

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

Old Town Historic Core & Leary Way (PR-2015-00795) – Package 1 and 2
 Planning Commission Issues Matrix for June 22, 2016

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
B. Small Lot Residential Density Limit (Package 1, Technical Committee Report, April 8, 2016, Exhibit B, page 3)		
1. What could realistically be built on small lots given the remaining standards including on-site parking requirements? (Biethan)	<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>	Opened 4/20, Closed 4/27

Old Town Historic Core & Leary Way (PR-2015-00795) – Package 1 and 2
 Planning Commission Issues Matrix for June 22, 2016

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
C. Exterior Building Material (Package 1, Technical Committee Report, April 8, 2016, Exhibit B)		
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><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 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>	Opened 4/20, Closed 4/27

Old Town Historic Core & Leary Way (PR-2015-00795) – Package 1 and 2
 Planning Commission Issues Matrix for June 22, 2016

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
D. Building Design - Cap (Package 2, Technical Committee Report, May 27, 2016, Exhibit A)		
1. Can the list of permitted roof forms provide additional flexibility for design? (Miller)	<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>6/15: Commissioner Miller described that his primary interest was in wanting to ensure that the prescriptive nature of this code section was specific to the Historic Core and did not expand to other portions of the Downtown. He asked staff to provide additional background information particularly regarding the criteria through which the Design Review Board would measure proposed development against the Historic Core design standards. With the information provided and staff’s confirmation that the requirement would be limited to the Historic Core overlay, Commissioner Miller closed this issue.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation:</u></p> <p>6/15: In preparation for its 2015 review of proposed amendments to Historic Core zoning code standards, the Commission requested that staff meet with the Design Review Board (DRB) in advance in order to include DRB members’ recommendations for the Commission’s reference and discussion. The DRB discussed this topic at their March 19, 2015 meeting in the context of tripartite architecture and provided the following recommendations for development, specific to the building cap:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The building cap should complement traditional character found in the Historic Core; • The new design standards should require distinctive architectural and design definition to ensure that the building cap creates a visible and high quality termination for the structure; and • The code should also include opportunity for variety and innovation. <p>The Commission had also identified in their criteria for review the Principles for Design Review, developed by Makers in 2015. Principles 2, 4, 5, and 10 provide guidance for</p>	Opened 6/8, Closed 6/15

Old Town Historic Core & Leary Way (PR-2015-00795) – Package 1 and 2
 Planning Commission Issues Matrix for June 22, 2016

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>developing code standards for building design and roof forms:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Encourage building variety while providing for designs that reflect the context of the site and that include some unifying elements of consistency within specific districts. (E.g.: Use of brick near historic core to create a more unified district.) 4. Encourage buildings with a variety of heights and interesting roof forms. 5. Ensure that new buildings enhance rather than detract from nearby or adjacent historic structures. 10. Ensure that individual building elements and details are visually consistent with a building’s overall architectural style. <p>6/8: 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 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>	

Old Town Historic Core & Leary Way (PR-2015-00795) – Package 1 and 2
 Planning Commission Issues Matrix for June 22, 2016

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status					
E. On-Site Parking Ratio for Residential Suites (Package 2, Technical Committee Report, May 27, 2016, Exhibit A)							
1. 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>6/15: Commissioner Miller was satisfied with the information and clarification that the required minimum ratio for residential suites did not include a provision, similar to multi-family structures, that permits counting of adjacent on-street parking for 25 percent of the required off-street parking. He closed this item.</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 1166 1583 1382"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="2" data-bbox="856 1166 1583 1198">Residential</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="856 1198 1075 1256">Attached dwelling unit, 2-4 units</td> <td data-bbox="1075 1198 1583 1382" 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 1256 1075 1382">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, Closed 6/15
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 22, 2016

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status			
	<table border="1" data-bbox="858 240 1583 341"> <tr> <td data-bbox="858 240 1075 277">Dormitory</td> <td data-bbox="1075 240 1583 277" rowspan="2">Bed (0.5, 1.0)</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="858 277 1075 341">Residential suite</td> </tr> </table> <p data-bbox="667 380 1755 623">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 data-bbox="667 662 873 695"><u>Public Comment:</u></p>	Dormitory	Bed (0.5, 1.0)	Residential suite	
Dormitory	Bed (0.5, 1.0)				
Residential suite					
<p data-bbox="191 737 642 1122">2. What is the history or source of the allowance for attached dwelling and multifamily development to count 25 percent of on-street parking toward the required off-street parking? Does or how does this provision conflict with the transportation demand management program elements? (Miller, Nichols, and Captain)</p>	<p data-bbox="667 737 1749 943"><u>Planning Commission Discussion:</u> Commissioners requested information regarding the existing code allowance for counting curbside parking along a project site for up to 25 percent of required off-street parking. The Commissioners wanted to understand whether and how this provision possibly conflicts with components of the Transportation Demand Management program such as customer parking in the Historic Core and vicinity of the Downtown.</p> <p data-bbox="667 985 1766 1230"><u>Staff Response/Recommendation:</u> The purpose of this code allowance is to provide some credit for curbside parking that is along the development frontage (up to 25 percent of the off-street requirement). It recognizes that the parking directly fronts the new development and is likely to be used by guests and for short term tenant use. Throughout the Downtown, the required minimum parking for guests is calculated at one parking space for every four dwelling units. The allowance was established approximately two decades ago to also provide an incentive for new development in the Downtown.</p> <p data-bbox="667 1273 1759 1373">However, the provision for counting curbside parking is available only for development that meets the minimum required number of spaces per unit. For projects that request reduced parking requirements, the on-street parking provision would not be available.</p>	<p data-bbox="1801 737 1902 802">Opened 6/15</p>			

Old Town Historic Core & Leary Way (PR-2015-00795) – Package 1 and 2
 Planning Commission Issues Matrix for June 22, 2016

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<u>Public Comment:</u>	
Additional Issues		
3. Could portions of Leary Way or Gilman Street be vacated to function as pedestrian-only areas? (MacNichols, Miller, Nichols)	<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>	Opened 4/20