Marymoor Subarea Neighborhood Workshop and Online Questionnaire Comment Summary

Prepared for the South Marymoor Subarea Committee, February 19, 2016

Comments and questions from workshop and questionnaire	*Staff comment*
Allowed Uses, Incentives, Compatibility	
1. **Park event noise, cut-through traffic**. Concerns about plan to allow multi-family housing in this area. Concern about more people using the park and impacting the park. Could encourage more cut-through traffic in the park.	Staff will meet again with Marymoor Park staff in late February.
2. **LW Tech property**. LW Tech anticipates developing vacant lot it owns. School anticipates that there may be requirements like walkways to Marymoor.	
3. **Uses during transition / compatibility**. Could end up with apartment buildings next door to businesses. Concerned about maintaining existing businesses in such situations; some communities, like Edmonds, have experienced challenges..	Committee's proposal puts responsibility to ensure compatibility on new development rather than existing businesses.
4. **Use changes**. Need clarification about what "use" means – how specific is it? If use changes, what new uses would be permitted? Are there uses not allowed? Want to ensure existing uses can remain, expand.	Committee proposes allowing all uses currently operating and most other Manufacturing Park zone uses. Uses that are 1) not operating today *and* 2) clearly incompatible with the area for environmental or land use reasons, such as fueling stations, would not be allowed under the Committee's proposal.
5. **Parking**. Small parking spaces are not desired. Adequate parking for multifamily is a must. Recommend fee-in-lieu instead of allowance to reduce parking. Parking restrictions can hurt existing businesses. Will incentives compromise the functionality of the area?	Staff will propose parking standards taking into account anticipated parking demand.
6. **Building height**. What is anticipated height? Too tall, too dense at Group Health site.	This area is not an urban center; staff anticipates height and density limits that are less than what is allowed in urban centers.
Topic Table Notes - Thresholds and Timing	
1. **Thresholds**. Thresholds that are in place would continue to apply . Owners should not be required to meet infrastructure, site or design changes to be consistent with neighborhood vision. When will thresholds be employed?	Committee's current proposal is that existing uses remain permitted and new site standards must be met when proposed improvements to an existing structure exceeds the value of the structure.
2. **Timing**. Interest & demand will drive the transition. Owners should not be forced to change their land use. Market based approach seems logical. Incentivize timely transition. When is general timing for zone change?	Committee's current proposal is that redevelopment timing is market based and owners would decide when to redevelop their property. Staff anticipates that the Committee will discuss zoning timing at its February meeting.
3. **Binding Site Plans**. How/when do they get broken? Can all or part of plans be dissolved?	Binding site plans and their management are handled between property owners. Property owners would need to work through associated issues.
4. Threshold where city needs to get involved. Chicken+egg, Carrot+stick.	

Comments and questions from workshop and questionnaire	*Staff comment*
Land Use and Urban Design	
1. **Parking, parking garage**. Parking garage is too small. Put it close to Marymoor park or the light rail station. King County Parks is excited for shared parking opportunities. Garage and station could buffer neighborhood from 520. Vehicle access, parking are of concern. Keep vehicles off of side streets. Don't allow commuters to park on local streets. Too much street parking – won't be needed with more driverless cars. Reduce traffic impacts.	Parking garage size is based on Sound Transit's past analysis and conceptual design. City will monitor on-street parking over time. Active management (time limits, etc.) may be warranted as conditions change over time.
2. **Land use concepts**. Alt A is preferred with mixed use. Like existing commercial businesses but the area is not a friendly walking environment now. Consider spreading mixed use throughout the subarea. Likes residential split up. Residential south of 65th is too far from transit. Focus on what is best for Marymoor Park – hide buildings from park so park users see green. Desire something attractive, livable. Desire housing choices for households that are downsizing. Protect environment, green spaces, bike/walking trails with nature views. Parking drives building heights to 5+ stories. Origins & destinations. Are people coming to or going? Consider where you want people to go	Staff anticipates a station that is both origin and destination. It will attract riders from north and east of Redmond, riders who live in the area, and people who work in the Marymoor Subarea. Staff developing zoning regulations based on Alt. A as preferred concept with more opportunities for mix of uses.
3. **Density**. Concerned about overdevelopment. Want to see attractive development. Residential density is already beyond traffic capacity of streets.	This area is not an urban center; staff anticipates height and density limits that are less than what is allowed in urban centers. Proposed street network is designed to accommodate trips generated from new multifamily and non-residential development.
4. **Noise.** Noise concerns with housing next to velodrome**.** Consider that stations have noise.	Staff following-up with King County Parks staff.
5. **Parks / open space**. Green space is not large enough. Put park by station. Create green spine connecting small parks/plazas to Marymoor. Marymoor is a large park space. Are there examples of open space on top of Sound Transit parking structures or stations?	Staff developing zoning regulations including consideration of parks, open space, and green space. There are no examples in the Sound Transit system, but there are other examples of open space coexisting with parking structures.
6. **Traffic**. Traffic impacts are significant at E Lk Samm Pkwy. Get people in and out using SR 520**.** Traffic backs-up past right in/right out location – is it needed? Connect E Lk Samm Trail to Downtown. Traffic is already bad – this will make it worse.	HDR work confirms that there is congestion around perimeter of area today on arterials. Staff proposing study of SR 202 corridor in future City budget.
7. **Infrastructure phasing**. Will Redmond be taking a lead role for infrastructure? Does the City use eminent domain or conditional development? Want to see contributions from developers.	Infrastructure that mainly serves new development, such as most proposed new streets in the street network, will likely be built concurrent with redevelopment. Infrastructure that benefits the broader transportation network could be built independently of redevelopment, though would compete for funding with other projects in Redmond. While the City has the right to use eminent domain, it is unlikely to be used here because 1) most new streets are likely to be built concurrent with redevelopment and 2) even when eminent domain can be used, the City prefers to negotiate with property owners to a mutually beneficial outcome.