

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE REPORT - ADDENDUM

To: Planning Commission

From: Technical Committee

Staff Contacts: Rob Odle, Planning Director
425-556-2417

Lori Peckol, AICP, Policy Planning Manager
425-556-2411

Sarah Stiteler, AICP, Senior Planner
425-556-2469

Kimberly Dietz, Senior Planner
425-556-2415

Date: April 8, 2016

File Numbers: PR-2015-00795 and SEPA-2015-00993

Project Name: Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments for the Old Town Historic Core Overlay and for Leary Way and Gilman Street

This report addresses Package 1, the first of three additional addendums to the original Technical Committee Report of June 26, 2015 and to the August 5, 2015 report addendum. This report addendum discusses Technical Committee recommended refinements to amendments for Comprehensive Plan policies and vision, definitions, Downtown density limits, and building design specific to exterior material in the Old Town Historic Core.

Reasons the Proposal should be Adopted: The Technical Committee recommends approving the refined amendments to the Redmond Comprehensive Plan and to the Redmond Zoning Code because the proposal:

- Reflects significant stakeholder and community feedback provided during 2015 and 2016; and

- Provides additional clarity, conciseness and opportunities for innovation compared to the earlier Technical Committee recommendations.

I. APPLICANT PROPOSAL

A. APPLICANT

City of Redmond

B. INTRODUCTION TO PACKAGE 1

The proposed refinements to the Technical Committee recommendation as shown in Exhibits A and B are provided in response to significant feedback from stakeholders that staff received during 2015 and during community and stakeholder engagement in 2016. Exhibit D provides a summary of this feedback by topic, briefly highlights the refinements, and references current policy and/or code for each topic. The topics included in package 1 are Comprehensive Plan policies and vision, definitions, Downtown density limits, and building design specific to exterior material in the Old Town Historic Core.

Topics in package 2 will include on-site parking, design process alternatives, and the building's cap and corner treatments. And, topics in package 3 will include amendments specific to Leary Way and Gilman Street; building height, mass, stepbacks, encroachments, base design, and frontage design edging parks; incentive strategies, pedestrian experience and connections, and signage.

C. BACKGROUND AND REASONS FOR PROPOSAL

As described in the June 26, 2015 Technical Report, staff began the Historic Core planning process in January 2014 (see Exhibit C for the study area). The purpose is to develop a plan for the historic central core of the City's first business district with the significant participation of property and business owners and community stakeholders.

The scope and approach for the Historic Core plan is based on feedback from the October 2013 joint City Council and Landmark Commission meeting and interests expressed by property and business owners. The City Council's direction for the Plan components included the following:

- Integrate the vision, design standards, and character of the Historic Core with the Redmond Central Connector.
- Provide early and ongoing outreach with property and business owners to create awareness and to learn about opportunities and challenges. Help the business owners identify collective and mutual interests.
- Consider incentives in the Historic Core such as the Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program, working with property owners to maintain and enhance

existing structures, and providing information to property and business owners regarding other incentive programs such as National Historic Landmark.

- Take into account the current brick character and one- to two-story building heights.
- Plan for wayfinding and placemaking signage to create great spaces in which to shop and dine.
- Include interpretive elements that highlight historic buildings including those that have been demolished.
- Promote opportunities for community celebration and increasing awareness include interpretive elements for interior spaces such as in community gathering establishments.
- Create a range of options that support business and property owners’ needs. Make certain updates to standards are easily implemented and not onerous.

Deliverables of the Historic Core plan will include:

- Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan – recognizing the Historic Core and updating associated policies
 - Goals, Vision, and Framework Policies;
 - Community Character and Historic Preservation; and
 - Urban Centers – Downtown Neighborhood Policies.
- Amendments to Redmond Zoning Code, particularly:
 - Updates to design standards for development in the Historic Core; and
 - Updates to the Downtown Pedestrian System map.

Property and business owners and community stakeholders informed, reviewed, and provided feedback to the recommended policy and code amendments that comprise the deliverables in general and in particular Package 1.

The engagement process included:

Date(s)	Engagement Process
February 2014 to May 2015	Community and stakeholder engagement to inform development of preliminary Historic Core concepts. Engagement included community meetings, activities within the Historic Core, activities in partnership with Downtown capital improvement projects, online input tools, social media and other web-based discussions, email and mail, and in-person meetings.
June 24, 2015 to August 5, 2015	Planning Commission public hearing that remained open for verbal and written testimony through August 5, 2015. On March 23, 2016, the public hearing was continued to a date certain of April 20, 2016. Staff will request that it be continued to April 27.
February 18, 2016	Package 1 community and stakeholder engagement meeting.
February 15 to March 14, 2016	Package 1 individual stakeholder meetings.

Staff's analysis for Package 1, in Exhibit E, reflects the Planning Commission's direction from April 15, 2015 regarding policy level questions and issues. These were identified as questions and issues that the Commission would like to consider during review of proposed Historic Core plan amendments including:

- Consistency with Comprehensive Plan policies regarding the Downtown vision and associated design standards,
- Consistency with the City Council's approved design standard principles, included for reference in Exhibit F,
- Recognition and awareness of the Old Town Historic Core,
- Economic impacts,
- Quality and timeless architecture and design,
- Mobility choices and parking opportunities, and
- The relationship between the Old Town Historic Core and the rest of the Downtown.

The Supporting Analysis section below describes the alternatives staff considered particular to this amendment.

II. RECOMMENDATION

The Technical Committee recommends approval of the refined proposed amendments to the Redmond Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code, addressing the first of three amendment packages. This package includes Comprehensive Plan policies and vision, definitions, Downtown density limits, and building design specific to exterior material for development in the Historic Core.

III. FACTORS CONSIDERED AND ALTERNATIVES

To gain additional insights on proposed refined amendments to Comprehensive Plan policies and Zoning Code design standards for the Historic Core, staff met with stakeholders and community members. First, staff met in one-on-one meetings with stakeholders to understand and discuss their individual comments, concerns and questions. As follow up, staff developed proposed refinements and sought feedback from stakeholders. This outreach and engagement included phone consultation, open houses, and one-on-one meetings. Exhibit D provides a summary of this feedback by topic, briefly highlights the refinements, and references current policy and/or code for each topic. Below is a summary of key issues, alternatives and the reasoning for the Technical Committee recommendation.

A. Comprehensive Plan Policies and Zoning Code Design Standards

1. Comprehensive Plan Policies

Analysis and Alternatives. Stakeholders suggested clarifying terms - "Historic Core" versus "Old Town Historic Core", the goals and intent, and the relationship of the Historic Core and Old Town. As part of responding to these comments, staff

considered whether it is more appropriate to continue to describe the Historic Core as a portion of the Old Town zone or establish it as a separate zone. Staff recommends keeping the Historic Core as a portion of the Old Town zone, adding policy to clearly describe the intent, and using an overlay in the Zoning Code to show the geographic area within which additional design standards would apply. The reasoning is that much of the policy level intent for the Old Town zone and the Historic Core are similar – a pedestrian oriented retail area. Keeping the Historic Core policies in the Old Town zone provides clarity regarding the intent for the Historic Core without duplicating existing policy direction.

2. Zoning Code Design Standards

Analysis and Alternatives.

- **Downtown Density Limit:**

One of the stakeholder requests was to amend the Zoning Code to remove the Downtown residential density requirement within the Historic Core to allow for unlimited density as currently permitted elsewhere in the Downtown for 12,000 sq ft or larger site areas. Staff’s reasoning to support this amendment includes that development intensity would still be limited by building height and bulk, parking and other standards. In addition, this change could support retention of the smaller lot pattern since property aggregation would no longer be needed to reach higher densities. The alternative to the staff recommendation is to maintain the current code and density requirement. This alternative could potentially encourage more parcel assembly to reach higher densities. Staff also received concerns regarding the need for new development to ensure adequate parking supply for onsite uses. The aspect of onsite parking will be included in the second package of refined amendments for the Historic Core plan.

- **Exterior Building Material:**

Staff received several comments regarding the initial recommendations for exterior building materials. The Technical Committee’s refined recommendation provides additional flexibility regarding exterior building materials and will likely reduce anticipated costs for building materials somewhat. An alternative to the staff’s recommendation is to require masonry over the building’s base and middle portion. Ultimately, staff recommends an approach that reflects the location of the facades for the second and third floors: 1) for buildings that do not step back from the first story, masonry would be required as the primary material for the first, second, and third stories, and 2) for buildings that step back from the first story, masonry would be required as the primary material for the first story only and supplemental modern building materials would be allowed for floors 2 and higher. Staff believes that this approach balances the significance of use of masonry and other high quality building materials to the character of the Historic Core while recognizing that when floors are stepped back the facades are somewhat less prominent.

Additionally, the Technical Committee’s initial recommendation did not provide flexibility for exterior material on facades that front utilitarian corridors and recommended the use of masonry as the primary material for the entirety of the first story, regardless of the building’s orientation and function. The Technical Committee’s revised recommendation is for a partial continuation of masonry at the first story for a minimum of 20 feet along facades that front utilitarian or non-pedestrian portions of the building such as for private alleyways. Staff also received a request for use of vertical, transitional designs and recommends maintaining a horizontal, transitional design orientation in favor of traditional architecture, as compared below. The reasoning for this recommendation is for consistency with the overall character of the Historic Core.

Transitional Design

Horizontal, Traditional Design Orientation	Vertical, Modern Design Orientation
	

B. Other Planning Commission Topics for Consideration

Staff analyzed the proposed additions and refinements in the context of the Planning Commission’s policy level questions and issues. Exhibit E includes a summary of this analysis. Staff also considered alternatives for the following Commission’s policy questions:

1. Economic Impact

Alternatives and Analysis. Staff’s initial recommendation was for use of high-quality masonry for the first, second, and third stories. In response to additional comment, staff further considered the benefits and impacts of the proposed amendments and requirements regarding exterior building material including longevity, fire suppression, long-term maintenance, and choices for installation. For example, the resources listed below were used to compare masonry and masonry panel to other material. The Technical Committee’s revised recommendation is to require use of high-quality masonry only at the ground floor

and in addition to traditional masonry, also allow the use of masonry panels at the second and third stories.

Siding Type	Cost
Brick wall	\$34 - \$40
Brick veneer	\$9-\$11
Vinyl	\$4-\$6

These costs are per square foot for a full-width brick wall, brick veneer siding and vinyl siding. Also, the costs cited include the siding, materials, wrap, and related materials, but not the labor such as the cost of the wall being sided.

Staff obtained information for this analysis from the following sources:

- <http://www.house-design-coffee.com/brick-veneer.html>
- 2014-2015 Cost Comparisons for Common Commercial Wall Systems, by Capital Building Consultants, commissioned by Brick Industry Southeast Region, <http://www.gobricksoutheast.com/CostComparisons/2014WallCostComparison4Web.pdf>

Staff also considered the use of alternative material such as composites and concrete. Staff supports use of composites when installed above the third story, or when a building is stepped back from the first story, starting at the second story. Though these materials provide designs that mimic the appearance of wood, staff believes that they are not suitable for the first story or, for the second or third stories when not stepped back. In general, damage to composite panels requires replacement of an entire panel or board, making these materials less suitable for the first story and high-activity pedestrian corridors.

2. Integration with and Relationship to the Rest of the Downtown

Alternatives and Analysis. Staff considered extending portions of the proposed design standards and regulations for the Historic Core to adjacent zones. New and planned development would limit the application of the regulations if extended. Additionally, adjacent zones include design elements such as lighting standards that, when implemented with new development, demonstrate consistency with Downtown's historic portion.

IV. COMPLIANCE WITH CRITERIA FOR COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AND ZONING CODE AMENDMENTS

Redmond Comprehensive Plan Policies PI-16 direct the City to take several considerations, as applicable, into account as part of decisions on proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan. Items 1 through 6 apply to all proposed

amendments. The following is an analysis of how this proposal complies with the requirements for amendments.

1. Consistency with Growth Management Act (GMA), State of Washington Department of Commerce Procedural Criteria, VISION 2040 or its successor, and the King County Countywide Planning Policies.

Proposed amendments to policies and code take into account direction by the GMA, the Department of Commerce, VISION 2040, and Countywide Planning Policies. GMA's planning goals for guiding development of Comprehensive Plan policies and associated regulations include encouraging development in urban areas, reducing sprawl, encouraging efficient multimodal transportation systems, encouraging economic development and housing opportunities, and encouraging community involvement during planning processes.

The recommended refined amendments maintain Redmond's portion of projected housing and jobs growth within King County's urban growth boundary. The planning process for the proposed amendments as well as for the refined proposed amendments included significant amounts of community and stakeholder involvement.

GMA's planning goals also include historic preservation. This goal calls for identifying and encouraging the preservation of lands, sites, and structures that have historical or archaeological significance. The recommended amendments will facilitate this goal by recognizing the significance in continuing to preserve existing landmarked properties, encouraging high-quality and pedestrian-oriented architecture and design within the unique, historic portion of the Downtown, and supporting additional investment in the City's original business core.

2. Consistency with the Redmond Comprehensive Plan.

The proposed amendments are consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, particularly FW-23 thru FW-26 which speak to Downtown's character and vibrancy, LU-2 which ensures that development regulations provide for achieving the preferred land use pattern, CC-3 which ensures that the Downtown is a place that feels comfortable for pedestrians and addresses characteristics, DT-25 which ensures that development in the historic portion of the Old Town zone retains the area's historic village character and complements the character and scale of existing historic buildings, policy FW-20, which calls for a variety of business choices meeting the needs of the community and PI-19 which calls for clear and consistent development regulations.

3. Potential general impacts to the natural environment, such as impacts to critical areas and other natural resources, including whether development will be directed away from environmentally critical areas and other natural resources.

The proposal is unlikely to have any adverse impacts on the natural environment and may have some positive impacts. For example, federal and state law requires the preservation and protection of cultural resources. States are also mandated to maintain a record of archaeological and historical resources. Staff has considered these mandates in the context of new and redevelopment in the Historic Core and has notified respective property owners of the requirements they shall adhere to in this regard. Staff will continue communicating these requirements to property owners and developers, particularly in areas such as the Historic Core where the presence of cultural resources may be high.

4. Potential general impacts to the capacity of public facilities and services. For land use related amendments, whether public facilities and services can be provided cost-effectively and adequately at the proposed density/intensity.

The proposal, calling for amendments and refinements to amendments regarding policy and design standards is unlikely to have any significant impacts on the capacity of public facilities and services.

5. Potential general economic impacts, such as impacts for business, residents, property owners, or City Government.

The proposal could have positive impacts on the economic condition of businesses in the overlay by guiding design of development to support achievement of an attractive, engaging, and highly functional pedestrian environment. The proposed refinements to amendments would also continue to provide opportunities for variety and flexibility.

6. For issues that have been considered within the last four annual updates, whether there has been a change in circumstances that makes the proposed amendment appropriate or whether the amendment is needed to remedy a mistake.

This package continues review of an amendment first included on the Comprehensive Plan annual docket in 2013-14 and carried over to the 2015-2016 annual docket.

V. AUTHORITY AND ENVIRONMENTAL, PUBLIC AND AGENCY REVIEW

A. Amendment Process

Redmond Zoning Code (RZC) 21.76 requires that amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, Zoning Code and Zoning Map be reviewed under the Type VI process. Under this process, the Planning Commission conducts a study session(s), an open record hearing(s) on the proposed amendment, and makes a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council is the decision-making body for this process.

B. Subject Matter Jurisdiction

The Redmond Planning Commission and the Redmond City Council have subject matter jurisdiction to hear and decide whether to adopt the proposed amendment.

C. Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA)

A SEPA checklist was prepared and a Determination of Non-Significance was issued for this non-project action on June 10, 2015 (see Exhibit E in June 26, 2015 Technical Committee Report). The Technical Committee's refined recommendations are not different in terms of anticipated environmental impacts compared to the initial recommendations.

D. 60-Day State Agency Review

State agencies were sent 60-day notice of this proposed amendment on June 1, 2015 and of the proposed refinements to amendments on April 1, 2016.

E. Public Involvement

The public and stakeholders have had several opportunities to contribute to and comment on the proposed amendments and on the proposed refinements to the amendments including a significant number and variety of engagement events from February 2014 to May 2015, February and March 2016, and through the Planning Commission review process. A public hearing was held on July 15, 2015 and was continued to a date certain of April 20, 2016. Public notice of the hearing was published in the Seattle Times on June 24, 2015 (see Exhibit D in June 26, 2015 Technical Committee Report) and on March 30, 2016. Notice of the Planning Commission hearing was posted in City Hall, the Redmond Library, and through RZC 21.76.080, Extraordinary Notice: two 4' x 8' signs were installed at two different locations in the proposed Historic Core Overlay area. Notice of the hearing is given on the Planning Commission agendas and extended agendas. Notice was also provided to business and property owners affected by the proposed amendments to the Zoning Map. Specific outreach to stakeholders within the Historic Core has occurred on multiple occasions between May and July 2015 and during February and March 2016 via mailed packet, telephone, e-mail contact, and in-person meetings.

F. Appeals

RZC 21.76 identifies Zoning Code and Comprehensive Plan Amendments as a Type VI permit. Final action is by the City Council. The action of the City Council on a

Type VI proposal may be appealed by filing a petition with the Growth Management Hearing Board pursuant to the requirements of the Board.

VI. LIST OF EXHIBITS

- Exhibit A: Recommended Amendments to the Comprehensive Plan
- Exhibit B: Recommended Amendments to the Redmond Zoning Code
- Exhibit C: Historic Core Overlay Map
- Exhibit D: Summary of Stakeholder Comments, Technical Committee Recommendation, and Current Policy and Code
- Exhibit E: Evaluation of Technical Committee Recommendation relative to Design Standard Principles and Planning Commission Criteria
- Exhibit F: City Council Design Standard Principles

Conclusion in Support of Recommendation: The Technical Committee has found the proposal to be in compliance with the Redmond Zoning Code, Redmond Comprehensive Plan, Redmond Municipal Code, and State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA).



ROBERT G. ODLE,
Director of Planning and Community
Development



LINDA DE BOLDT,
Director of Public Works