (Vierra, 2019)</p> <p>In addition, staff recommends refinement to Table 21.12.170A Priority Features and Incentives (Overlake) and Table 21.13.220A Features and Incentives (Marymoor Village) to remove the reference to LEED Silver:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="451 760 1711 1230"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" data-bbox="451 760 1711 841">Table 21.12.170A Priority Features and Incentives</th> </tr> <tr> <th data-bbox="451 841 802 922">Priority Feature</th> <th data-bbox="802 841 976 922">Applicable Zones</th> <th data-bbox="976 841 1711 922">Maximum Incentive Per Feature</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="451 922 802 963">...</td> <td data-bbox="802 922 976 963"></td> <td data-bbox="976 922 1711 963"></td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="451 963 802 1230">5. LEED Certification/Green Building (or Equivalent)</td> <td data-bbox="802 963 976 1230">1,2,3,4,5</td> <td data-bbox="976 963 1711 1230"> LEED Silver: Additional .25 FAR for residential uses. LEED Gold: Additional .25 FAR for residential uses and an additional .25 FAR for commercial uses. LEED Platinum: Additional .25 FAR for residential uses, additional .25 FAR for commercial, and one story height bonus for all buildings within the project limit. </td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Table 21.12.170A Priority Features and Incentives			Priority Feature	Applicable Zones	Maximum Incentive Per Feature	...			5. LEED Certification/Green Building (or Equivalent)	1,2,3,4,5	LEED Silver: Additional .25 FAR for residential uses. LEED Gold: Additional .25 FAR for residential uses and an additional .25 FAR for commercial uses. LEED Platinum: Additional .25 FAR for residential uses, additional .25 FAR for commercial, and one story height bonus for all buildings within the project limit.	
Table 21.12.170A Priority Features and Incentives														
Priority Feature	Applicable Zones	Maximum Incentive Per Feature												
...														
5. LEED Certification/Green Building (or Equivalent)	1,2,3,4,5	LEED Silver: Additional .25 FAR for residential uses. LEED Gold: Additional .25 FAR for residential uses and an additional .25 FAR for commercial uses. LEED Platinum: Additional .25 FAR for residential uses, additional .25 FAR for commercial, and one story height bonus for all buildings within the project limit.												

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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status						
	<p>Table 21.13.220A</p> <p>Features and Incentives</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="453 415 1675 561"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="453 415 804 532">Feature</th> <th data-bbox="804 415 1005 532">Applicable Performance Areas</th> <th data-bbox="1005 415 1675 532">Maximum Incentive</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="453 532 804 561">...</td> <td data-bbox="804 532 1005 561"></td> <td data-bbox="1005 532 1675 561"></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <hr/> <p>Increase ecological score to 35 by incorporating items 7 and 14, or item 13</p> <p><u>LEED Certification/Green Building (or Equivalent)</u></p> <p>1, 2, 4, 5 1, 2, 3, 4, 5</p> <p>Height: 1 story for buildings representing half of total gross floor area (MDD4 only). FAR: 0.2 each for residential (where allowed) and non-residential.</p> <p><u>LEED Silver: Additional .25 FAR for residential uses</u></p> <p><u>LEED Gold: Additional .25 FAR for residential uses and an additional .25 FAR for commercial uses.</u></p> <p><u>LEED Platinum: Additional .25 FAR for residential uses, additional .25 FAR for commercial, and one story height bonus for all buildings within the project limit.</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>	Feature	Applicable Performance Areas	Maximum Incentive	...			
Feature	Applicable Performance Areas	Maximum Incentive						
...								

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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<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 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. • Affordable Commercial/Local Business was first implemented through development agreements and has not been codified. Until additional work can be conducted, staff recommends maintaining the recommended second-tier approach and incentive program. The second-tier approach allows private developers some flexibility while they determine how to implement in their leasing program. This first step toward codification, as currently recommended, can inform future additions and refinements to policy and code. This approach also allows for community conversation during Redmond 2050 including whether the concept is further emphasized as a priority for the City as well as how it potentially relates to leasing agreements with local, non-profit organizations. <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	

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

Planning Commission Issues Matrix – including Commission’s July 14, 2021; August 25, 2021; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
I-2. Height in Relationship to Light and Airspace (Shefrin)	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 8/25: Commissioner Shefrin asked if development typically maximized its development potential and how that would relate to light access and airspace in the vicinity.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 8/25: Staff noted that it is typical of development to maximize its potential as allowed by code. Additional density is not recommended as part of this amendment and would retain consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code. The current floor area ratios (FAR) for the Overlake zoning districts would remain the same and is only recommended for reorganization, for clarity purposes.</p> <p>Overtime, developments taking advantage of above-grade, interior parking could convert parking areas to residential units provided that the amount of remaining parking continued to meet the site-specific off-street parking demand.</p> <p>The Technical Committee’s recommendation to RZC 21.12.100 OV (Overlake) Building Height for those developments taking advantage of the height transfer associated with verified high-water tables includes the requirement of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “A shadow study to identify impacts to open spaces, public areas, and neighboring developments;” <p>Staff also described that development of sites of three or more acres involve a master plan. The master plan also requires a height and shadow study.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	Opened 8/25, 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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>I-3. EV Charging for Above-Grade, Interior Parking (Varadharajan)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 8/25: Commissioner Varadharajan asked whether EV Charging stations could continue to be installed when parking is provided above-grade and interior to the building.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 8/25: Staff confirmed that there were no recommendations to amend nor anticipated impacts to the provisions of section RZC 21.40.030 Electric Vehicle Charging Stations (Citywide Parking Standards).</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	<p>Opened 8/25, Closed 8/25</p>
<p>I-4. Relationship of Code Amendments to Neighborhood Planning (Nichols, Varadharajan)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 8/25: Commission Chair Nichols asked what the relationship of the recommended code amendments are to the upcoming neighborhood planning process in Overlake and Marymoor Village. Commissioner Varadharajan also asked what the timeline is for the amendments, including to height, to become effective.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 8/25: Staff described how the recommended amendments function like a pilot effort, are in partnership with and supportive of the policy planning process, and help prepare the neighborhood for changes as an outcome of the neighborhood plan. The plans for Overlake and Marymoor Village are anticipated for Council action in two and three years, respectively. The recommended amendments to the code would be established and implemented during one to two years until the respective neighborhood plans became effective. The amendments to the code, currently before the Commission, are anticipated for Council action in March of 2022 and would become effective 11 days thereafter.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	<p>Opened 8/25, Closed 8/25</p>

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

Planning Commission Issues Matrix – including Commission’s July 14, 2021; August 25, 2021; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<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>
<p>J. Parking for Affordable Housing Units</p>		
<p>J-1. Confirm Total Housing Costs including Parking for Affordable Housing Units (Nichols)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> 9/22: Commissioner Nichols encouraged staff to clarify and confirm the total costs associated with units for affordable housing residences. In response to A Regional Coalition for Housing’s (ARCH), July 8, 2021 Executive Board Meeting, Commissioners requested additional information regarding parking costs and allowances for such costs as related to affordable units.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 10/27: Affordable housing units provide rental or ownership housing for households whose annual income is 80 percent or less than the area median income. Housing expenses are not to exceed 30 percent of the monthly household income. Parking is important for 91% of ARCH tenants, enabling residents’ access to jobs, school, and other locations that are not otherwise accessible. Therefore, parking is an essential component of housing expenses.</p>	<p>Opened 9/22</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; September 8, 2021; and September 22, 2021 discussions

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>The City and ARCH ensure that the total costs of housing remain affordable to residents through operational procedures such as the review of applications for new development and in the form of covenants. Staff will continue to administer project review per the City’s development regulations whereby reinforcing and limiting housing costs for the intended households. Additional confirmation and clarification of development regulations will be included during the next available amendment series to the Redmond Zoning and Municipal Codes.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> None</p>	

References

Vierra, S. (2019). Green Building Standards and Certification Systems. *Whole Building Design Guide*, Resource Pages.