

Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Plan Update (LAND-2014-00055)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for February 19, 2014, *last updated on February 18, 2014*

Discussion Issues

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
A. Vision		
A1. General theme of shifting housing to Marymoor Subarea and creating employment capacity in the Northeast Subarea: does the Commission concur at a high level that this is an appropriate recommendation? (Biethan)	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 2/12: The CAC recommendation is described in the Technical Committee Report.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	Opened 2/12
B. Character		
B1. Is there a synergy of character between the two halves (north, south of Redmond Way)? If not, what could it be? (Chandorkar)	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 2/19: Staff concurs with the CAC Co-Chairs’ analysis as described below. Another theme that unites the two parts of the neighborhood is innovation. Businesses on both sides of Redmond Way are engaged in making new products, ranging from new gaming technology to hydraulic lifts. In fact, businesses on one side of Redmond Way are sometimes suppliers to businesses on the other side.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u> 2/12: The CAC Co-Chairs responded that better connections across Redmond Way would go a long way toward integrating these different parts of the neighborhood. In addition to physical connections, the Co-Chairs noted that connections between people could also have a positive impact in a neighborhood where there are a wide variety of ongoing activities.</p>	Opened 2/12
C. Environment		
C1. How does the plan address greening the neighborhood? (joint meeting)	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	Opened 2/12

Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Plan Update (LAND-2014-00055)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for February 19, 2014, *last updated on February 18, 2014*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
C2. How do we affect and protect the aquifer in the Marymoor Subarea and the neighborhood as a whole as new development occurs? (Chandorkar)	<u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>Public Comment</u>	Opened 2/12
D. Land Use		
D1. How are manufacturing operations addressed in the proposed plan? (joint meeting)	<u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>Public Comment</u>	Opened 2/12
D2. What are general impacts to schools of the proposed land use plan? (joint meeting)	<u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>Public Comment</u>	Opened 2/12
D3. What is performance zoning? Provide a primer. (joint meeting)	<u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 2/19: A brief description of performance zoning is included in the Technical Committee Report. Details on implementation will be discussed when the Planning Commission reviews the implementing regulations for this plan update. <u>Public Comment</u>	Opened 2/12
D4. What building heights are being contemplated? (joint meeting)	<u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>Public Comment</u>	Opened 2/12

Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Plan Update (LAND-2014-00055)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for February 19, 2014, *last updated on February 18, 2014*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
E. Housing		
<p>E1. Discuss no-net-loss housing policy. Is it appropriate in this case? Where else could housing be accommodated? (Sanders, Chandorkar)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 2/19: Redmond’s resident population is about 55,000 and its daytime population pushes 100,000. Redmond nearly doubles in size during the day because it is a regional jobs center. This puts an unusual burden on local infrastructure and services, especially transportation infrastructure. The Comprehensive Plan establishes housing and jobs targets for 2030. It is important to retain the limited capacity that exists for housing so that Redmond can achieve its vision of being a community where people can choose to live and work, thereby shortening commutes and associated impacts. Eroding housing capacity through rezones makes it difficult to achieve that vision. The proposed rezone of land in SE Redmond from R-12 to employment would reduce housing capacity by 700 dwellings. In terms of alternative locations, staff also considered Overlake Village though the allowed height and capacity for housing in Overlake already exceeds what developers are proposing to build at this time. Increasing that capacity may not be meaningful for some time.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	<p>Opened 2/12</p>
<p>E2. How does the plan address having housing near family-wage jobs? What do we mean by family wage jobs? How does plan facilitate aging in place and not getting priced out of the neighborhood? (Murray, joint meeting)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 2/19 UPDATED: First, definitions. Redmond does not define a “family wage” nor does the term appear in the proposed neighborhood plan. It does appear elsewhere in the Comprehensive Plan, and was raised at the Planning Commission-City Council joint meeting in December 2013. One definition comes from the “2010 Northwest Job Gap Study” by the Alliance for a Just Society. Its definition is quoted in the December 2012 King County Comprehensive Plan, page 9-11, as follows: “A family wage...is a wage that allows a family to meet its basic needs without resorting to public assistance and provides it some ability to deal with emergencies and plan ahead.” According to the study, a family wage in King County in 2010 was \$32.01 per hour, or \$66,589 per year. The average wage in King County in 2010 was \$27.08 per hour, or \$56,326 per year.</p>	<p>Opened 2/12</p>

Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Plan Update (LAND-2014-00055)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for February 19, 2014, *last updated on February 18, 2014*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>In a broad sense, all of Redmond’s existing and future housing is “near” family-wage jobs. Using the definition above, thousands of such jobs exist in Downtown, Overlake, Southeast Redmond, Sammamish Valley and Willows/Rose Hill combined. In a narrower sense, shifting housing capacity to the Marymoor Subarea gives families in those homes better future options for accessing jobs. The area north of Woodbridge is at the edge of the City and is not well-served by transit. We heard anecdotes from apartment managers in the area that tenants leave for other parts of Redmond because commuting by transit is not convenient enough in Southeast Redmond. The Marymoor Subarea is not currently served by any transit, but in the future will be connected to the region’s job centers via light rail. The Marymoor Subarea is also a potential growth center for jobs in new industries. Neighborhood plan policies call for zoning regulations that allow for growth, change, and adaptation in area businesses so that they can thrive as the economy changes. Those jobs would be within walking distance of new homes in the Marymoor Subarea.</p> <p>Having homes at a variety of price points puts Redmond within reach for more individuals and families. The neighborhood plan supports that most importantly by retaining housing capacity. Continuing to maintain capacity means more people can choose to live in Redmond near good jobs. Second, the neighborhood plan calls for a minimum amount of designated affordable housing, similar to policies and regulations in place in much of Redmond. The policies also provide for using creative incentive and regulatory approaches to achieving affordable housing. Having a supply of long-term affordable housing facilitates aging in place and reduces instances of getting priced out.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	
<p>E3. What innovative housing opportunities are proposed in the plan, such as live-work options? Where have these been successful? (joint meeting)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 2/19 UPDATED: Innovative housing opportunities are emphasized in the Marymoor Subarea and in the little land that remains for single-family development. Starting with the latter, the plan encourages diversity in single-family unit type, such as by encouraging cottages, single-family attached homes and small-lot short plats (“backyard homes”). In the Marymoor</p>	<p>Opened 2/12</p>

Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Plan Update (LAND-2014-00055)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for February 19, 2014, *last updated on February 18, 2014*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>Subarea the plan calls for using performance zoning. What this means for housing is that there will be less emphasis on unit type and more emphasis on ensuring that at least 700 units are accommodated in the area, and that the subarea works well as a place for people to live, work and visit. Live-work is one possibility in the Marymoor Subarea, especially along NE 65th St. where the soft edge of the housing area is planned to be. Lions Gate is a local example of live-work.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	
F. Economic Vitality		
<p>F1. Consider the complementary nature of schools and jobs, especially in the Marymoor Subarea. (joint meeting)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>2/19</u>: The following supplements the discussion of this aspect that can be found in the Technical Committee Report.</p> <p>Schools such as the Lake Washington Institute of Technology will be allowed uses within the Marymoor and in portions of the Northeast Subareas. Close proximity to employment areas can facilitate opportunities for active learning such as through internships and apprenticeships and could incite entrepreneurial ventures. The Southeast Redmond CAC noted their interest in such opportunities as well as for small, incubator spaces, business support systems that could be provided through economic development, and partnerships with K12 schools including Lake Washington School District’s STEM school.</p> <p>The southern portion of the Northeast Subarea provides support for siting schools as an additional component of community building. Staff concurs with the CAC’s interest in using this area as a place that not only provides transition between residential and employment uses but also as a place that helps establish a sense of neighborhood place and character. Places of learning could develop in cooperation with additional residential, Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Park, and future neighborhood commercial. Similarly, proximity to employment could provide opportunities for partnership and active, enhanced learning.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	<p>Opened 2/12</p>

Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Plan Update (LAND-2014-00055)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for February 19, 2014, *last updated on February 18, 2014*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
<p>F2. What opportunities are available for expanding higher-ed opportunities, such as LWIT? How can we expect higher-ed opportunities to grow and succeed in the Marymoor Subarea without transit service? (Murray, joint meeting)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 2/19: Plan policies, especially LU-18, call for adopting zoning regulations that allow for educational opportunities, such as those offered at LWIT. There is currently no transit service in the Marymoor Subarea. Of course, this will change with the addition of light rail, though that is many years in the future. In the meantime, plan policies call for improving the pedestrian and bicycle environment across Redmond Way and for improving access to transit. Metro is working with the City on an alternative transit service pilot in Southeast Redmond, and we may learn from that experiment that alternative forms of transit access are viable in the neighborhood. New traditional local transit service is difficult to initiate anywhere in Metro’s service area due to lack of funding.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	<p>Opened 2/12</p>
G. Regional Retail		
H. Marymoor		
<p>H1. Describe how the neighborhood plan generally addresses the proposed Light Link rail station. How does the plan address more-detailed station area planning and the evolution of land uses in the area? Where is the appropriate location for housing in the subarea? (Biethan, Miller, joint meeting)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 2/19 UPDATED: Generally, the neighborhood plan addresses the link light rail station by: 1) supporting light rail extension in policy, 2) providing opportunities for employment and housing within walking distance of the light rail station, 3) calling for a more-connected transportation network in the Marymoor Subarea, and 4) calling for future, more-detailed station area planning efforts in cooperation with Sound Transit.</p> <p>The CAC’s recommendation is to accommodate about 700 new homes in the subarea, focusing on the area closest to Marymoor Park. Reasons for focusing residential growth closer to Marymoor Park include: 1) homes would be farther from freeway and light rail station noise, 2) homes would enjoy adjacency to a regional park, and 3) research indicates that people are typically willing to walk further between homes and transit than they are between work and transit (for example, see this paper from the Public Policy Institute of California: http://www.ppic.org/content/pubs/report/r_211jkr.pdf, especially starting at</p>	<p>Opened 2/12</p>

Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Plan Update (LAND-2014-00055)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for February 19, 2014, *last updated on February 18, 2014*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>page 14).</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	
<p>H2. What are the consequences of shifting housing capacity from the Northeast to Marymoor Subarea? Address 1) economic vitality, 2) displacement, 3) harmonizing residential and manufacturing uses, and 4) infrastructure and amenities needed to support housing. (Miller, Chandorkar, joint meeting)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 2/19 UPDATED: Overall, shifting housing capacity from the Northeast to the Marymoor Subarea fosters a relationship with Marymoor Park by zoning for housing directly adjacent to the Park’s boundary, establishes a unique living environment that capitalizes on a more urban environment while maintaining connection with extensive open space, places density within walkable and bikable access to the neighborhood’s commercial area and to Downtown by way of light rail and trails, and enables more people to live near the Lake Washington Institute of Technology. The further responses below describe anticipated consequences for the specific issues Commissioners identified.</p> <p>Economic Vitality: The recommended shift of capacity creates opportunity for employment in 70 acres of land that is currently zoned for residential uses. Staff has heard from OneRedmond that this type of land would be desirable for employment uses. Additional findings from outreach for the neighborhood plan update indicates interest in flexible business space. Both of these could be accommodated in the Northeast Subarea. Ultimately, the variety of employment areas maintained and recommended through the neighborhood plan support a variety of business types and sizes.</p> <p>Displacement: Businesses in the Marymoor Subarea could be displaced over time as a result of the change in zoning from Manufacturing Park to a zoning designation that emphasizes housing. These businesses could relocate in the Central Subarea or the Northeast Subarea.</p> <p>Harmonizing Residential and Manufacturing Uses: The Northeast Subarea recommendation calls for a variety of strategies for transition and buffering between residential and higher intensity land uses. Regulations under development will work to establish a transition that enhances quality of life for those who live and work in the Subarea. The Marymoor Subarea recommendation calls for an urban and industrial character that supports people who live,</p>	<p>Opened 2/12</p>

Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Plan Update (LAND-2014-00055)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for February 19, 2014, *last updated on February 18, 2014*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>work, and visit, including by having some convenience and community gathering amenities. Due to ingress and egress challenges, this Subarea may transition away from heavier manufacturing processes toward a variety of uses that are supportive in the proposed performance zoning.</p> <p>Infrastructure and Amenities: New development and redevelopment will require investment in transportation and other infrastructure and amenities. Plan policies call for a detailed infrastructure study of the Marymoor Subarea in recognition of this.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	
<p>H3. Are artist lofts a realistic expectation here? (Miller, O’Hara)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 2/19 UPDATED: Two perspectives encouraged the CAC’s discussion regarding live-work uses or artist lofts. The first comes from Redmond’s artistic community as they describe the need for small, affordable places to work and possibly live while having opportunity to showcase and sell their products. The second comes from the emerging housing trend of small, studio or single-room occupancy units being developed in Redmond’s Downtown and other urban areas. Tudor Manor, Vision 5 and most recently, the Allez.</p> <p>Though the neighborhood plan supports this type of development, it does not specifically require such. More so, the plan provides flexibility through performance zoning for this and a variety of other forms of design and use within constrained end points such as minimum and maximum height and lot line setbacks.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	<p>Opened 2/12</p>
<p>H4. How does the plan address the Marymoor Park edge and access to the park? (joint meeting)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 2/19 UPDATED: The neighborhood and then the CAC emphasized enhancing connections to and a neighborhood relationship with Marymoor Park. Staff met with King County Park</p>	<p>Opened 2/12</p>

Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Plan Update (LAND-2014-00055)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for February 19, 2014, *last updated on February 18, 2014*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>planners to review the neighborhood plan and to consider this request. Their perspective was similar though with caution regarding vehicular traffic as mentioned above in H2. Primarily, the housing portion of the Subarea creates a physical and conceptual connection to and with the Park. Design and non-motorized connections will help those who live and work in the area to access and capitalize on the Park.</p> <p>Local trails will also help people from other portions of the neighborhood and vicinity access the Park and take advantage of regional trails such as the East Lake Sammamish Trail and the Sammamish River Trail. Per County Park staff’s request, a pathway will also help people traveling by light rail connect with the central portion of the Park, thereby creating travel alternatives for those visiting the Park and its various events.</p> <p>Design and landscaping will also help soften and blend the transition between the Park and the Subarea’s distinct uses.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	
I. Redmond Way		
<p>I1. How did the overlay process develop and how are we responding to feedback from the community? Does the proposed plan create an adequate long-term solution to the question of additional retail/ service uses along Redmond Way? (joint meeting, Murray)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	<p>Opened 2/12</p>
J. Central		
<p>J1. Describe how the Taylor Property fits into the proposed neighborhood plan. (Biethan)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	<p>Opened 2/12</p>

Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Plan Update (LAND-2014-00055)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for February 19, 2014, *last updated on February 18, 2014*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
K. Northeast		
<p>K1. Provide additional detail about thoughts around the Cadman site and how the long-term plan fits into the current. What do we know about Cadman’s future plans? Address the growth of Woodbridge. (Biethan, O’Hara, joint meeting)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 2/19 UPDATED: A representative of Cadman participated on the Southeast Redmond CAC and helped ensure that the plan provides ongoing support for their business and specific operations within the neighborhood over the long-term. One of Cadman’s acquisition and development specialists provided input during the plan update process by attending one of three quarterly open houses, reviewing the plan’s progress online, and providing feedback to staff.</p> <p>In keeping with amended land use patterns, existing businesses and operations are supported in place, based on current operations. The Northeast Subarea incorporates Cadman’s interest in maintaining a neighborhood presence and progressively focusing its operations in the northern portion of the Subarea. Additionally, Cadman would like to reserve opportunity for master planning in response to market conditions at such time that it opts to sell portions of its land. To ensure equitable transition between existing residential uses and the northern industrial uses, the Northeast Subarea will support master planning and through performance zoning, guide uses from lower intensities in the south to higher intensities in the north.</p> <p>An additional 140 to 170 dwelling units will be accommodated in the southern portion and will be buffered from adjacent low-intensity employment areas through vegetation and site design. 700 dwelling units will be accommodated in the Marymoor Subarea to offset density that is currently supported north of the Woodbridge community.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>	<p>Opened 2/12</p>
<p>K2. How have other areas dealt with similar transitions from residential to manufacturing and industrial uses? (joint meeting)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 2/19 UPDATED: To help the CAC consider strategies for equitable transitions between uses of different intensities, staff provided research material from online and field reconnaissance</p>	<p>Opened 2/12</p>

Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Plan Update (LAND-2014-00055)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for February 19, 2014, *last updated on February 18, 2014*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status																												
	<p>and from discussion with planning staff at case study locations. This process, as described in the Technical Report, included Fairhaven (Bellingham), Georgetown (Seattle), St. John’s (Portland) and Hillsboro, Oregon. Staff also visited Southlake Union and the historic-industrial and the northern Boeing Field portions of Georgetown.</p> <p>Land use, vegetation and site design including setbacks assist with transitions in these and other locations. Additional research regarding performance zoning identified examples in Fort Collins, Colorado, Harlem, New York, Gig Harbor, and Beaverton, Oregon through which combinations of these three strategies support adjacencies similar to those found currently and anticipated in Southeast Redmond.</p> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>																													
<p>K3. Is shifting employment uses into the Northeast Subarea the right approach? Consider that Redmond doesn’t necessarily have a surplus of manufacturing land that can be turned-over to residential uses. (joint meeting)</p>	<p><u>Planning Commission Discussion</u></p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 2/19 UPDATED: The rationale for this recommendation is contained in the Technical Committee Report. The following table shows the Northeast Subarea’s current land use and recommended land use by area.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="667 943 1692 1333"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Current Area</th> <th>Recommended Area</th> <th>Difference</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Residential</td> <td>72 acres</td> <td>11 acres</td> <td>- 61 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Business Park</td> <td>37 acres</td> <td>21 acres</td> <td>- 16 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Industrial</td> <td>79 acres</td> <td>79 acres</td> <td>No change</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Neighborhood Commercial</td> <td>--</td> <td>6 acres</td> <td>+ 6 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Design District for employment uses</td> <td>--</td> <td>70 acres</td> <td>+ 70 acres</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Park</td> <td>15 acres</td> <td>15 acres</td> <td>No change</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Public Comment</u></p>		Current Area	Recommended Area	Difference	Residential	72 acres	11 acres	- 61 acres	Business Park	37 acres	21 acres	- 16 acres	Industrial	79 acres	79 acres	No change	Neighborhood Commercial	--	6 acres	+ 6 acres	Design District for employment uses	--	70 acres	+ 70 acres	Park	15 acres	15 acres	No change	<p>Opened 2/12</p>
	Current Area	Recommended Area	Difference																											
Residential	72 acres	11 acres	- 61 acres																											
Business Park	37 acres	21 acres	- 16 acres																											
Industrial	79 acres	79 acres	No change																											
Neighborhood Commercial	--	6 acres	+ 6 acres																											
Design District for employment uses	--	70 acres	+ 70 acres																											
Park	15 acres	15 acres	No change																											

Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Plan Update (LAND-2014-00055)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for February 19, 2014, *last updated on February 18, 2014*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
L. Evans Creek		
L1. How do we protect Woodbridge from the adjacent/ nearby and less residential uses? (Biethan)	Planning Commission Discussion Staff Response/Recommendation Public Comment	Opened 2/12
M. Transportation		
M1. Stated goal is encourage walking and bicycling to/ from light rail station, but not seeing adequate planned crossings of Redmond Way near there. (O’Hara)	Planning Commission Discussion Staff Response/Recommendation Public Comment	Opened 2/12
M2. What are the likely traffic impacts of shifting housing to the Marymoor Subarea? (Chandorkar)	Planning Commission Discussion Staff Response/Recommendation Public Comment	Opened 2/12
M3. What happens to traffic with future growth, especially NE 76 th Street? (Murray)	Planning Commission Discussion Staff Response/Recommendation Public Comment	Opened 2/12
M4. How does the plan address freight mobility? (joint meeting)	Planning Commission Discussion Staff Response/Recommendation Public Comment	
M5. How does the plan address	Planning Commission Discussion	Opened

Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Plan Update (LAND-2014-00055)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for February 19, 2014, *last updated on February 18, 2014*

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
connectivity, especially: 1) light rail to businesses, 2) ped-bike generally, and 3) East Lake Sammamish Trail to Redmond Central Connector? (joint meeting)	<u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>Public Comment</u>	2/12
M6. What is the future of the Bear Creek park & ride with the arrival of light rail transit? (Miller)	<u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>Public Comment</u>	Opened 2/12
N. Parks / Rec / Open Space		
N1. How does the plan address parks and open space? (joint meeting)	<u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>Public Comment</u>	Opened 2/12
O. Neighborhood Gathering		
P. Other		
P1. Should the Keller property near Millennium be incorporated into the neighborhood? (Chandorkar)	<u>Planning Commission Discussion</u> <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> <u>Public Comment</u>	Opened 2/12

Questions

1. *What is the net change, if any, of the number of planned residential units in the new plan, compared to the current plan in place? Does the mix of housing type (multi- vs. single-family) change in the new proposed plan? (Biethan, Chandorkar)*

Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Plan Update (LAND-2014-00055)

Planning Commission Issues Matrix for February 19, 2014, *last updated on February 18, 2014*

2/19: The existing housing capacity in the Northeast Subarea is about 850 units. Of those, about 700 are proposed to shift to the Marymoor Subarea and about 150 are proposed to remain in the Northeast Subarea. Thus, the net change for the neighborhood overall is about zero. The existing capacity in the Northeast Subarea is zoned R-12. The future capacity in the Marymoor Subarea would be at an average closer to 20-25 units per acre. That could include a mix of townhomes and flats, with probably more flats than townhomes in order to achieve a total of 700 units.

2. *What is the level of transit service in Southeast Redmond? (Murray)*

2/19: Please see the Redmond Transit Map for a good overview of transit service in Southeast Redmond. It can be viewed online at <http://redmond.gov/common/pages/UserFile.aspx?fileId=71383>.

3. *What is the size of the transition area in the Northeast Subarea? How much land? What is the scope? (Murray)*

2/19 UPDATED: The Northeast Subarea is 222 acres and includes the following recommended land uses: Industrial (79 acres), Business Park (21 acres), Design District employment area (70 acres), Neighborhood Commercial (6 acres), Residential (11 acres), Rural Residential (20 acres) and Park (15 acres).

Other Southeast Redmond Subarea land areas are as follows:

NAME	ACREAGE
Central	366
Evans Creek	214
Marymoor	691
Northeast	222
Redmond Way	40
Regional Retail	91

For size comparison, Redmond Town Center is 149 acres and Marymoor Park is 640 acres.