

Discussion Issues

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
A. Comprehensive Plan Policies and Visions (Package 1, Technical Committee Report, April 8, Exhibit A)		
1. Differences between the Old Town zone and the Historic Core overlay and reasoning for the recommended approach? (Miller)	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion:</u> Commission Miller asked what are the differences between the Old Town zone and the Historic Core overlay, and what is the reasoning for the Technical Committee’s recommended approach?</p> <p>4/27: The Commission was satisfied with staff continuing to discuss the remaining portions of the Old Town zone during updates to Downtown design standards. Commissioners agreed to close this item.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation:</u> The vision for the Old Town zone as a whole and for the Historic Core is to be a focus for retail activity as well as other services and housing opportunities. While that portion is similar, the Old Town zone is 30 acres in size and the proposed Historic Core is 11 acres in size. The Historic Core is the location of eight of the City’s 16 designated landmark structures. Also, there has been considerable new development during the past few years in the rest of the Old Town zone and very little in the proposed Historic Core. Given this, together with the character of historic structures within the proposed overlay, staff recommends applying the recommended design standards to the Historic Core overlay rather than Old Town zone as a whole. The remaining portions of the Old Town zone will continue to be guided by the policies and code applicable to that zone. When a standard is not addressed specifically for the Historic Core, development within the overlay area would then utilize other applicable code.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	Opened 4/20, Closed 4/27
B. Small Lot Residential Density Limit (Package 1, Technical Committee Report, April 8, 2016, Exhibit B, page 3)		

Old Town Historic Core & Leary Way (PR-2015-00795) – Package 1 and 2
 Planning Commission Issues Matrix for June 15, 2016

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>1. What could realistically be built on small lots given the remaining standards including on-site parking requirements? (Biethan)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion:</u> Commissioner Biethan asked for additional information regarding what could realistically be constructed if the density maximum was removed and reliance was on other standards including on-site parking, height, bulk, and design?</p> <p>4/27: Commissioners would like to know more about this request and the ability to parking additional density on the smaller lots located in the Historic Core. Commissioner Biethan, Miller, Haverkamp, and Nichols agreed that staff’s analysis would be enhanced with input by developers/designers and that without this additional expertise; the request could not be thoroughly evaluated. Commissioners agreed to close this item and to reserve the request for later consideration.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation:</u> Staff will continue analyzing the potential outcomes related to the proposed amendment and follow up regarding this question.</p> <p>4/27: Staff requested additional information from several developers, designers and property owners regarding the interest in removing the small lot residential density limit and maintaining the site-specific requirements, particularly minimum parking standards. However, staff did not receive additional information in this regard.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p>	<p>Opened 4/20, Closed 4/27</p>
<p>C. Exterior Building Material (Package 1, Technical Committee Report, April 8, 2016, Exhibit B)</p>		
<p>1. What is the Design Review Board’s process regarding requests for Administrative Design Flexibility such as that proposed for exterior building material? (relates to pgs. 17-18) (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion:</u> Commissioner Miller requested additional information regarding the process for Design Review Board review of development applications, particularly when requesting the proposed Administrative Design Flexibility regarding exterior building material.</p> <p>4/27: Commissioner Miller was satisfied with staff’s response to this question and agreed to close this item.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation:</u> The process for DRB review of design departures within</p>	<p>Opened 4/20, Closed 4/27</p>

Old Town Historic Core & Leary Way (PR-2015-00795) – Package 1 and 2
 Planning Commission Issues Matrix for June 15, 2016

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>our current process is as follows: if a development proposal does not meet the specific requirements identified in the RZC, staff will prepare an evaluation/analysis of the “departure” through review of applicable codes, policies and design intent statements. This analysis, along with the staff review and recommendation of the overall proposal is prepared for Technical Committee and Design Review Board consideration. In the case of item 5B (Building Material) of the section, the process for DRB review is proposed to be the same as current practice. The DRB is thus provided the decision framework of Comprehensive Plan goals and policies, along with design standards in the RZC. In addition to application of the more prescriptive elements, the current (and proposed) Administrative Design Flexibility provisions within the Zoning Code give additional flexibility to staff and DRB when reviewing design proposals that allow consideration of innovative or “out of the box” proposals.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p>	
<p>D. Building Design - Cap (Package 2, Technical Committee Report, May 27, 2016, Exhibit A)</p>		
<p>1. Can the list of permitted roof forms provide additional flexibility for design? (Miller)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion:</u> Commissioner Miller asked why the hip with deck roof form was included in the recommended list for building caps in the Historic Core. He was not familiar with this roof form having ever been used on historic structures in Redmond. Commissioner Miller agreed with opportunities for flexibility and asked how the proposed building cap standard could provide additional flexibility.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation:</u> Staff agreed that the hip with deck roof form had not been used in Historic Core and that it could offer an option for developers to blend traditional roof forms with recent interests in activating the most upper portions of buildings.</p> <p>The expanded list of roof forms was based on a combination of roof forms commonly found in the Historic Core and in general, located in similarly developed and sized western, settlement towns. Staff also considered roof forms that could support the blending of traditional character with modern architecture while continuing to prohibit the use of the shed roof form. The shed roof is present in newer development in the Downtown though</p>	<p>Opened 6/8</p>

Old Town Historic Core & Leary Way (PR-2015-00795) – Package 1 and 2
 Planning Commission Issues Matrix for June 15, 2016

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status					
	<p>staff felt this form to be more modern and less traditional in its application. Staff will develop another alternative for the Commission’s consideration in response to the interest in additional flexibility.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p>						
E. On-Site Parking Ratio for Residential Suites (Package 2, Technical Committee Report, May 27, 2016, Exhibit A)							
2. What was the basis for the current parking ratio for residential suites and is the number appropriate to the use? (Miller)	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion:</u> Commissioner Miller requested clarification regarding the minimum parking ratio for residential suites. In particular, he asked how the ratio was calculated and whether it is an amount that is appropriate to the demand created by the specific use.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation:</u> A residential suite is a type of residence in which all living space other than a bathroom is contained within a single room and which is located in a multifamily structure in which clusters of residential suites share common amenities such as kitchens, laundry facilities, and gathering spaces.</p> <p>As this type of unit continued to be developed in Downtown, the ratio took into account the configuration in comparison to multi-family residential. In the Old Town code below, the multifamily ratio is calculated based on unit and may include from 1 to 3 bedrooms. The residential suite, as similar in some respects to a studio unit, includes one bedroom per unit and therefore was calculated at half the required minimum parking of a standard multifamily unit.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="856 1203 1583 1421"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #ffcc00;"> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="856 1203 1583 1235">Residential</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="856 1235 1077 1295">Attached dwelling unit, 2-4 units</td> <td data-bbox="1077 1235 1583 1421" rowspan="2">Dwelling Unit (1.0, 2.25) Plus one guest space per four units for projects with six units or more. Curbside parking along the site may be counted towards up to 25 percent of the required off-street parking.</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="856 1295 1077 1421">Multifamily Structure, Mixed-Use Residential</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Residential		Attached dwelling unit, 2-4 units	Dwelling Unit (1.0, 2.25) Plus one guest space per four units for projects with six units or more. Curbside parking along the site may be counted towards up to 25 percent of the required off-street parking.	Multifamily Structure, Mixed-Use Residential	Opened 6/8
Residential							
Attached dwelling unit, 2-4 units	Dwelling Unit (1.0, 2.25) Plus one guest space per four units for projects with six units or more. Curbside parking along the site may be counted towards up to 25 percent of the required off-street parking.						
Multifamily Structure, Mixed-Use Residential							

Old Town Historic Core & Leary Way (PR-2015-00795) – Package 1 and 2
 Planning Commission Issues Matrix for June 15, 2016

Issue	Discussion Notes		Status			
	<table border="1"> <tr> <td data-bbox="856 245 1077 282">Dormitory</td> <td data-bbox="1077 245 1787 282" rowspan="2">Bed (0.5, 1.0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="856 282 1077 342">Residential suite</td> </tr> </table>	Dormitory	Bed (0.5, 1.0)	Residential suite	<p>Downtown Redmond includes two developments, Tudor Manor (2011) and Vision 5 (2013), comprised entirely of this housing type and staff anticipates construction of a third development, 162Ten, within the year. Natural and Built Environments, developer of the Redmond projects, also constructed the Arete (2015) residential suites in Kirkland. The developer provides staff with updates regarding parking supply and demand for each of the Redmond projects and has reported that less than half of the residents of Tudor Manor, for example, own cars.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p>	
Dormitory	Bed (0.5, 1.0)					
Residential suite						
Additional Issues						
<p>3. Could portions of Leary Way or Gilman Street be vacated to function as pedestrian-only areas? (MacNichols, Miller, Nichols)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion:</u> Commissioner MacNichols, Miller, and Nichols requested information regarding the potential for vacation of right of way to take place at locations in the Historic Core such as Leary Way or Gilman Street.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation:</u> Staff is currently working with a consultant to analyze aspects of the Leary Way and Gilman Street streetscapes and anticipates bringing proposed amendments to the Planning Commission in September 2016. Those recommendations will involve Zoning Code provisions for the street cross-section and applicable standards for adjacent development. Whether portions of these streets should be closed on a permanent or temporary basis to function as pedestrian only is a larger question that would need transportation and other analysis beyond the scope of the proposed Historic Core plan.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p>		<p>Opened 4/20</p>			