

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
R22 Master Planned Development, Development Agreement, Binding Site Plan, and Site Plan Entitlement		
<p>1. Affordable Housing and Incentive Program</p> <p>(Council President Stuart)</p>	<p><u>Council Discussion</u></p> <p>Council President Stuart requested information on the affordable housing and any Incentive Program measures that are proposed with this application.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u></p> <p>The applicant is proposing that 12.5% of residential dwelling units be affordable to households making up to 50% of the King County area median income (AMI). In order to achieve the minor increase in allowable floor area ratio (FAR) required to support the project as proposed, the applicant is proposing one additional affordable dwelling unit at 50% AMI, which would achieve 40 points (equivalent to 0.8 bonus FAR), pursuant to RZC 21.55.200.</p>	<p>Opened 2/3/26</p> <p>Closed 2/24/26</p>
<p>2. Deviation Requests</p> <p>(Councilmember Kritzer)</p>	<p><u>Council Discussion</u></p> <p>Councilmember Kritzer requested information on the requests for deviations and Administrative Design Flexibility that are being made with this application.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u></p> <p>The application requests ten (10) instances of flexibility from Redmond Zoning Code (RZC) standards, and the deviation requests are summarized below. The RZC provides mechanisms for requesting flexibility, and the code authority by which the flexibility is requested is also included below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Design Flexibility-Impervious Surface Coverage: RZC 21.12.500 establishes a maximum impervious surface coverage of 80% of the site area in the OBAT Zone. The applicant is requesting ADF to increase the allowable impervious surface to 86% across the Master Plan area. The project seeks to maximize the density on the site while still allowing abundant light and views to dwelling units and avoiding bulky massing from the street, which requires a building that covers a large portion of the site. Therefore, the request for increased impervious surface allows for the Master Plan to achieve superior design. The Technical Committee recommends approval of this ADF request. 	<p>Opened 2/3/26</p> <p>Closed 2/24/26</p>

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Code Authority: RZC 21.76.070.C • Landscaping Deviation-5' Planting Area: RZC 21.32.050.P requires that a minimum five-foot-wide planting area be provided between all exterior building walls and vehicular paved areas such as driveways and parking lots. Some of the areas between buildings and vehicular paved areas are not able to provide the minimum 5-foot planting width required because of vehicle and fire access width requirements. The proposal provides planting at reduced widths where planting remains feasible, reducing widths to 3'9" and 4'8" in certain locations. In those locations dedicated to emergency access and back-of-house functions, planting has been omitted between the drive aisle and the building. While the proposal does not strictly comply with the landscaping requirements along each individual drive aisle, the overall Master Plan area provides high-quality areas of consolidated landscaping in common open space areas and along the public right-of-way that meet the intent of the landscaping standards of RZC 21.32. This deviation is granted by the Technical Committee. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Code Authority: RZC 21.32.030. • Landscaping Deviation-Urban Landscaping Tree Requirements: RZC 21.32.070.B.3 requires that one tree be provided for every 125 square feet of required open space, which would require 226 trees to be planted on-site. The required number of trees is not feasible due to conflicts with underground utilities and ancillary equipment. Trees must be planted a certain distance from underground utilities so that roots do not interfere with underground pipes or cables, thereby limiting the number of trees able to be planted. Per RZC 21.32.030.A, the Technical Committee may allow deviations from the landscaping standards of RZC 21.32 in the case of conflicts with utilities. This deviation is granted by the Technical Committee. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Code Authority: RZC 21.32.030. • Tree Exception Request: RZC 21.72 establishes standards for the retention, protection, and replacement of trees when development occurs. As noted in Section VI, the applicant is seeking a tree exception to remove landmark trees and retain less than 35% of existing significant trees on-site. RZC 21.72.090 authorizes the Administrator to grant exceptions to the requirements of RZC 21.72, provided that the exception request satisfies the criteria of 	

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p>RZC 21.72.090.B. Strict compliance with the tree code standards would be in conflict with the increased density of urban centers and would be inconsistent with the adopted vision for the Overlake Metro Center. Strict compliance with tree retention standards is made more difficult by the fact that the existing site is developed with surface parking, with trees interspersed within the parking area throughout the interior of the lot. In order for this site to achieve the higher-density urban development envisioned in Redmond 2050, exceptions from the standards of RZC 21.72 are necessary. The deviation is granted by the Administrator.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Code Authority: RZC 21.72.090 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Deviation-Vehicle Parking Dimensions: RZC 21.40.010 establishes dimensional standards for parking spaces. The applicant is requesting a deviation from minimum parking space width requirements to allow for partial intrusion of structural columns into parking spaces. Pursuant to RZC 21.40.010.E.1, the Technical Committee may approve alternate designs not meeting the established parking standards when a qualified transportation engineer demonstrates that the alternate design proposal meets more current and accepted standards. The applicant cited Desman, an engineering firm that specializes in parking garage design, which indicated that the narrower stalls are an acceptable solution for residential parking (Attachment 10-Sheet 34 and Attachment 11-Sheet 33). Therefore, the deviation is granted by the Technical Committee. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Code Authority: RZC 21.40.010 • Administrative Design Flexibility-Private Open Space: The applicant is requesting ADF from the private open space requirements of RZC 21.36.100.B to allow for only 53% of dwelling units to provide private open spaces such as balconies and patios. The applicant is also requesting that up to 50% of the balconies be 12 square feet rather than the minimum 50 square feet typically required. RZC 21.36.100.B.2 specifically allows for these deviations to be pursued through the ADF process. Providing one 50-foot balcony per unit would result in a cluttered façade, and the reduction in size allows for more flexibility and variation in the façade, contributing to a better overall design. The Technical Committee recommends approval of this ADF request. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Code Authority: RZC 21.76.070.C 	

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Administrative Design Flexibility-Street Typology and Relationship to Buildings: For Phase 2, the applicant is requesting ADF from the requirement that there must be a minimum of 50% of the building edge within 0-20 feet from the street-facing property line, as required by RZC 21.12.510.C. Existing utility easements along the street front for Phase 2 prevent the project from complying with the minimum building edge requirement. However, the building front of Phase 2 is located as near to the sidewalk as is feasible, maintaining a 0-20 foot distance for 28% of the building front and being located no further than 38 feet from the sidewalk at any point. Strict compliance with the street typology standards would result in underdevelopment of the site, so the ADF allows the proposal to better meet the intent of the OBAT Zone. The Technical Committee recommends approval of the ADF. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Code Authority: RZC 21.76.070.C • Administrative Design Flexibility-Minimum Waste Collection Points and Storage: the applicant is seeking ADF from the requirement that no dwelling unit within a multifamily development be more than 200 feet from a solid waste collection point (RZC 21.45.050). Each floor with dwelling units has a centralized trash collection room. The project proposes a maximum distance of 360 feet from dwelling unit to trash collection room. Due to significant grade changes across the site and the desire to limit the number of access roads through the site, there is only one location at the base of each building that is suitable for trash pickup. Providing additional ground-level trash transfer rooms would reduce the overall area dedicated to parking and resident amenities. While the maximum travel distance to dispose of trash is greater than 200 feet for some units, all of that distance is indoors and on the same floor. The Technical Committee recommends approval of the ADF. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Code Authority: RZC 21.76.070.C • Alternative Design Compliance-Rooflines: For Phase II, the applicant is requesting Alternative Design Compliance for the requirement that the width of any continuous roofline treatment must not extend more than 120 feet (RZC 21.58.3200). The applicant proposes continuous rooflines greater than 120 feet along internal access drive aisles, while maintaining roofline modulation for those façades facing the public street. Because the facades seeking 	

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p>Alternative Design Compliance do not face the street and have other buildings relatively close, the rooflines will not be easily visible from the public right-of-way or from ground level. In addition, the facades in question have a pattern of varying colors and materials as well as balconies, which serve to add texture and break down the perceived scale of the façade. The Alternative Design Compliance request meets the criteria of RZC 21.58.0300.E, and the request is granted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Code Authority: RZC 21.58.0300.E <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alternative Design Compliance-Minimum Residential Courtyard Dimensions: For Phase 2, the applicant is requesting Alternative Design Compliance from the minimum residential courtyard dimensions of RZC 21.58.6030, which require a minimum courtyard width of 55 feet. The majority of the east and west courtyards in the Phase 2 building comply with the minimum 55-foot width requirement, but due to the irregular shapes of the courtyards, there are points that narrow to a minimum of 36 feet for the west courtyard and 44 feet for the east courtyard. This deviation from courtyard width requirements allows for well-designed and usable courtyards that visually open to the street while still providing a balance of privacy and seclusion from traffic noise, thereby meeting the purpose of the courtyard dimension standards. The Alternative Design Compliance request is granted. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Code Authority: RZC 21.58.0300.E 	