

Issue	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
HOUSING		
<p>1. Add multiplexes to our definitions. (PC Direction) (East)</p>	<p><u>Commission Discussion</u> Commissioners asked that terms for housing typologies, like multiplex, be clear and consistent, and have a definition. Commissioners asked staff to use terms that readers would understand, and where possible to add illustrations or renderings. Commissioners were interested in terms that are used by developers and builders. Commissioners agreed that terms with a meaning in state law should have the same meaning in the Redmond Comprehensive Plan where applicable.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u> “Multiplex” and other key terms will be added to the glossary component of the Comprehensive Plan. In addition, key terms can be defined and placed into the final text of each element. Final definition will be developed in collaboration with Community Development and Implementation (CDI) planners.</p> <p>Discussion: Does the commission have a preference on the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Define multiplex as a catch-all term of a housing typology which includes all types (duplex, triplex, fourplex, etc). OR 2. Define multiplex as a housing typology of “5-or-more dwelling units”. Policy language would list which specific types of plex. Example: Policy X applies only to duplexes. Policy Y applies to duplexes, triplexes, fourplex, and multiplexes. <p>The existing “multiplex” definition per the Comprehensive Plan Glossary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • “A structure that is a two-unit, three-unit or four-unit attached dwelling, and may also be known as a duplex, triplex or fourplex. Multiplex units may be side by side or on top of one another” 	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 2/23</p>
<p>2. Design review process: how can we ensure that building designs end up reflecting the community preferences? (HO-9) (East)</p>	<p><u>Commission Discussion</u> Commissioners asked that changes to the design review process are precise and thoughtful. Commissioners want to avoid having design review be utilized to stop projects, which is not its purpose. Commissioners asked staff to study other jurisdictions with great design outcomes. Commissioners agreed that flexibility can be valuable in producing different design outcomes.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u></p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 2/23</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p>This policy provides high-level guidance and emphasis for reviewing the design review process, but the detailed work of actual changes will be conducted outside the scope of the Comprehensive Plan update.</p> <p>The City of Redmond design review process reviews projects for their aesthetic, architectural, or other design considerations. Design review focuses on the appearance of new construction, site planning, and such concerns as landscaping, signage, and other aesthetic issues.</p> <p>One method of ensuring that building designs end up reflecting the community preferences is through updates to the process. Draft 1.0 policy HO-9 reflects this: “Update design standards to streamline development review and achieve superior design.” A faster review process means that developments will be more agile in responding to changing community preferences.</p>	
<p>3. How do design standards handle growth and make livable communities? (General Discussion) (East)</p>	<p><u>Commission Discussion</u> Commissioners agreed with staff conclusions.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u> This policy provides high-level guidance and emphasis for reviewing and potentially updating design standards, but the detailed work of actual changes will be conducted outside the scope of the Comprehensive Plan update.</p> <p>Accommodating growth will mainly be achieved through zoning regulations. Sufficient land must be zoned to accommodate the City’s growth targets. Most new development is subject to design standards that address the variety of building typologies needed in a growing community.</p> <p>Design standards are one tool to ensure that the new growth is developed in a manner to create livable communities, recognizing that there are a wide variety of architectural preferences in the community. One component of “livable communities” is equity. Creating accessible communities based on universal design principles helps ensure that all members of our community can enjoy and use the built environment.</p> <p>Draft 1.0 policy HO-9 provides the City with policy direction to pursue superior design. On-going community engagement combined with planning best practices will help create livable communities as Redmond accommodates growth.</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 2/23</p>
<p>4. What are examples of the home repair assistance</p>	<p><u>Commission Discussion</u> Commissioners expressed support for assistance programs. Commissioners want City programs</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 2/23</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p>programs? (HO-13) (East)</p>	<p>need to be communicated more effectively to the population so that people can make use of the programs.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u> City of Seattle: Home Repair Loan Program (HRLP) provides affordable loans to income-qualified homeowners to address critical health, safety, and structural issues. The program is designed for owner-occupied, single-family homes with low- to moderate-income households. The no interest loans are funded by local and federal programs that prioritize repairs that address health and safety concerns.</p> <p>Washington State: Home Rehabilitation Loan Program (HRLP) provides deferred loans to rural, low-income households that need repairs and improvements on their primary residence for health, safety, or durability. Eligibility is based on income (roughly 200% poverty which varies for household size) and location. Funding for the loan program comes from the Washington State Capital Budget.</p>	
<p>5. How can we get affordability from condos? Will condos be too expensive or too luxurious? What about other missing middle forms? (HO-4 through HO-8) (Aparna)</p>	<p><u>Commission Discussion</u> Commissioners want policies and actions that create more condominium housing units to provide more housing choices to the community. Commissioners asked staff about state laws that impede condominium development. Commissioners asked staff how affordability requirements apply to condominiums. Commissioners identified the tension between wealth building through homeownership and housing affordability.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u> Affordability (housing affordable to households earning 80% or less of the area median income) for condominiums and missing middle housing types will generally come from Redmond’s inclusionary zoning requirements. However, condos and missing middle typologies will also provide less expensive housing choices compared to detached single family homes.</p> <p>Currently, condominiums listed in Redmond range in price from around \$300,000 to upwards of \$800,000 depending on factors like size, condition, and location. Even expensive condominium units can still contribute to lessening regional housing unaffordability because there is a significant deficit of housing units. Adding any type of new housing will help alleviate the pricing pressure that comes from high demand and low supply.</p> <p>Development of condominiums in Washington state has been difficult in part due to state liability</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 2/23</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p>laws and related financing challenges. Senate Bill 5334 passed in 2019 and made changes that reduce builder and condominium owner association liability. All else being equal, this is expected to increase the development of condominiums.</p> <p>Condominiums built in Redmond will contain affordable units. All developments over 10 units must contain some amount of affordable units (the amount varies by the level of affordability). Although there are alternative compliance options to the inclusion of affordable units, historically the City has preferred on-site units. Affordable unit owners are allowed to sell the house at more than the initial purchase price, however that amount is limited by resale covenants administered by ARCH.</p>	
<p>6. How can we incorporate resilient and sustainable, building materials across the design standards for all structures? (HO-9) (Aparna)</p>	<p><u>Commission Discussion</u> Commission interested in collaborating with developers to receive their input.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u> Draft 1.0 policy HO-9 reflects provides policy direction to update design standards to superior design. Planning staff are discussing possible comprehensive plan locations for policies related to building performance, design standards, and other related topics since those topics transcend housing.</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 2/23</p>
<p>7. Want conversation on design standards to include the organizations that do the actual development building. Want all stakeholders involved with improving the process. (HO-9) (Captain)</p>	<p><u>Commission Discussion</u> Commission interested in collaborating with developers to receive their input.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u> Long Range Planning staff will coordinate with Community Development and Implementation (CDI) planners to ensure stakeholders are meaningfully engaged in any revision of design standards and design review processes.</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 2/23</p>
<p>8. Make language simpler and easier to understand, be effective and equitable communicators. In the past, the ADU updates were not well understood by the community. (PC Direction) (Captain)</p>	<p><u>Commission Discussion</u> Commission wants to make technical documents more accessible. Illustrations desired where possible. Commission interested in tools to facilitate communication, such as dynamic mapping tools for people to determine if their property is eligible for multiplex structures and ADUs.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u> Long Range Planning staff will coordinate with Community Development and Implementation (CDI) planners to ensure codes, programs, standards, and other materials include language</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 2/23</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p>9. Implications of allowing by-right multiplexes in residential areas. (HO-8) (Nichols)</p>	<p>developed with equity and accessibility. City is simplifying language to minimize jargon. City is also developing other tools to help communication, such as renders of various housing types.</p> <p><u>Commission Discussion</u> Commission asked if it was likely that, even if barriers are removed, most structures would stay as detached single-family homes. Commission expressed interest in geographic equity with respect to multiplex structures. Commission asked staff what a single-family zone would look like if multiplex structures are allowed by right.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u> One implication is that there would likely be a small increase in density for the single-family zones. Per the community engagement from the Housing Action Plan questions on multiplex structures (and ADUs), respondents were somewhat concerned with parking and traffic as a result of additional growth in neighborhoods. Other potential impacts from growth could be infrastructure impacts and regional service impacts (like schools).</p> <p>By code, various multiplex structures are already allowed across single-family zones. However, there are policy and regulatory barriers that restrict or inhibit construction. For example, underlying density requirements, design standards, numerical limits, and separation requirements all limit multiplex construction.</p> <p>The aesthetics of single-family home zones would largely remain the same. Per the Housing Action Plan, in 2019 approximately 0.4% of the housing units in Redmond were duplexes, triplexes, or quadplexes. This suggests there would be minimal construction of multiplex structures if policy HO-8 and supporting regulations were adopted. In addition, there are various City requirements for multiplex structures to take on the appearance of detached single-family homes.</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 2/23</p>
<p>10. ADA compliant sidewalks : general explanation. (General Discussion) (HO-7) (Nichols)</p>	<p><u>Commission Discussion</u> Commission asked staff to approach solutions for sidewalks from design and maintenance perspectives. Commission noted that some sidewalks in the City are hazardous, even in great weather conditions. Snowed and iced over sidewalks pose a significant mobility barrier, which is an equity issue. Commission asked staff if fourplexes trigger ADA compliance requirements.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u> The federal Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) creates the framework for required design standards to ensure access to a wide variety of people. ADA compliance and universally designed sidewalks foster more usable and equitable communities. For example, Redmond's</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 2/23</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p>Urban Center design standards for Downtown includes “The finish floor of the ground floor unit designated for ADA (Americans with Disabilities Act) accessibility may have a front door at the same grade as the street sidewalk.” ADA compliance triggers for single-family style homes with four or more dwelling units.</p> <p>Stakeholders expressed interest in going above and beyond ADA compliance and considering ways to improve the experience of all users. Universal Design is the design of products and environments to be usable by all people, to the greatest extent possible, without the need for adaptation or specialized design. We’ll be looking at usability and universal design as we update our streetscape standards.</p> <p>HO-7 seeks to increase the supply and diversity of housing types near employment centers and transit stations. Increasing efficient and equitable pedestrian movement will be especially important in these areas, which are by their design less auto centric.</p>	
<p>11. Regional Collaboration. (General Discussion) (HO-19 through HO-22) (Nichols)</p>	<p><u>Commission Discussion</u> Commission wants two-way communication with partners where Redmond can share successes and challenges with other entities to increase regional knowledge and increase collaborative efficiencies.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u> Regional collaboration on implementation could take many forms. For example, the City currently has a formal interlocal agreement with other East King County jurisdictions to form A Regional Coalition for Housing (ARCH) to preserve and develop affordable housing. ARCH and the City collaborate through an exchange of staff services, for example ARCH monitoring and managing affordable housing. The City and other member jurisdictions of ARCH contribute funds that are leveraged for affordable housing projects.</p> <p>Other partnerships could take a more casual structure. For example, regular coordination between Redmond and Bellevue planning staff to coordinate housing planning efforts in Overlake. Other examples could be participating in regional boards or continued conversations with housing developers, non-profits, and human service providers.</p>	<p>Opened 2/9 Closed 2/23</p>
<p>12. Discussion of water conservation and renewable energy in context of HO-17, which concerns energy efficiency.</p>	<p><u>Commission Discussion</u> Commission asked staff to expand HO-17 to include water conservation and renewable energy. Commission satisfied with staff response.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u></p>	<p>Opened 3/9 Closed 3/23</p>

Issue	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
(Aparna)	Staff affirmed that suggested language can be added. Intent is to promote any and all sustainable building practice, not to exclude any items missing from the specific list of sustainable topics listed in the policy.	
13. Allowance of cottages in neighborhoods other than Education Hill (N-EH-16). (Aparna)	<p><u>Commission Discussion</u> Commission asked staff if cottages will be allowed in neighborhoods other than Educational Hill. Commission satisfied with staff response.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u> Staff affirmed that at the Comprehensive Plan policy level cottages will be allowed in all neighborhoods. Intent of the Housing Element and associated element policy updates is to provide expanded housing choices across the City.</p>	Opened 3/9 Closed 3/23
14. Location for policies related to housing for people experiencing homelessness. (HO-5, HO-20) (Aparna)	<p><u>Commission Discussion</u> Commission interested in the location of policies focusing on homelessness. Commission satisfied with staff response.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u> Staff have approached policies related to homelessness by organizing the policies, mainly, across the Housing Element and the Human Services Element. The more tangible, building stock, policies are located in the Housing Element. This includes the factors that contribute to homelessness, such as an unaffordable housing. Homelessness is discussed in HO-5 and HO-20.</p> <p>The programmatic and service-oriented homelessness policies will be located in the Human Services Element. The Human Services Element will be brought to the Planning Commission as part of Redmond 2050 Phase 2.</p>	Opened 3/9 Closed 3/23