

| Issue | Discussion Notes | Issue Status |
|--|--|--|
| HOUSING 1.0 | | |
| <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 |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| | 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>9. Implications of allowing by-right multiplexes in residential areas. (HO-8) (Nichols)</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 |

| Issue | Discussion Notes | Issue Status |
|--|---|--------------------|
| HOUSING 2.0 Language Changes | | |
| <p>1. "Green" retrofits for housing. (New - HO-XXX) (Aparna)</p> | <p><u>Commission Discussion</u> Commissioners asked that support for environmentally friendly retrofits for homes be represented in the policies. Either as part of existing policy or as a new policy.</p> <p>Commissioners noted that home repair programs are identified in draft policies, but retrofit programs are not.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u></p> | <p>Opened 8/24</p> |
| <p>2. Impact of short-term rentals on housing supply. (New - HO-XXX) (Aparna , Gliboff)</p> | <p><u>Commission Discussion</u> Commissioners asked that policies exploring addressing the housing constraint issues caused by short term rentals be included in the policies.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u></p> | <p>Opened 8/24</p> |

| Issue | Discussion Notes | Issue Status |
|--|---|--------------------|
| <p>3. Condominium Support (New - HO-XXX) (Aparna, Gliboff , Weston)</p> | <p><u>Commission Discussion</u> Commissioners discussed opportunities to strengthen City policy direction to support the creation of condominiums in the City. Commissioners noted that condominium production is an equity issue and warrants strong, proactive policy support. Consideration for tools like incentives.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u></p> | <p>Opened 8/24</p> |
| <p>4. EV Charging Support for Multifamily/Mixed-Use (New - HO-XXX) (Gliboff)</p> | <p><u>Commission Discussion</u> Commissioners discussed opportunities to expand electric vehicle charging station opportunities at multifamily and mixed-use developments.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u></p> | <p>Opened 8/24</p> |
| <p>5. Confusing language (HO-6) (Van Niman)</p> | <p><u>Housing HO-6</u> Identify and implement strategies to meet affordable housing targets identified in the King County Countywide Planning Policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emphasize the creation of affordable homes when meeting housing targets. • <u>Prioritize housing affordable to households at or below 30 percent AMI.</u> • Adapt to changing conditions and new information when adopted strategies are insufficient for meeting the countywide need and advancing other housing objectives. • Adapt to changing conditions and new information when adopted strategies result in the perpetuation of the inequitable distribution of affordable housing. • Identify, <u>prioritize</u>, and implement <u>with urgency</u>, opportunities to rezone low-density residential zones to higher-density zones, <u>for areas outside of agricultural preservation areas and critical areas.</u> • Pursue strategies to meet unique needs for both ownership and rental housing. <p><u>Commission Discussion</u> Commissioners expressed desire to explore whether the language of the added bullet, which prioritizes households at 30 percent AMI, could be made clearer. Opportunity to spell out “AMI” term.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u></p> | <p>Opened 8/24</p> |
| <p>6. Appropriate section for this policy.</p> | <p><u>Housing HO-10</u> <u>Foster the creation of 10-minute walkable communities through housing, transportation,</u></p> | <p>Opened 8/24</p> |

| Issue | Discussion Notes | Issue Status |
|---|--|--------------------|
| <p>(HO-10) (Weston)</p> | <p><u>economic planning, to create clustered places where residents have easy access to homes, jobs, and recreation.</u></p> <p><u>Commission Discussion</u> Commissioners discussed whether this walkable policy would be more appropriate in the environmental section of the Housing policies.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u> Need to add “and” between “transportation,” and “economic planning”.</p> | |
| <p>7. Text clarity, historical context. (HO-19) (Weston)</p> | <p><u>Housing HO-19</u> Implement strategies to reduce development costs, streamline city processes, and develop standard operational practices to increase the quantity, affordability, and timeliness of new housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Review and update development standards and regulations to add clarity and minimize unnecessary housing development costs. • Update design standards to streamline development review and achieve superior design. • Regularly assess development review processes to identify opportunities for increased efficiencies. • Add criteria to Redmond Municipal Code to allow for implementation of impact fee waivers for affordable housing. • Develop strategies to increase the supply of affordable housing including development fee payment deferral options for ADUs and changes to existing density incentives to prioritize the provision of housing at the deepest levels of affordability. • <u>Create flexible design standards to accommodate the wide variety of architectural preferences in the community.</u> • <u>Structure design standards to ensure that new growth is developed in a manner to create equitable communities</u> • <u>Revise the processes and practices of the design review process and remove capacity to prevent creation of housing projects.</u> <p><u>Commission Discussion</u> Commissioners expressed interest in revising the language of the “Revise the processes...” bullet point text to improve clarity. Commissioners expressed interest in the historical context of what specific processes and practices of the design review process have been used to create housing projects (ex/ aesthetics? Environmental? Etc.). Potentially revise policy language to target those specific</p> | <p>Opened 8/24</p> |

| Issue | Discussion Notes | Issue Status |
|--|--|--------------------|
| | <p>processes and practices.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u></p> | |
| <p>8. Stronger word than “encourage” (HO-20) (Van Niman)</p> | <p><u>Housing HO-20</u> Explore using programs that require or encourage public agencies, private property owners, and developers to build housing that helps fulfill City housing policy goals.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identify and implement policies, programs, and regulations that facilitate and support homeownership opportunities. • Evaluate the use of financial assistance, property tax relief, and measures to increase housing supply and diversity. • <u>Encourage a shared responsibility among the private and public sectors for addressing affordable housing needs through programs such as, but not limited to, programs for commercial development to contribute funds toward affordable housing goals.</u> • <u>Explore opportunities to support the production of cooperative housing.</u> <p><u>Commission Discussion</u> Commissioners expressed interest in more proactive language than “encourage”.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u></p> | <p>Opened 8/24</p> |
| <p>9. Expansion of policy to all residential types. Consider specifying reduction in natural gas. (HO-23) (Gliboff, Aparna, Weston)</p> | <p><u>Housing HO-23</u> Increase energy efficiency requirements and/or incentives for larger mixed-use and multifamily units to, <u>among other environmental factors,</u> reduce energy consumption, reduce greenhouse gas emissions, reduce secondary pollution, <u>increase water conservation, increase renewable energy share,</u> and increase indoor air quality.</p> <p><u>Commission Discussion</u> Commissioners discussed expanding the policy to include all residential types, rather than just mixed-use and multifamily.</p> <p>Commissioners noted that natural gas is a contributor to climate change. Commissioners discussed possibility of specifying support for electrification and reduction in natural gas use.</p> | <p>Opened 8/24</p> |

| Issue | Discussion Notes | Issue Status |
|--|---|--------------|
| | Staff Comments | |
| 10. Language clarity. (HO-25) (Van Niman) | Housing HO-25 Identify and explore energy benchmark tracking for building energy performance. Commission Discussion Commission interested in discussing potential language revisions to improve clarity. Staff Comments | Opened 8/24 |