

Overlake Code Testing Phase Comments

Comments received from Nov 2022 - Feb 2023 are summarized below. They are grouped by topic and are paraphrased; similar comments have been combined for brevity and ease of response.

Note: Developer forums have been scheduled for March, April, and May of 2023 to continue refinement of the code updates prior to Planning Commission and City Council review and adoption. For more information, see the calendar of events posted on the Redmond 2050 [Get Involved](#) page.

For additional information on the code revisions that went through testing and other Overlake related updates, click on the links in the box or visit the [Overlake Updates](#) page. Additional feedback or questions can be provided on the [LetsConnect Discussion Forum](#) or sent to Beckye Frey, Principal Planner, at bfrey@redmond.gov.

Overlake Code Testing:

- [Restructuring RZC 21.12](#)
- [Zoning District and Development Standards](#)
- [Uses](#)
- [Incentive Package](#)
- [Design Guidelines](#)
- [Streets/Transportation](#)

Provide Additional Feedback
on [LetsConnect](#)

Contents

Reorganization of Code.....	2
Zoning Districts.....	2
Uses.....	2
Development Standards.....	3
Overlake Design Guidelines.....	3
Incentive Program.....	4
General Comments / Confusion.....	4
Structural Feedback.....	7
Affordable Housing Incentives.....	9
Inclusive / Universal Community.....	10
Anti-Displacement / Relocation.....	11
Open Space and Amenities.....	12
Public and Community Services.....	13
Building, Site, Form, and Use Incentives.....	13
Green Building standards.....	14
Other.....	15
Streets/Transportation.....	16
Other.....	16

Reorganization of Code

Minimal feedback on the restructuring proposed, with comments supportive of the direction.

Overlake Code Testing Phase Comment Matrix

#	Comment	Response
1	<p>Code Transparency / Clarity</p> <p>Use precise code language that will avoid post-adoption confusion and administrative interpretations.</p> <p>Specific concern related to housing types and potential conflicts with FHA or other codes.</p>	<p>Staff agrees with this goal. Improvements in this regard are an overarching goal and long-term work program for staff</p> <p>Comment has been relayed to the RZCRW team.</p>

Zoning Districts

Minimal feedback on the zoning district revisions, with all supporting of current direction.

#	Comment	Response
2	<p>Zoning Districts</p> <p>Keep the current proposal for three districts (one discussion item was if we should consider having only one district for property within the Metro Center).</p> <p>Support for the Urban Multifamily district being a “light” mixed-use district.</p>	<p>No change needed.</p>
3	<p>Metro Center Boundary</p> <p>No objection to expanding, but concern about impacts to surrounding neighborhoods. Consider lower height/intensity limits and buffering where Metro Center meets the neighboring low-density residential districts.</p>	<p>OVMF district is intended to have buffering and lower building forms to reduce impacts on the boundary edges.</p>

Uses

#	Comment	Response
4	<p>Stand Alone Multifamily</p> <p>Why not allow stand-alone MF?</p> <p>What is the definition for Mixed-Use?</p>	<p>The community expressed concern for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need for non-residential uses to have a complete community • Displacement of existing businesses, and need for new spaces for them to go into so they can stay (potentially) in Overlake • Market factors are pushing housing now, but the need for services and non-residential uses is a long-term need <p>Staff is working on revisions to clarify the definition of Mixed-Use.</p>

Development Standards

#	Comment	Response
5	<p>OVMF Standards</p>	<p>Staff is reviewing comment. Minimum standards will be evaluated in the Preferred Alternative.</p>

Overlake Code Testing Phase Comment Matrix

	Should minimum be three stories?	
6	Raise the Base FAR Need to make higher density development easier to do	That is proposed.

Overlake Design Guidelines

#	Comment	Response
7	<p>20 ft Min Ground Floor</p> <p>Several comments expressing concerns about a 20ft first floor minimum. Some suggested a 14 ft minimum. One suggestion was to incorporate a percentage so that not all the first floor needed the additional height.</p> <p>Consider an optional incentive for flexibility and resiliency of spaces/uses over time.</p> <p>Concern about potential conflict with Fire Code requirements</p> <p>Ground floor space is often determined by parking geometry, and leftover spaces, which may not work well for retail, etc.</p>	Staff is reviewing comments and will have a revision to this requirement in future drafts.
8	<p>Stepbacks</p> <p>Stepbacks and 4th floor is not “market” and would impact affordable housing.</p> <p>Consider flexibility and/or consider at 3rd floor so it is above the concrete podium and not impacting the wood framing stories.</p>	Staff is reviewing options to increase flexibility while still meeting the goals of the stepbacks.
9	<p>Materials Flexibility</p> <p>Concerns about use of low-quality materials, “cheap metal”, and “cheap windows” and the impacts to the neighborhood over the lifetime of the building.</p> <p>Instead of eliminating lower cost materials (cementitious panels, etc.), consider impacts on affordability of construction.</p>	<p>During community visioning conversations on design elements, concerns about low-quality materials was one of the most frequent comments from the community related to recent development. Impacts to the community when those materials deteriorate over time is a concern.</p> <p>Staff is looking at ways to modify materials requirements to allow lower cost materials with specific limitations on placement, etc., allow some use but in ways that will mitigate the negative impacts (weathering and other issues that cause increased costs and environmental impacts over the lifetime of the project).</p>
10	<p>Towers</p> <p>Define Towers - how many stories?</p> <p>Tower construction is significantly more expensive - not</p>	Staff reviewing comments.

Overlake Code Testing Phase Comment Matrix

	<p>feasible in today's market.</p> <p>Consider larger maximum floorplates to increase rentable space / potential housing units.</p> <p>Tower spacing /separation and maximum floorplates are often the result of areas with small lots and many towers. As a new product in an areas with large lots, may not need these limitations.</p>	
11	<p>General / Design</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Intention and categories are great • Level of specificity concerned • Don't homogenize - middle 20% of design there is no exceptional architecture • Encourage creative design / creating interesting places 	Staff is reviewing this comment.

Incentive Program

NOTE: Most comments received were related to the incentive program. There was a lot of confusion and misunderstanding. We'll address these higher-level concerns before diving into the specific comments. In several responses below we reiterate that the incentive program is optional. Development can occur without the use of incentives. The City's goal is to right-size the program and that includes right-sizing the base development standards.

General Comments / Confusion

#	Comment	Response
12	<p>Green Building Confusion</p> <p>The bridge amendments, the Redmond 2050 updates, and the Redmond Zoning Code Rewrite (RZCRW) all have a piece related to green building. This created significant confusion in late 2022, especially at the workshop and at Planning Commission.</p>	<p>In response to comments received, the bridge amendment revision to fix an error was dropped. The Overlake incentive program will remain as is until the Redmond 2050 updates replace it. The bridge amendments were always intended to be temporary and be replaced with the new incentive package.</p> <p>The Redmond 2050 green building updates are only for Overlake. The RZCRW is developing programmatic updates for other areas of the city (i.e., not Overlake).</p>
13	<p>Scope and Timing</p> <p>Due to the scale of change, some developers are concerned about projects currently in review or about to submit under current codes. We received multiple requests to consider a phased implementation so that projects that are already started can be completed under the current code.</p>	Discussions about change in Overlake have been underway for a few years. At the same time, we recognize that there will always be "edge" cases. Staff is open to reviewing the vesting process and considering options for projects underway.
14	Confusing / Priorities Unclear	The testing phase was intended to get feedback that would narrow

Overlake Code Testing Phase Comment Matrix

#	Comment	Response																																			
	<p>Many reviewers stated that the lack of points made it hard for them to comment on how it would impact them and found it difficult to digest.</p> <p>Not clear on what the highest priorities are.</p>	<p>the items included and provide input on the prioritization, effectiveness, etc. that would then be combined with a consultant review of the costs and benefits of each item and result in points assigned to each item.</p> <p>The next version of the incentive program will include a narrowed list with points. Additional feedback opportunities will occur to help finalize the proposal.</p>																																			
15	<p>Points Assignments/ Priorities</p> <p>The greatest impact should have the greatest number of points.</p> <p>The priorities should be set by cost / economic feasibility.</p>	<p>The categories were created from community feedback on priorities, but the specific priorities of each item will be set after the consultant research on costs, impacts, etc.</p>																																			
16	<p>Concern About Requirements</p> <p>Much of the development in Overlake today utilizes the incentive program to achieve the FAR to meet economic ROI thresholds, with developers saying they feel this makes the incentive program almost de facto required, since the economics for major developments only possible through using incentives to increase FAR.</p> <p>Developers asking for higher base FAR without the need of the incentive program to alleviate the concern about the cost of the items in the incentives list.</p>	<p>The incentive program is and will remain optional.</p> <p>Staff is proposing an increase in the base FAR (will be finalized based on the Preferred Alternative). This is likely to be accompanied by an increase in affordable housing and green building requirements to advance high-priority community objectives.</p> <p>The current code:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>ZONING DISTRICT</th> <th>Base Density</th> <th>Max Density</th> <th>Base Height</th> <th>Max Height</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>OBAT</td> <td>1.55 FAR</td> <td>1.62 FAR</td> <td>4 stories</td> <td>5/10 stories</td> </tr> <tr> <td>OV1</td> <td>3.7 FAR</td> <td>5.35 FAR</td> <td>5 stories</td> <td>9 stories</td> </tr> <tr> <td>OV2</td> <td>3.7 FAR</td> <td>5.35 FAR</td> <td>5 stories</td> <td>9 stories</td> </tr> <tr> <td>OV3</td> <td>3.7 FAR</td> <td>5.35 FAR</td> <td>5 stories</td> <td>9 stories</td> </tr> <tr> <td>OV4</td> <td>2.9 FAR</td> <td>5.2 FAR</td> <td>5 stories</td> <td>12 stories</td> </tr> <tr> <td>OV5</td> <td>3.7 FAR</td> <td>5.35 FAR</td> <td>4/5 stories</td> <td>9 stories</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>The new base FAR and max height will be adjusted to accommodate the growth allocated to Overlake (considering a range from 4 to 6, but the specific FAR to be determined by the additional capacity needed), but the base FAR will be higher that it is today . Like what was done in Marymoor, with the increased capacity we are proposing increasing the standards for affordable housing and green building. Based on testing feedback, all items marked as minimums in the draft incentives will be removed from the incentives and instead be the new baseline requirements for all development in the Overlake Metro Center.</p> <p>We are also proposing minimum development standards to ensure that we meet our growth allocations. The new standards will be set at a point that makes the minimum easy to be accomplish without use of the incentive program.</p>	ZONING DISTRICT	Base Density	Max Density	Base Height	Max Height	OBAT	1.55 FAR	1.62 FAR	4 stories	5/10 stories	OV1	3.7 FAR	5.35 FAR	5 stories	9 stories	OV2	3.7 FAR	5.35 FAR	5 stories	9 stories	OV3	3.7 FAR	5.35 FAR	5 stories	9 stories	OV4	2.9 FAR	5.2 FAR	5 stories	12 stories	OV5	3.7 FAR	5.35 FAR	4/5 stories	9 stories
ZONING DISTRICT	Base Density	Max Density	Base Height	Max Height																																	
OBAT	1.55 FAR	1.62 FAR	4 stories	5/10 stories																																	
OV1	3.7 FAR	5.35 FAR	5 stories	9 stories																																	
OV2	3.7 FAR	5.35 FAR	5 stories	9 stories																																	
OV3	3.7 FAR	5.35 FAR	5 stories	9 stories																																	
OV4	2.9 FAR	5.2 FAR	5 stories	12 stories																																	
OV5	3.7 FAR	5.35 FAR	4/5 stories	9 stories																																	
17	<p>Concern About Requirements</p>	<p>The intent was to have the minimum requirements for use of the</p>																																			

Overlake Code Testing Phase Comment Matrix

#	Comment	Response
	Many comments were received to raise the bar outside the incentive package and not have minimum standards in the incentive package itself. Commenters thought it was too confusing to mix the two concepts.	incentive program, which is optional. Due to the confusion and requests to remove them, we are looking at options for how to do so. This will be tied to the increase affordable housing and green building requirements (see above discussion about FAR) but may include other adjustments related to universal design or other topics.
18	<p>High-Rise Not Timely</p> <p>High rise, type 1 construction is a long way off, rents need to get higher for this to make sense.</p>	<p>Staff recognizes that the market conditions today do not support a tall high-rise (steel construction) without incentives. With consultant support we hope to find ways to close the economic gap to ensure that we are accommodating the growth allocated to Overlake. This is a long-term plan, but we hope to find ways for near-term growth utilize these options.</p> <p>This will be a delicate balancing act and may require adjustments during future code updates as market conditions change and we see how much impact the new program will have.</p>
19	<p>Raise standards outside of the incentives (removed minimums)</p> <p>We heard from multiple stakeholders the desire to raise the minimum standards separately from the incentive program (developers, environmental stakeholders, staff, TAC).</p>	Staff is incorporating this concept into the code revisions and will bring to Planning Commission for their review in March and April.
20	<p>Public Funding</p> <p>We received a few comments that we might be putting options in the program that should be publicly funded and not provided through private development.</p> <p>Public realm amenities and reservable spaces are more appropriate for public property than private property.</p>	<p>We recognize that some options in the incentive program are items that the City may choose to implement through public funds (parks, police/fire buildings, etc). We include co-location and other incentives as options to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide alternative pathways to achieve community needs; • Increase developer flexibility by providing additional options to chose from that meets identified community needs; and • Maximize land uses, mixture of uses, and integration of services instead of under-developing for single-use buildings.

Structural Feedback

#	Comment	Response
2 1	<p>Number of Categories</p> <p>The number of categories was confusing; seems like a “shotgun” approach.</p> <p>Consider consolidating to fewer categories or making “tracks” so</p>	<p>Staff has revised the list to have one fewer category and moved the largest items, pilot projects, etc. to a separate bonus points category. The consultant will review based on the consolidated categories.</p> <p>Staff reviewed the comments related to creating “tracks” and proposes to keep that structure to allow us to take at minimum a small step forward on all the goals with each project. The menu of options format will allow the maximum flexibility to developers to</p>

Overlake Code Testing Phase Comment Matrix

#	Comment	Response
	<p>that a developer can choose either affordable housing or green building or another topic.</p> <p>If we do away with the many categories, we won't get some of those critical pieces that we need. May be possible to collapse one category, but won't want much more (needed to achieve goals).</p>	<p>achieve these goals.</p> <p>The intent is that minimum requirements will not be a huge lift.</p>
<p>2</p> <p>2</p>	<p>Number of Items</p> <p>The number of items on the list was too much (confusing), and too many requirements.</p>	<p>Staff gathered items that the community asked to be considered for the program during 2021 and 2022, with each succession of review periods narrowing the list.</p> <p>There will be fewer items on the final list, but most feedback we got was that the existing program does not have enough options and enough flexibility.</p> <p>Staff is trying to balance having a small enough list to be easily understood with having enough options for flexibility. This includes having some small points items and some large points items, so that developers can tailor their menu of choices to what works best for their site and development goals. Too few options would eliminate the flexibility that is being requested by developers.</p>
<p>2</p> <p>3</p>	<p>Cost of Items</p> <p>Concern that there are some high-cost items on the list.</p> <p>Concern that most of the items in some categories are high-cost (no/limited low- or medium-cost options to choose from).</p>	<p>There will be low-, medium-, and high-cost items to choose from for maximum flexibility. Not all items will work for all sites, and some options will only be chosen a few times.</p> <p>Staff is working with a consultant to review the costs and ROI for each item as well as the usability & impact of the items listed. The higher the cost or difficulty level, the more points would be assigned, so that the benefits to the developer stay at least even with cost. If the consultant finds something in the list as simply not viable in the near or mid-term staff will evaluate if that item should be removed or moved to the bonus category</p> <p>We have pulled some of those items into a separate category to help clarify that these are "big ticket" and potentially limited items. Staff is proposing that a bonus category item could be used to meet any category minimum other than affordable housing and green building, to add an additional layer of flexibility for those projects.</p> <p>Additional workshops have been scheduled for March, April, and May. The development community is welcome to propose new items for consideration at different cost levels that still meet the City's goals. New items proposed at this time will <u>not</u> be included in the scope of review for the consultant team at this time due to the cost and timing of that review.</p>

Overlake Code Testing Phase Comment Matrix

#	Comment	Response
24	<p>Costs / Benefit Analysis</p> <p>There was appreciation for bringing on a consultant team to study the incentive package costs and benefits. Several were concerned about the cost of items not being worth the points.</p> <p>Comment received that developers pass on costs to users (both residential and non-residential) so large requirements that add costs or remove developable/rentable area will decrease affordability.</p>	<p>A contract is under negotiation with a consultant team for the following services (to be reviewed by Council in March):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Market conditions, including which incentives developers are most likely to pursue and why • Financial impacts of options • Costs to City to manage program • Impacts of options in achieving city goals
25	<p>Minimum Points Per Category</p> <p>Feedback was mixed, in part due to the confusion about the work yet to be done to finalize the program.</p> <p>We received direction from stakeholders to keep to the line to require movement on multiple goals, but also received comments from developers that they'd like to only to affordable housing or only green building and not have to do anything else.</p> <p>Received one request to consider tracks but generally feedback was to keep the existing structure but simplify and clarify.</p> <p>Consider some of the base minimums for the highest priorities - allows developer predictability and forces the needle forward</p>	<p>Future edits will provide additional clarity but will keep the minimum points per category. There will be fewer categories (by at least one) and one new way to meet a category's point requirements (large/bonus points category) that will add additional flexibility.</p>
26	<p>TOD Focus Area</p> <p>No issue with boundaries but question about results that could be achieved - it might all end up looking the same anyway</p>	<p>Staff is reviewing this comment.</p>
27	<p>Affordable Housing OR Green Building</p> <p>We received a few comments expressing concern that it may not be financially feasible to do both affordable housing and green building. Especially not feasible to do the deepest/most affordable</p>	<p>The menu approach provides the flexibility requested. The consultant team is reviewing all proposed options in the incentive program.</p> <p>The goal is to provide a minimum number of points in each category then provide flexibility in how a development would like to achieve the minimum total points.</p> <p>There will likely be some low-, medium-, and high-cost/point options in each category, allowing for a developer to focus most of their</p>

Overlake Code Testing Phase Comment Matrix

#	Comment	Response
	housing and the most stringent green building standards.	points in whatever focus areas works best for their site and development goals.

Affordable Housing Incentives

#	Comment	Response
28	<p>30% or Below of Area Median Income (AMI)</p> <p>Having a minimum of 1% at 30% below is difficult. Providing housing for families below 60% AMI often requires integrated or nearby services which cannot be provided through typical private development projects.</p> <p>Don't foresee anyone using the over 3% at 30% AMI</p> <p>Consider in lieu fee for these lower AMI thresholds.</p>	<p>Staff is reviewing this comment.</p> <p>Not all options will work for all projects, but having higher points available for those than can do more is one key tool to help achieve the City's goals and meet our affordable housing goals. Affordable housing developers, especially those that are 100%, may utilize the higher percentages to help achieve the points they need to maximize the potential of their developments.</p> <p>The consultant is reviewing to evaluate the ROI and what items developers would use over others.</p>
29	<p>Multifamily Tax Exemption (M FTE)</p> <p>Rather than relying on development community to provide additional affordable housing through higher requirements or through incentives, consider overhauling the MFTE program.</p>	<p>The City is currently studying potential updates to the MFTE program. The results of this study will be shared with the Planning Commission this spring.</p>
30	<p>May Stop Development</p> <p>Concerned about economic impact of increasing the percentage of affordable housing.</p> <p>Portland added a 20% requirement and essentially stopped all new development - make sure to keep numbers in the range that doesn't have a similar impact</p>	<p>The incentive program is optional.</p> <p>The consultant is reviewing the costs and points for each item and we will adjust the program as needed prior to adoption.</p> <p>Increase of the baseline would be paired with an increase in the base FAR (i.e., allowed without the use of the incentive program).</p>
31	<p>Concern About Cost Shift</p> <p>Costs may be shifted to market rent units due to costs to lenders and equity investors</p>	<p>The programs and code updates are being studied to ensure that the public benefit is balance by increased capacity to minimize or eliminate the cost shift issue. This will be a factor that will change as the market changes as well, and as additional affordable housing funding options are made available through legislative and other updates.</p>
32	<p>Priorities / Points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Housing Action Plan (HAP) set the priorities 31 - 50 at top, next 30%, family sized, then 100% 	<p>The HAP was utilized for the preliminary prioritization, no change needed.</p> <p>Staff is reviewing and has forwarded priorities comments to the consultant team.</p>

Overlake Code Testing Phase Comment Matrix

Inclusive / Universal Community

#	Comment	Response
33	<p>Avoid Conflicts</p> <p>Make sure codes don't conflict with FHA codes</p>	Staff is reviewing.
34	<p>Be Detailed / Clear</p> <p>Needs to be very specific</p>	Staff is preparing a detailed checklist to accompany these options. The inclusive/universal design features will be a "pick x of x" menu to choose from to offer flexibility.
35	<p>ADA Is Minimum</p> <p>Make sure that incentives are tied to percentage above ADA minimum standards</p> <p>How do we check to see if the minimum ADA is not good enough</p>	<p>This is the approach that the City is taking for the incentives program.</p> <p>As part of the Redmond 2050 Equity in the Built Environment work and the update to the Transportation Master Plan, the City is conducting a study to better understand the needs of the disabled community to identify specific changes to our design standards for how we design and build our public realm spaces. More Info.</p>
36	<p>Need Stats</p> <p>What percent is disabled, what percent is IDD? Need more data on this item/need.</p>	Staff will prepare additional data and share with the Planning Commission at a future study session.
37	<p>Priorities / Points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus most points on common areas and housing units • Commercial Anti-Displacement / ADA units / IDD Units 	Staff is reviewing and has forwarded priorities comments to the consultant team.
38	<p>Don't Compromise</p> <p>Don't make compromises - this is a NEED not a want</p>	This is a high priority need from our community visioning process, which is why it has been added to the incentive program. Staff will consider this comment as we allocate points.
39	<p>Anti-Displacement</p> <p>Consider moving anti-displacement to another or stand-alone category</p> <p>High priority, don't want it lost in the mix</p>	Staff is reviewing the option to move anti-displacement to the Uses category.

Anti-Displacement/ Relocation

#	Comment	Response
40	<p>Priorities</p> <p>How to allocate points? What is the most effective tool?</p>	The consultant is reviewing these options and will provide feedback that will help us identify what will have the greatest impact. Staff is also working with OneRedmond on these options and potentially other tools.

Overlake Code Testing Phase Comment Matrix

#	Comment	Response
	First right of refusal is nice but won't do much on it's own - new spaces too expensive for many to move into	
41	Phasing Most projects are single phases and phasing as an option won't work	We understand that not all options will work for all projects.
42	Relocation Assistance What happens when you offer assistance but there is no place to go? Do they get points only if the relocation is successful?	Staff is reviewing this comment.

Open Space and Amenities

#	Comment	Response
43	Open Space Takes Up Too Much Space Concern about how these features take up developable space and thus decreasing income-generating spaces. Reducing the building footprint is an issue.	Staff is reviewing this comment.
44	Open Space / Connected Spaces Challenging under current code, consider how to incentivize a string of connected spaces.	Staff is looking to add connectivity into the landscape and open space revisions. Staff will review those sections of code with the Planning Commission in either March or April.
45	Public Spaces Should Be Public Make more spaces on public land and in the right-of-way and rely less on private development	The incentive program is voluntary. The incentive program will not replace City investment but will be a supplement and alternative approach to achieving community goals. By providing these options we increase the menu of choices for developers in how they can achieve points through several public benefit options.
46	Priorities / Points <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most points for highest benefit - don't waste points on "nice to haves" • Rooftop park is low priority • Rooftop and Podium top amenities are high priority • Shade is medium priority • Water features waste water, don't prioritize • Consider flexibility • play / dogs / gardens / interactive water play feature / pilot projects are lowest • Biggest need is community space then park space 	Staff is reviewing and has forwarded priorities comments to the consultant team. Staff has re-organized this section to provide points based on the size of facility, then additional points for amenities with low priorities adding the fewest points, etc.

Overlake Code Testing Phase Comment Matrix

47	<p>Dog Facilities</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High desire, many pets • Low or Medium priority • Need to be tied to sanitary system - look at code provisions to require • Off-leash park in Marymoor, so don't see as a need 	Forwarded to Parks staff for review.
----	--	--------------------------------------

Public & Community Services

#	Comment	Response
48	<p>Functional Concerns</p> <p>How these would be made functional not clear</p> <p>community services dispersed - phrased as an obligation - make cooperative spirit</p> <p>More complicated than open space and amenities</p>	Staff is reviewing
49	<p>Need More Options / Address More Community Needs</p> <p>List could be more expansive in this category</p>	Staff is reviewing and may add additional items during future updates to the program.
50	<p>Priorities / Points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Center highest priority • Emergency management staging is essential - maybe should be somewhere else • Almost everything else could be equal in points - all essential • Social services might be the lowest (assuming emergency management comes out), but not low • Why are we taking this on for the schools? They have their own levies for buildings - would put them last or remove 	Staff is reviewing and has forwarded priorities comments to the consultant team.

Building, Site, Form, and Use Incentives

#	Comment	Response
51	<p>Retail Incentives</p> <p>Retail and food related uses are hard to incorporate or more expensive to plan for (grease traps, venting, etc.). If the goal is to have these spaces, can they be incentivized in any way?</p>	Staff is reviewing this comment.
52	<p>Public Art</p>	Related to both RZCRW & Overlake incentives.

Overlake Code Testing Phase Comment Matrix

#	Comment	Response
	Supportive of public art but not a mandatory requirement Not a big ask / high priority	Public art is an option within the incentive program, and not a requirement. Comment has been forward to RZCRW team.
53	<p>Priorities / Points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard to say any of these are low priorities • Childcare is high priority / in alignment with state legislation • Conference Center medium priority but big ask • Arts center - more culture in Redmond is needed, big ask • Commercial kitchen is medium high priority • Group cultural art center with community center • public realm amenities could be a part of the open space amenities category • remove subterranean parking incentive - just put parking requirements • Consider Affordable Local Commercial (Seritage and LMC both did that) • Watershed protection - should it be incorporated into LID checklist - related to Tosh Creek - infiltrate or build extra-large facility (actively controlled stormwater facility) • Could add a star at Tosh Creek and combine those two bullets • Regional stormwater facilities • Hotel and conference at bottom • Affordable commercial at top / Food Court / Commercial Kitchen / Child Care Facility / Activated spaces 	<p>Staff is reviewing and has forwarded priorities comments to the consultant team.</p> <p>Staff has moved some options to other categories and have removed some items based on comment received.</p>
54	<p>Monitoring / Long Term</p> <p>How would be monitored? How long does the use have to be in place to achieve points?</p>	Staff is reviewing.

Green Building standards

#	Comment	Response
55	<p>State Code Changes</p> <p>Be aware of and coordinate timing and requirements with the new state requirements.</p> <p>Consider combined costs of additional state requirements with anything the city will require above them.</p> <p>Consider waiting until after the state is done before</p>	<p>Related to both RZCRW & Overlake incentives.</p> <p>Staff is aware of the upcoming changes and is designing the code updates to coordinate with them. No incentives will be given for meeting the new requirements.</p> <p>Comment has been forward to RZCRW team.</p>

Overlake Code Testing Phase Comment Matrix

#	Comment	Response
	adoption of any new incentives.	
56	<p>Minimum 90% Stormwater Infiltration</p> <p>May not be feasible in some areas of Overlake due to high water table or soil types.</p>	This requirement has been removed from the incentive program.
57	<p>Certifications</p> <p>LEED is problematic, certification is expensive and may not get you what you want</p>	<p>Staff is providing flexibility for certification that can achieve specific performance goals based on the adopted Environmental Sustainability Action Plan.</p> <p>Building Performance Standard. Achieve <u>any</u> Green Building Rating or Certification System* that requires a modeled site Energy Use Intensity (EUI) adhering to either a Tier 1 or Tier 2 EUI target (EUI_t) from Section 5, Table 1 in this Appendix. Demonstrate compliance with the Washington State Clean Buildings Performance Standard within 24 months of at least 75% occupancy adhering to a Tier 1 or 2 EUI_t. Share energy benchmarking data with the City of Redmond via Energy Star Portfolio Manager.</p>
58	<p>Cost for Green</p> <p>Concern that the cost of these options would make the incentive program unusable or not able to combine with other (min for each category).</p> <p>Support for higher initial costs because of the long-term lower costs for residents.</p>	Comments on this issue were mixed. The consultant will be reviewing costs, so that will be taken into consideration before the incentive program is finalized.
59	<p>Permitting Process</p> <p>Suggest also simplifying permitting process for green building.</p> <p>Consider improving timing of review</p>	<p>Due to the heavy workload and limited staffing resources we cannot make a separate review track at this time. We will keep this idea in mind for the future.</p> <p>Not consistently possible to advance individual permits based on their development concept. Timelines are regulated by the State as well as the RZC.</p>
60	<p>Specific Techniques</p> <p>Have specific performance standards and the more they do the more points they get.</p>	Staff is reviewing.
61	<p>Priorities / Points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> not many trees - tree retention isn't practical and wouldn't be many trees - maybe combine adding tree coverage with retaining construction waste diversion is citywide - it may be redundant Add local materials 	<p>Staff is reviewing and has forwarded priorities comments to the consultant team.</p> <p>Tree amendments are also in the City's RZCRW workplan.</p>

Overlake Code Testing Phase Comment Matrix

Other

#	Comment	Response
62	<p>Incentives Earned</p> <p>Consider impact fee waivers</p>	State law governs impact fee waivers, so this may impact our ability to incorporate into an incentive program. Staff is reviewing to see if this is possible.
63	<p>In Lieu</p> <p>Consider adding in lieu options, especially for affordable housing points</p>	<p>Staff is reviewing to see if and how we might incorporate this into the program.</p> <p>Staff is continuing to monitor state legislation.</p>

Streets/Transportation

#	Comment	Response
	<p>Road Alignments</p> <p>Agree with new alignment of 151st.</p>	No change needed.

Other

#	Comment	Response
	<p>Business Displacement</p> <p>Concern about redevelopment and rising costs to businesses in Redmond, lack of places for businesses to go to.</p>	<p>Staff in multiple departments are working on business assistance and anti-displacement tools, including the incentives program updates. The anti-displacement incentives are a high priority, as well as making sure we have places for business:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anti-displacement tools will have a higher point assignment • First floor height requirements and mixed-use requirements ensure we have spaces for non-residential uses to go into
	<p>Comp Plan Policies</p> <p>Be sure not to have prescriptive requirements in the Comp Plan Policies, avoid potential need for Comp Plan amendments when needs/standards change</p>	<p>This is a goal and was included in the phase that identified needed revisions to current policies. Policies are intended to be high level, with the code providing the specific implementation details.</p> <p>Staff is also trying to avoid prescriptive requirements in code where we can offer flexibility, instead looking for performance standards options that focus on desired outcomes instead of methods to achieve those outcomes.</p>
	<p>Building and Fire Code Conflicts</p> <p>Consider building and fire code requirements and potentially updating those requirements to there are no conflicts (appear to be now).</p>	Staff is reviewing and working with other departments on potential amendments related to flexibility and taller buildings.

Overlake Code Testing Phase Comment Matrix

#	Comment	Response
	<p>Public ROW</p> <p>Consider overhauling the standards for the public right-of-way. Consider allowing utilities to be under roadways instead of impacting building setbacks.</p>	<p>Comment has been forward to Public Works for consideration.</p>
	<p>Woonerfs, Pedestrian Cut-Throughs, and Urban Pathways</p> <p>A few comments were received related to impacts of Woonerfs, etc. and impact on buildable areas on a parcel.</p> <p>Consider where these items are required and that the topography and existing conditions impacts to implementing them.</p>	<p>Comments have been forward to Transportation and Public Works for consideration.</p> <p>Regional planning requirements for eliminating superblocks, pedestrian-oriented design, and multi-modal transportation requirements impact these standards.</p> <p>Redmond 2050 and Transportation staff are reviewing these topics are part of the update to the Transportation Master Plan.</p>
	<p>Traffic Infrastructure and Parking</p> <p>Concern about allowing too much growth without enough parking or building residents/employees and not enough parking for visitors. Concern that this disproportionately impacts low-income residents.</p> <p>Concern about growth not matching infrastructure investments.</p>	<p>Comments have been forward to Transportation and Public Works for consideration.</p>
	<p>Reduced Parking Requirements</p> <p>Concern that reducing parking requirements “is not a panacea” and neither is light rail. People will still need a car to shopping, recreating, outdoor sports opportunities, travel, etc.</p> <p>Keep in mind the transition period.</p>	<p>Comments have been forward to Transportation staff for review.</p>
	<p>Bike Parking</p> <p>Consider eliminating or reducing common area bike rooms (not in use and take up valuable space)</p>	<p>Comments have been forward to Transportation and Public Works for consideration.</p>
	<p>Solid Waste</p> <p>Would like more flexibility for trash collection off the streets.</p>	<p>The Development Services and Public Works staff are looking at updating standards for trash collection and will be preparing code revisions to address this topic.</p>
	<p>Developer Influence</p> <p>Concern that the standards are too skewed to developers and not enough to community benefit and long-term impacts of choices.</p>	<p>Staff is reviewing this comment.</p> <p>The consultant team is evaluating the incentives to look at if they achieve the city’s goals and can help meet the community needs.</p>
	<p>City Staffing Concern</p> <p>Concern that the City might be understaffed and/or need additional training.</p>	<p>Forwarded to Planning Director for review.</p>

Overlake Code Testing Phase Comment Matrix

#	Comment	Response
	10-Minute Community Avoid creating areas that are only one type of use - only residential or only office, etc. Need to have customers on evenings and weekends to retain small businesses.	2023 community conversations will be talking about this topic.
	Concern About Growth Review existing capacity before considering any up-zoning; don't want additional growth	Staff has conducted a detailed review of existing conditions and recent development proposals to update the current capacity calculations as part of the development of a Preferred Alternative.
	Calculator / Tool for Planning Can we develop a calculator for developers to use to figure out if their options selected get them to the FAR they want?	Yes - a excel spreadsheet can be provided to developers as a planning tool