



## Redmond Planning Commission Report: Appendices Land Use Map and Zoning Map Amendments – 6900 188th Ave NE

- A. Planning Commission Issues Matrix - Final
- B. Letters from Individual Commissioners
- C. Public Hearing Notice
- D. Public Hearing Minutes – Dec. 17, 2025
- E. Written Public Comments
- F. Technical Committee Report with Attachments
  - a. Staff Compliance Review and Analysis
  - b. Proposed Amendments to the Land Use Map and Zoning Map – 6900 188th Ave NE
  - c. SEPA Threshold Determination



Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status																					
1. Business Park Zones  Copley	<p><u><a href="#">Commission Discussion</a></u></p> <p>What percentage of total Business Park zoned land in Redmond does this proposal consist of?</p> <p><u><a href="#">Staff Comments</a></u></p> <p>There are two areas of Redmond where the Business Park zoning is located: in the Sammamish Valley near Willows Rd, and in SE Redmond, near Bear Creek, along 188th Ave NE, as well as Redmond Way. Business Park zones typically are adjacent to or serve as a buffer to manufacturing zones.</p> <p>Note that "Lot 7" refers to the parcel proposed for the land use /zoning map amendment.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="514 732 1255 1029"> <thead> <tr> <th><i>location</i></th> <th><i>Total acres</i></th> <th><i>% of total</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Redmond land area</i></td> <td>10,618 (16.59 sq miles)</td> <td>100%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Business Park zoning</i></td> <td>549</td> <td>5.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Sammamish Valley BP</i></td> <td>378</td> <td>3.5%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>SE Redmond BP</i></td> <td>171</td> <td>1.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Lot 7 - share of City BP</i></td> <td>4.82</td> <td>0.9 %</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Lot 7 - share of Bear Creek BP</i></td> <td>4.82</td> <td>2.8%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u><a href="#">Commission Discussion 12.17.25</a></u></p> <p>Commissioners requested information on the Development Agreements for the area, and how they apply to the proposal.</p> <p><u><a href="#">Staff Comments 12.17.25</a></u></p> <p>The original development agreement for the area that created the property known as Lot 7 is known as the Union Hill Corporate Campus (UHCC) Development Agreement (and sometimes referred to as the Taylor/Magnusson DA) and was adopted in 2007. It can be read at - <a href="https://www.redmond.gov/DocumentCenter/View/13551/TaylorMagnussen-Development-Agreement-City-Res-1265-PDF">https://www.redmond.gov/DocumentCenter/View/13551/TaylorMagnussen-Development-Agreement-City-Res-1265-PDF</a>. Following the development agreement, the City approved a short plat that created seven lots, including the lot in question. The short plat was recorded in 2012.</p>	<i>location</i>	<i>Total acres</i>	<i>% of total</i>	<i>Redmond land area</i>	10,618 (16.59 sq miles)	100%	<i>Business Park zoning</i>	549	5.2%	<i>Sammamish Valley BP</i>	378	3.5%	<i>SE Redmond BP</i>	171	1.6%	<i>Lot 7 - share of City BP</i>	4.82	0.9 %	<i>Lot 7 - share of Bear Creek BP</i>	4.82	2.8%	<p>Opened 11/17/2025</p> <p>Closed 1/14/2026</p>
<i>location</i>	<i>Total acres</i>	<i>% of total</i>																					
<i>Redmond land area</i>	10,618 (16.59 sq miles)	100%																					
<i>Business Park zoning</i>	549	5.2%																					
<i>Sammamish Valley BP</i>	378	3.5%																					
<i>SE Redmond BP</i>	171	1.6%																					
<i>Lot 7 - share of City BP</i>	4.82	0.9 %																					
<i>Lot 7 - share of Bear Creek BP</i>	4.82	2.8%																					

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p>Subsequently, the City executed three amendments to the DA in 2014, 2016 and 2019 as development and mitigation occurred. Later the property owner for Lot 7 proposed a new DA that applies only to Lot 7. The scope of the new Lot 7 DA is only to confirm and clarify those provisions from the Amended UHCC DA that remain applicable to Lot 7 and is supplemental to the Amended UHCC DA, which remains in full force and effect. This DA is known as Redmond Flex and was approved by Council in 2023. More information can be found at <a href="https://www.redmond.gov/1602/Redmond-Flex">https://www.redmond.gov/1602/Redmond-Flex</a>.</p> <p>More information on development agreements can be found at <a href="https://mrsc.org/explore-topics/planning/administration/development-agreements">https://mrsc.org/explore-topics/planning/administration/development-agreements</a>.</p>	
<p>2.</p> <p>Jobs needs and current job situation</p> <p>Weston</p>	<p><u><a href="#">Commission Discussion</a></u></p> <p>Commissioners asked about job goals and how the city is meeting said goals identified in Redmond 2050. Commissioners also asked about what kind of data, and at what level of detail, is available.</p> <p><u><a href="#">Staff Comments</a></u></p> <p>The Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan identifies that the City needs to accommodate about 30,000 additional jobs by 2050. About 78% of those jobs will be in designated centers, with the remainder located in areas of the Sammamish Valley and SE Redmond. The BP zone that the subject parcel is located in has 450 jobs allocated for future job growth. Assuming about 10 jobs/acre, (the BP zone section is about 46 acres), this site is allocated approximately 58 jobs. This would not change with a rezone as CMU allows for job-generating uses.</p> <p>The City does not have detailed data or statistics on economic data such as ownership, demographics, and job density - citywide or by zones. It is a goal of the City's economic development strategy to collect more detailed data.</p> <p>The Economic Strategic Plan does note:</p> <p><i>Small businesses represent a significant share of the City of Redmond's economy -93% of businesses in Redmond have less than 50 employees and employ just over 18% of all workers in the City of Redmond.</i></p> <p>More information can be found at - <a href="#">Redmond-Economic-Development-Strategic-Plan---ADOPTED-July-16-2024</a>.</p> <p>High level employment data can be found using the U.S Census OnTheMap tool: <a href="https://onthemap.ces.census.gov/">https://onthemap.ces.census.gov/</a>.</p>	<p>Opened 11/17/2025</p> <p>Closed 12/17/2025</p>

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p>3.</p> <p>Background on the existing split designation, origin of the CMU on 1 acre?</p> <p>Coleman</p>	<p><u>Commission Discussion</u></p> <p>Commissioner asked why the property has a Mixed-Use designation and the property is split zoned.</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u></p> <p>This is documented in the Technical Committee Report - Attachment A, criteria c. of the Zoning Map Amendment criteria. Staff was able to add some additional context and history.</p> <p>The 2007 Land Use Map for the City designated this parcel as <b>Multi-Family Urban (MFU)</b>. The Redmond 2030 Comp plan, adopted in 2011, continued this designation. These maps included areas designated as "proposed" general areas for neighborhood commercial.</p> <div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-around;"> <div data-bbox="520 727 1092 1230"> <p>Figure 1 - 2011 Land Use Map</p> </div> <div data-bbox="1134 727 1785 1230"> <p>Figure 2 - 2014 Land Use Map</p> </div> </div> <p>In 2014, per <a href="#">Ordinance 2752</a>, the Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Plan was updated. This update also included a Land Use and Zoning map amendment. This changed the zoning for the site from <b>MFU</b> to <b>Design District</b>, which allowed flexibility for residential and formalized a one-acre area of land as <b>Neighborhood</b></p>	<p>Opened 11/17/2025</p> <p>Closed 12/17/2025</p>

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p><b>Commercial.</b> The purpose was to create neighborhood amenities adjacent to the future SE Redmond Park and nearby residential development, as well as future businesses to the north</p> <p>The specific zoning divided the parcel into two zones, Neighborhood Commercial, which allowed residential uses, and NE Design District 2, which did not allow residential development and was intended to promote commercial/industrial development adjacent to other residential areas to promote local employment.</p> <p>Redmond 2050 continues this intention, even after land use and zoning consolidation that removed Design Districts and rezoned this property to Corridor Mixed Use and Business Park.</p> <p><u><a href="#">Commission Discussion 12.17.25</a></u></p> <p>Commissioner Van Niman asked about split-zoning and how this particular property became split zoned.</p> <p><u><a href="#">Staff Comments 12.17.25</a></u></p> <p>Staff provides additional history and context as a new issue in <a href="#">Issue 10</a> below.</p>	
<p>4.</p> <p>LWSD property and future uses</p> <p>Van Niman Weston Gagner</p>	<p><u><a href="#">Commission Discussion</a></u></p> <p>Clarification on what is the LWSD property? Note more clearly on maps and in discussion materials, as this future issue (potential school uses) weighs on the decision.</p> <p>Any plans to develop in next 5 years? Short term plans?</p> <p>Will change from BP to CMU affect development of a school?</p> <p><u><a href="#">Staff Comments</a></u></p> <p>The 24-acre parcel adjacent to the north of the parcel proposed to be rezoned is owned by the Lake Washington School District. Its most current capital facilities plan - <a href="#">Lake Washington School District Capital Facilities Plan 2025 - 30</a> identifies the property as Site #44 and is classified as reserved. LWSD in a follow up email noted that the property is being held for a potential fifth comprehensive high school in the future, but the district has no immediate plans, timeline, or funding for any projects on this site.</p> <p>The change in land use and zoning designation for this proposal has no impact on the future development of a school on the adjacent property.</p>	<p>Opened 11/17/2025</p> <p>Closed 12/17/2025</p>

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
<p>5.</p> <p>Facility demands</p> <p>Woodyear</p>	<p><u><a href="#">Commission Discussion</a></u></p> <p>How do we determine if we have capacity to accommodate changes?</p> <p><u><a href="#">Staff Comments</a></u></p> <p>All land use amendments, including comprehensive plan policy and land use map amendments, require a land use application and a State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) application. Staff from utilities, transportation, environmental, and planning review the applications to identify issues, including capacity to serve said proposal. As a Type VI process as defined in RZC 21.76, staff provides an analysis, and the Technical Committee makes a recommendation to Planning Commission. Planning Commission reviews this Technical Committee Report to inform its deliberations.</p>	<p>Opened 11/17/2025</p> <p>Closed 12/17/2025</p>
<p>6.</p> <p>Outreach to community, local neighborhood</p> <p>Coleman</p>	<p><u><a href="#">Commission Discussion</a></u></p> <p>Has outreach to the community and local neighbors been conducted?</p> <p><u><a href="#">Staff Comments</a></u></p> <p>Community outreach efforts adhere to the process proscribed for Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Map amendments as noted in RZC 21.76.</p> <p>This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Planning Commission holding study sessions and a public hearing.</li> <li>• Providing a 21-day notice for the public hearing.</li> <li>• Public notifications and letters to interested parties as part of the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) requirements.</li> <li>• Posting of an extraordinary sign per <a href="https://redmond.municipal.codes/RZC/21.76.080.F.5.b">https://redmond.municipal.codes/RZC/21.76.080.F.5.b</a>.</li> </ul>	<p>Opened 11/17/2025</p> <p>Closed 12/17/2025</p>

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	 <p>Additional efforts include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maintaining a webpage for this proposal at <a href="#">2025-26 Comprehensive Plan Docket   Redmond, WA.</a></li> <li>• Posting materials on the Planning Commission webpage.</li> <li>• Articles in the City's "Plans, Policies, and Regulations" newsletter.</li> </ul>	
7.	<p><b>Zoning code question</b></p> <p><b>Weston</b></p> <p><u><a href="#">Commission Discussion</a></u></p> <p>Impact on change to BP have on SE Redmond noise overlay? Move north, impact to properties to the north.              Concerned on MF zones?</p> <p>Transition overlays - what uses can be next to each other? What impacts on, impacts by overlays?              Worried about multifamily - is it isolated? Are we limiting multifamily future?</p> <p>How does this affect the manufacturing and industrial center designation?</p> <p><u><a href="#">Staff Comments</a></u></p> <p>The subject property is located near two Zoning Overlays, as noted in <a href="#">RZC 21.05.100</a>.</p> <p>The SE Redmond noise overlay is intended to protect new residential development from potential significant noise impacts from nonresidential uses, specifically operations at Genie Industries to the west and Heidelberg (Cadman) recycling and quarry-related operations to the north. It is intended to shift as the area redevelops and land uses change, such as for future residential and school development. The noise overlay was recently modified to accommodate the Woodside Townhomes development.</p>	<p>Opened 11/17/2025</p> <p>Closed 12/17/2025</p>

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p>The City is working on a Manufacturing-Industrial Center (MIC) designation for the Manufacturing Park and Industrial zones to the north and west of the subject parcel. More information can be found at <a href="https://www.redmond.gov/2347/Southeast-Redmond-Manufacturing-and-Indu">https://www.redmond.gov/2347/Southeast-Redmond-Manufacturing-and-Indu</a>. The subject property is outside the proposed designated MIC and would not have any impacts to the uses in the MIC.</p>	
<p>8.</p> <p>How many housing units allowed if rezoned?</p> <p>Copley</p>	<p><u><a href="#">Commission Discussion</a></u></p> <p>What is the possible maximum amount of housing units that could be allowed if rezoned?</p> <p><u><a href="#">Staff Comments</a></u></p> <p>An <u>approximation</u> of the maximum housing unit count that could be achieved can be determined by looking at the size of the parcel and the Floor Area Ratio (FAR) allowed in the zone. Using these variables with a commonly accepted average size of a housing unit can provide an estimate for land use planning purposes.</p> <p>Currently, the 5.84 acre parcel could potentially yield <b>109 housing units at 800 sq ft each</b>. (One acre of the parcel is zoned Corridor Mixed-Use).</p> <p>If the whole parcel is rezoned to Corridor Mixed Use, it could potentially yield <b>637 housing units at 800 sq ft each</b>.</p> <p>This is based on the assumptions:</p> <p>Parcel size: 5.84 acres (254,687 sq ft)                      Base Max FAR (w/o incentives) - 2.0                      Average housing unit size - 800 sq ft</p>	<p>Opened 11/17/2025</p> <p>Closed 1/14/2026</p>
<p>9.</p> <p>Zoning and land uses and projections</p> <p>Aparna</p>	<p><u><a href="#">Commission Discussion</a></u></p> <p>Comm Aparna submitted the following questions to provide additional context:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Corridor Mixed Use: As currently defined, does it involve office space? Are there prescribed ratios to qualify as mixed use?</li> </ol>	<p>Opened 11/17/2025</p> <p>Closed 12/17/2025</p>

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Given the importance of corridor mixed use and the complete neighborhood, what would be a good mix of small retail, small commercial/offices, and housing? Would this vary if a site has been converted from a BP park to a corridor mixed use?</li> <li>3. If the project is recommended, would it nullify in any way BP zoning/land use in other parts of the city?</li> <li>4. What was the projection for the jobs/ type of industry for this parcel?</li> </ol> <p><b><u>Staff Comments</u></b></p> <p>For reference, staff would like to note:</p> <p>The specific non-residential uses allowed in the CMU and BP zones can be found in <a href="https://redmond.municipal.codes/RZC/21.04.0200">https://redmond.municipal.codes/RZC/21.04.0200</a>.</p> <p>The residential uses allowed in the two types of zones can be found in <a href="https://redmond.municipal.codes/RZC/21.04.0100">https://redmond.municipal.codes/RZC/21.04.0100</a>.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The CMU allows uses that generally utilize office spaces. These fall under the broad uses categories that include "General Sales or Service" and "Education, Public, Health, and Other Institutions".</li> </ol> <p>Detailed zoning code requirements for CMU can be found in <a href="https://redmond.municipal.codes/RZC/21.08.100">https://redmond.municipal.codes/RZC/21.08.100</a>. The code does not proscribe the ratio of commercial to residential uses in a building, but does provide minimum ground floor ceiling heights for mixed use structures to encourage commercial first floor uses.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. The Corridor Mixed-Use designation allows for flexibility of uses to help achieve both City goals of creating jobs and developing complete neighborhoods. How those goals are met will be different for different areas of the City. The zoning code does not proscribe an ideal mix, but identifies preferred and allowed uses that could be part of the mix.</li> <li>3. This proposal is land use and zoning map amendment and is not a project proposal. This proposal has no impact on other areas that are similarly zoned CMU and/or BP. Any changes to those would require a separate amendment proposal that would need to be added to a future docket process or periodic review. Any changes to the Comp Plan land use policies or zoning code for these uses/zones would follow a similar process.</li> <li>4. Generally staff does not and can not project jobs and land uses on a specific parcel during the Comprehensive Plan update, but may use input from the Council, the community, others stakeholders, as well as well as owners and users in a given area to provide job growth allocations. The Land Use chapter of the Comp Plan as well as the Zoning Code provide the vision and specific uses allowed. These uses are</li> </ol>	

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p>grouped into broad categories, allowing for much flexibility by property owners to develop to their benefit while also ensuring the community's goals are fulfilled.</p> <p>The preferred growth alternative for the Redmond 2050 comprehensive plan allocated <b>450 jobs</b> to the BP zone in this area that includes the subject property as well as the adjacent properties owned by the Lake Washington School District, Heidelberg (successor to the Cadman Quarry), and a family trust. This allocation was made with consideration to other job allocations throughout the city, as well as the known intentions of underlying property owners and the allowed uses permitted in the zoning code. It should be reiterated that job allocations are not deterministic but representative a hypothetical value of what could potentially occur and what the city's zoning can accommodate. This allocation would not change as job-producing uses will still be allowed.</p>	
10.	<p><b>Split zoning</b></p> <p><b>Van Niman</b></p> <p><u>Commission Discussion</u></p> <p>Comm Van Niman asked about split zoning - why was it done? What is the purpose for doing so? Is it a common practice?</p> <p><u>Staff Comments</u></p> <p>Split zoning is not uncommon, especially for larger or undeveloped areas. Although zoning boundaries generally follow parcel boundaries, there is no legal requirement to do so, and they sometimes follow other features such as roads, hills, rivers and other water features. A property may also end up split zoned as land subdivision occurs. Redmond has some occurrences of split-zoned parcels, some for the reasons above, as well as some that were created to protect critical areas. The Redmond 2050 zoning consolidation removed split zones where it was feasible.</p> <p>Lot 7 was most likely split due to the policy direction to have a Neighborhood Commercial designation near SE Redmond Park, and the assumption that parcels in the area would most likely subdivide or be adjusted in the future.</p> <p>Staff reviewed PC minutes from the time of the SE Neighborhood Plan update and found one discussion about the NC designation (7-09-2014 Minutes):</p> <p><i>Issue B1 was about sites for neighborhood commercial zoning in Woodbridge and the CAC's intent to include this type of zoning in this area. Ms. Dietz said she started at the center point of the Neighborhood Commercial zone and the measured out along the routes where people might want to walk to or from as</i></p>	<p>Opened 12/14/2025</p> <p>Closed 1/14/2026</p>

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p><i>they relate to the Neighborhood Commercial areas. The Commission was comfortable with the staff response to this issue, and Issue B1 was closed.</i></p> <p>Meeting minutes from the public hearing on Feb. 19, 2014 for the SE Redmond Plan speak to the intent to shift housing from the Woodbridge area to Marymoor in anticipation of light rail, and shifting manufacturing lands in Marymoor to the new Design District.</p> <p>Additional information and context can found in the Planning Commission Report and Recommendation on the SE Redmond Neighborhood Plan (Aug 6, 2014): <a href="#">SE-Redmond-Neighborhood-Plan-Update-PDF</a>.</p>	
<p>11.</p> <p><b>Comparisons to other cities – land use and zoning designations</b></p> <p>Gagner</p>	<p><u><a href="#">Commission Discussion</a></u></p> <p>Redmond has around 5% of its land designated to business park. How does this compare to the percentages in our similarly situated neighbors? I'm thinking of Bellevue, Kirkland, and Issaquah - but maybe those aren't as similarly situated as I assume? I'd like to understand if we are in the same ballpark as neighbor cities grappling with similar issues, or are we way below/over?</p> <p><u><a href="#">Staff Comments</a></u></p> <p>Communities can have different types of land use designations and zoning designations with different allowed uses and design standards that are unique to a given community due to its topography, history, land development, infrastructure, and community goals that make comparisons difficult. Cities are also allocated different housing and employment targets that makes comparisons unproductive.</p> <p>A review of the land use maps for Issaquah, Bellevue, Kirkland, and Woodinville indicated that only Redmond has a land use designation called "<b>Business Park.</b>" Areas of those cities that are known to have uses like Redmond's Business Park designation have land use designations such as <b>Mixed-Use</b> (common to all cities), <b>Low-Rise Mixed Use</b>, <b>Office</b>, <b>Commercial</b>, <b>Light Industrial</b>, and <b>Industrial</b>.</p> <p>Until the Redmond 2050 update, the Business Park designation in Redmond was a mixed-use designation, as it allowed "Mixed Use Residential Structures". The 7-story Redmond Pure building, located at 17634 NE Union Rd, has 105 dwelling units and 5,050 square feet of retail space and is in a BP zone.</p> <p>Mixed-Use residential was removed from BP as part of an effort to retain BP land for employment uses, but had the consequence of removing some areas of the city that could accommodate residential. Additional capacity was added in centers and neighborhoods that, on whole, added residential capacity in Redmond.</p>	<p>Opened 12/14/2025</p> <p>Closed 1/14/2026</p>

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	 <p>Pure Redmond Apartments (Photo - Google Maps)</p>	
<p>12.</p> <p>Gagner</p> <p>Potential redevelopment of BP lands</p>	<p><u><a href="#">Commission Discussion</a></u></p> <p>Comm. Gagner asked how much of the BP land is undeveloped or could be redeveloped?</p> <p><u><a href="#">Staff Comments</a></u></p> <p>Staff reviewed the 2020 Buildable Lands analysis conducted for Redmond 2050 update, as well as current property records and aerial maps and found the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The largest acreage of developable lands in the BP zone occurred in the Willows Rd area. Since the 2020 report those areas have:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Redeveloped as the Gehry-designed Building X owned by Meta (680,000 sq ft)</li> <li>○ Maintained the same use by the owner (Aerojet Campus)</li> </ul> </li> <li>• In SE Redmond:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A property on Union Hill Rd identified as developable has maintained the same use as a daycare/preschool</li> <li>○ Lot 7 was identified as "vacant"</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p>Opened 12/14/2025</p> <p>Closed 1/14/2026</p>
<p>13.</p> <p>Property ownership/sales history</p> <p>Woodyear</p>	<p><u><a href="#">Commission Discussion</a></u></p> <p>Commissioner Woodyear asked about sales history/ownership of the parcel.</p> <p><u><a href="#">Staff Comments</a></u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Early 1900's - Weyerhaeuser* Timber Co., then Campbell Lumber Co.</li> <li>• 1930's - area purchased by Horace Cadman for future Cadman Quarry</li> </ul>	<p>Opened 12/14/2025</p> <p>Closed 1/14/2026</p>

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Larger parcel created in 2007, joint ownership by Taylor Union Hill LLC and Cadman-Magnusson LCC</li> <li>• Property short platted in 2012, creating Lot 7, same ownership</li> <li>• Sold in 2022 to Redmond WA 188 LLC</li> </ul> <p>* Earlier spelling of name as recorded in Anderson Map Co's King Co. Atlas, 1907</p>	
14.	<p><b>SEPA in-fill exemptions</b></p> <p><b>Aparna</b></p> <p><u><a href="#">Commission Discussion</a></u></p> <p>Comm. Aparna asked if this proposal was covered under the Redmond 2050 SEPA Infill Exemption.</p> <p><u><a href="#">Staff Comments</a></u></p> <p>This proposal falls under the Citywide Infill Exemption, which covers the full extent of the city apart from the Downtown and Marymoor Infill Exemptions, and the Overlake Planned Action.</p> <p>Additional information on the Redmond 2050 SEPA Infill Exemptions can be found at - <a href="https://www.redmond.gov/DocumentCenter/View/29620/Appendix_62-Infill-Exemption-2023_0920">https://www.redmond.gov/DocumentCenter/View/29620/Appendix_62-Infill-Exemption-2023_0920</a> and in the Redmond Zoning Code at <a href="https://redmond.municipal.codes/RZC/21.70.095">https://redmond.municipal.codes/RZC/21.70.095</a>.</p>	<p>Opened 12/14/2025</p> <p>Closed 1/14/2026</p>
15.	<p><b>Commissioner opinions on proposal</b></p> <p><b>Weston Aparna</b></p> <p><u><a href="#">Commission Discussion</a></u></p> <p>Commissioner Aparna submitted the following comment by email:</p> <p>Unless some new information comes to light, I am going to vote to reject the Redmond Flex proposal. Here are my reasons:</p> <p><b>Diversity in land-use is important for a vibrant, vital city.</b>                      Redmond 2050 does a great job of balancing various land-uses and zoning and allocating land with a long-range vision of growing the city into a vibrant place with all types of buildings and uses. Changing this project land use reduces the land allocated to business/manufacturing uses. We cannot get that land back. Diversity is key to vibrancy and, reducing diversity in land use, reduces the energy and vitality of a city and neighborhoods over the long term. It also builds resilience.</p> <p><b>Housing alone cannot be a compelling enough argument given Redmond 2050's complete and competing priorities.</b>                      In my view, for a docket item to be approved, the applicant has to make a compelling case for us to change the current land-use for the city. I believe saying we need more housing is not a strong enough argument as it</p>	<p>Opened 12/14/2025</p> <p>Closed 1/14/2026</p>

Item	Discussion Notes	Issue Status
	<p>comes at the expense of potential jobs which are also part of the vision for the city. As I see it more housing is not a "must-have" when other uses and jobs will be eliminated.</p> <p>We have released a lot of land and accommodated housing to be infilled and built in accordance with projections. We should watch out that much of the city does not become a 'bedroom' community with large apartment communities and not much else.</p> <p>Additionally, I feel that the proposal could increase housing rentals but not housing ownership. Additionally, the staff's response to rental yield based on 800sft does not feel right as it would yield 1BR or two small bedrooms. This is not family unit yield.</p> <p><b>We should be circumspect about changing Redmond 2050 vision given that it is still new.</b>                      Give Redmond 2050 implementation some time to see if the vision is maintained. We need to give Redmond 2050's bold vision a chance (2-3 years) to take effect before we tinker with land use amendments. After all, we are still working on the Transportation Master Plan that supports Redmond 2050. We should not have knee-jerk reactions, adopting short-term visions. Long-range planning requires some patience and the need to stay on the course for at least some time to gauge efficacy.</p> <p><b>The city has a holistic agenda for development.</b>                      Resilience is built into the city's vision by adopting a balance of priorities.                      Approving this item, sends a message that housing is the only priority for the city which runs counter to the complete Redmond 2050 vision.</p> <p>Chair Weston submitted the following comment by email, presented as a slide:</p>	

**Item**                      **Discussion Notes**                      **Issue Status**

**Numbers from the Land Use Element in the 2050 Comp Plan**

<https://www.redmond.gov/DocumentCenter/View/35164/01---Land-Use-Element-PDF-p-3>

**Current Conditions**  
 The Comprehensive Plan enumerates land use designations, each of which are implemented in the Redmond Zoning Code through a set of zones. The most intense land uses are directed to Overlake, Downtown, and Marymoor Village centers. The land use context of what currently exists helps us better understand land use policies. The table below summarizes land area devoted to each land use designation in 2024.

**Table 2-1 City of Redmond Land Area by Land Use Designation**

*Land Use Element - Adoption*

---

**REDMOND 2050**

Land Use Designations	Acres	Percent of All Land Area
Neighborhood	5,376	52.4%
Marymoor Mixed-Use	88	0.9%
Downtown Mixed-Use	474	4.6%
Overlake Mixed-Use	847	8.3%
Citywide Mixed-Use	126	1.2%
Manufacturing Park	691	6.7%
Business Park	477	4.6%
Urban Recreation	478	4.7%
Parks and Open Space	1,515	14.8%
Semirural	79	0.8%
Conservation Open Space	115	1.1%

Housing: 67.4%

Jobs: 11.3%

Parks, Recreation, Open space: 21.4%

- My opinions:
- The purpose of land use and zoning is that they're **long term**, and **protective**.  
 Protective = environmental, quality of life, and ensure less lucrative, but still important, uses are preserved within the city.
  - Helps keeps the needs in balance, so the city runs well.
  - We did a lot to expand housing in Redmond 2050 – converting land to mixed use and increasing housing density everywhere, especially in Centers.
  - We did not expand manufacturing park or business park. BP is now less than 1/20<sup>th</sup> of Redmond's land.
  - The proportion of homes to business park spaces is only going to go up, as housing develops but business park stays the same.
  - I think it's premature to forfeit some of the small remaining space dedicated to this land use.**

**Staff Comments**

Staff would like to clarify that Mixed-Use land use designations allow for and encourage job-generating uses. Approximately 78% of the 30,000 jobs the City needs to accommodate are allocated to the three Centers - Overlake, Downtown and Marymoor, all of which are Mixed-Use.

**Dear Redmond City Council,**

In the recent docket before the Planning Commission, I voted to reject the Redmond Flex proposal.

*(Please note that most of this text appears in the Issue Matrix (# 15)).*

These are my reasons for rejecting the docket proposal:

- **Diversity in land-use is important for a vibrant, vital city.**

Redmond 2050 does a great job of balancing various land-uses and zoning and allocating land with a long-range vision of growing the city into a vibrant place with all types of buildings and uses. Changing this project land use reduces the land allocated to business/manufacturing uses. We cannot get that land back. Diversity is key to vibrancy and, reducing diversity in land use, reduces the energy and vitality of a city and neighborhoods over the long term. Diversity also builds resilience.

- **Housing alone cannot be a compelling enough argument given Redmond 2050's complete and competing priorities.**

In my view, for a docket item to be approved, the applicant has to make a compelling case for us to change the current land-use for the city. I believe saying we need more housing is not a strong enough argument as it comes at the expense of potential jobs which are also part of the vision for the city. As I see it more housing is not a "must-have" when other uses and jobs will be eliminated.

We have released a lot of land and accommodated housing to be infilled and built in accordance with projections. We should watch out that much of the city does not become a 'bedroom' community with large apartment communities and not much else. I felt that the proposal could increase housing rentals but not housing ownership. Additionally, the staff's response to rental yield based on 800sft does not feel right as it would yield 1BR or two small bedrooms. This is not family unit yield.

- **We should be circumspect about changing Redmond 2050 vision given that it is still new.**

Give Redmond 2050 implementation some time to see if the vision is maintained. We need to give Redmond 2050's bold vision a chance (2-3 years) to take effect before we tinker with land use amendments. After all, we are still working on the Transportation Master Plan that supports Redmond 2050. We should not have knee-jerk reactions, adopting short-term visions. Long-range planning requires some patience and the need to stay on the course for at least some time to gauge efficacy.

- **(new) Attracting new types of jobs.**

While we do need retail and service jobs, a business/manufacturing park will add new types of jobs to the community that add to the city's long-term economic vitality.

- **(new) We should consider contaminated site cleanup and associated costs and their potential impact on development.**

I am an avid advocate for the cleanup of the contaminated site. However, as I understand from the Department of Ecology letter, the cleanup for housing on the same land would require more steps than a business park. I am concerned that the extra costs of cleaning up for housing could impact quality of the built project, amp up costs of units, or delay development. Alternatively, if the difference in costs and levels between cleaning up for the two types of zoning is not significant, then the concern is moot.

- **The city has a holistic agenda for development.**

Resilience is built into the city's vision by adopting a balance of priorities.

Approving this item, sends a message that housing is the only priority for the city which runs counter to the complete Redmond 2050 vision.

Thank you for your attention and consideration.

Sincerely,

**Aparna Varadharajan**

(Planning Commissioner)

To the Redmond City Council,

As Chair of the Planning Commission, I want to take a moment to thank the Planning Commissioners for their thoughtful evaluation of this proposed amendment. In some ways, our work is easier when we're dealing with complex systems over long time periods because it's less personal and easier to take the long view, and think city-wide what will most benefit Redmond.

But I saw commissioners use that same approach on this land use and zoning amendment, as they evaluated it from so many angles over the course of 2025:

- Bedroom community vs. balance
- Jobs, including number and type
- Housing, including affordable vs. luxury
- Historical land use goals, vs. the modern vision of the city that emerged after the light rail and the centers
- Long term benefits vs. short term gains
- Environmental outcomes, including the CARA
- Complete neighborhoods
- Protecting the city's successful Redmond 2050 planning process, and giving our goals a chance to come to fruition.

I also think commissioners were clear-eyed about the risks. We want to ensure there is fairness and transparency in city processes. Most commissioners want to avoid an impression that zoning is flexible – land is already expensive enough, and we don't want to trigger future land investment for profit/turnover premised on rezoning, rather than a sincere effort towards construction.

I was impressed by the seriousness and consideration of this commission's hard working volunteers. I agree with their conclusion that this land use and zoning change is not in the best interest of Redmond.

Thank you,

Susan Weston

Chair, Redmond Planning Commission

Jan 16, 2026

**NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING  
CITY OF REDMOND**

**Redmond Comprehensive Plan  
Amendments: Land Use Map  
and Zoning Map  
(LAND-2025-00259, SEPA-2025-00258)**

The City of Redmond Planning Commission will hold a Public Hearing at Redmond City Hall Council Chambers, 15670 NE 85th Street, Redmond, Washington on December 17, 2025 at 7 p.m. or as soon thereafter, on:

**SUBJECT:** Land Use Map and Zoning Map amendments for a property at 6900 188th NE. The proposal is to redesignate a portion of a 5.82 acre split-designated parcel from Business Park to Citywide Mixed-Use, so the whole property has the same land use designation. Concurrently, the proposal would rezone a portion of the property from Business Park to Corridor Mixed-Use, ensuring the entire property has the same zoning designation.

**REQUESTED ACTION:** Planning Commission recommendation on the proposed amendments to the Redmond Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map and Zoning Map.

**PUBLIC PARTICIPATION:** Join in-person at City Hall, watch live at [redmond.gov/RCTV](https://www.redmond.gov/RCTV), Comcast channel 21, Zply channel 34, on [facebook.com/CityofRedmond](https://www.facebook.com/CityofRedmond), or listen live by phone by calling 510-335-7371.

Public comment can be provided in-person or by phone during the meeting by providing a name and phone number to [PlanningCommission@redmond.gov](mailto:PlanningCommission@redmond.gov) no later than 5 p.m. on the day of the hearing.

Written public comments should be submitted prior to the hearing by email to [PlanningCommission@redmond.gov](mailto:PlanningCommission@redmond.gov) no later than 5 p.m. on the hearing date. Comments may also be sent by mail to: Planning Commission, MS: 4SPL, P.O. Box 97010, Redmond, Washington, 98073-9710.

A copy of the proposal is available at <https://www.redmond.gov/2285/2025-26-Comprehensive-Plan-Docket>. If you have any comments, questions, or would like to be a Party-of-Record on this proposal, please contact Glenn Coil, Senior Planner, 425-556-2742, [gcoil@redmond.gov](mailto:gcoil@redmond.gov).

If you are hearing or visually impaired, please notify Planning Department staff at 425- 556-2441 one week in advance of the hearing to arrange for assistance.

**LEGAL NOTICE:** November 26, 2025



**REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION**

Susan Weston, Chair | Jeannine Woodyear, Vice-Chair  
Adam Coleman | Bryan Copley | Denice Gagner  
Tara Van Niman | Aparna Varadharajan

**MEETING MINUTES**

**REDMOND PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING**

**Wednesday, December 17, 2025 – 7:00 p.m.**

**1. Call to Order & Roll Call – 7:00 p.m.**

Commissioners Present: Chair Susan Weston, Vice-Chair Jeannine Woodyear, Commissioners Adam Coleman, Denice Gagner (virtual), Tara Van Niman, and Aparna Varadharajan

Commissioners Absent: Commissioner Brian Copley (Excused)

Staff Present: Odra Cardenas, Jeff Chuchill, Glenn Coil, Michael Hintze, Francesca Liburdy, and Chris Wyatt

Recording Secretary: Carolyn Garza, LLC

**2. Approval of the Agenda**

➤ *Motion to approve the Agenda by Commissioner Van Niman, seconded by Commissioner Coleman. The Motion passed.*

**3. Approval of Meeting Minutes & Summaries**

➤ *Motion by Commissioner Aparna to approve the December 3, 2025 Meeting Minutes. Motion seconded by Commissioner Van Niman. The Motion passed unanimously.*

Redmond Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
December 17, 2025

#### 4. Items from the Audience (General)

- **David Morton**, Redmond 98053, spoke regarding twelve identified contaminated sites within the Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas (CARA) and water quality for current and future generations. Intervention could include more restrictive land use regulations within CARAs, enhanced monitoring requirements, stricter clean up standards, mandatory groundwater testing protocols, and proactive identification of risks prior to becoming identified sites. The Planning Commission should add the topic to a future agenda and Morton was available for further information or participation in future conversations.

#### 5. Land Use and Zoning Map Amendments - 6900 - 188<sup>th</sup> Avenue Northeast - Public Hearing & Study Session

Senior Planner Coil presented the topic.

##### *Public Hearing*

- **Rachel Mazur**, Attorney with Hillis Clark Martin & Peterson and Land Use Counsel for the Applicant, stated having submitted a comment letter and that rezoning the parcel in question is a common-sense solution to allow residential use. The applicant is coordinating with Ecology regarding clean up strategies for the property as required by law for a future residential development. An updated letter from Ecology dated December 10, 2025 confirms enrollment in the expedited version of the voluntary clean-up program.
- **David Morton**, Redmond 98053, asked that the contamination issue be considered before making a recommendation. The letter from Ecology on December 10, 2025 stated that a revised clean up plan is required for residential development. The cost of capping versus full soil removal makes Business Park development more practical. A rezone will mandate the most expensive cleanup scenario. Developers maximize residential density to recoup expenses, making the mixed-use aspect unlikely. Market conditions are temporary and once developed the land will not return to an employment use. The contamination issue indicates that the site should remain designated as Business Park. Morton recommended denial of the proposal.

Chair Weston closed the verbal portion of the Public Hearing, leaving the written portion open.

##### *Study Session*

Senior Planner Coil presented the Issues Matrix.

Regarding Issue one, the amount of Business Park zoned in Redmond by Commissioner Copley, there were further Commissioner questions answered.

Redmond Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
December 17, 2025

Regarding Issue two, job goals and Redmond 2050 by Chair Weston, the Issue was closed.

Regarding Issue three, split designation by Commissioner Coleman, there were further Commissioner questions answered and the Issue was closed.

Regarding Issue four, the Lake Washington School District (LWSD) property by Chair Weston, Commissioners Van Niman and Gagner, the Issue was closed.

Regarding Issue five, facilities demand, the issue was neither left open nor closed.

Regarding Issue six, zoning code and public outreach by Commissioner Coleman, the Issue was closed.

Regarding Issue seven, zoning code and overlay by Chair Weston, the Issue was closed.

Regarding Issue eight, housing units allowed by Commissioner Copley, the Issue was left open for a response from Commissioner Copley.

Regarding Issue nine, mixed-use details and other emailed questions by Commissioner Aparna, the Issue was closed.

Vice-Chair Woodyear asked if the owner of the parcel was the same prior to the zoning change in 2014 and Senior Planner Coil replied that the answer would be researched.

Commissioner Van Niman asked that a history of the split designation be documented, and for clarification from Morton regarding Public Comment. Chair Weston asked that questions for Morton be followed up on after the meeting. Commissioner Van Niman stated wanting the questions in the Matrix. Planning Manager Churchill stated that the history can be added to the Matrix but that allocations of the previous Comprehensive Plan are no longer operative, good historical information but not impactful to current allocations.

Commissioner Coleman asked about remediation requirements. Senior Planner Coil replied that remediation is a site-specific issue related to a property owner and Ecology, but not a part of land use or zoning designations and referred to comments in the Staff Memo. Chair Weston stated that the Planning Commission purview is to either recommend the land use and zoning or agree on an amendment, and the conversation asked for by Commissioner Coleman is for a later date if the topic returns. Planning Manager Churchill replied that Public Works was consulted upon receiving the letter from Ecology, and what was learned is in the Staff Memo; the cleanup requirements are known to both Ecology and the applicant.

Redmond Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
December 17, 2025

Commissioner Aparna asked if an Environmental Impact Study (EIS) covering all housing built in Redmond 2050. Planning Manager Churchill replied that infill exemptions were established for any housing in Redmond. Commissioner Aparna asked if the EIS would cover this zoning change, and Planning Manager Churchill replied that exact coverage in the infill exemption would be researched but stated belief that the EIS does cover the change; what would not be changed are clean up requirements from Ecology. Commissioner Aparna asked for the question to be added to the Matrix.

Chair Weston stated, regarding one of two emails received, that 11.3% remains in Redmond for designation of either Manufacturing Park or Business Park, and the need should be covered in the city for the long term. Commissioner Gagner asked if the city tracks what percentage of land is being fully utilized. Senior Planner Coil replied that the city does not specifically track details. Planning Manager Churchill replied that a land analysis is done on a periodic basis for updates, but there are no numbers or a table to reference and staff can examine. Commissioner Van Niman asked for clarification regarding a percentage and Senior Planner Coil explained.

Commissioner Aparna stated having sent an email to the Commissioners to express that because of the change in vision for the city and Redmond 2050, the issue should wait for the new vision to begin to play out; that a consequence is that once changed, the designation is unlikely to change back, and that the avenues for housing created in Redmond 2050 should be allowed to occur.

Commissioner Van Niman asked that the history of the split parcels be included in the Matrix. Chair Weston asked for clarification regarding how a history will help the Commission come to a decision. Commissioner Van Niman replied that one parcel of land should have only one zone. Commissioner Aparna stated that the argument being presented is that housing needs to be included.

Commissioner Gagner stated that a follow-up question would be emailed to staff.

Chair Weston stated that the Issue would be revisited next month, and that questions can be emailed to staff in the meantime. Planning Manager Churchill asked that questions for the Issues Matrix be emailed by the end of the year.

Chair Weston closed the written portion of the Public Hearing.

*(Five-Minute Break)*

## **6. Transportation Master Plan (TMP) Update – Study Session**

Transportation Planning Manager Hintze gave the presentation.

Redmond Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
December 17, 2025

Regarding Issue one, Commissioner Aparna stated that the Issue could be closed.

Regarding Issue nine, speed reduction, Chair Weston stated that the issue could be closed.

Commissioner Coleman noted that Issue eight had been closed but was not marked closed in the packet and staff agreed that the Issue was closed by email.

Regarding Issue ten, safety and E-Bikes, Commissioner Coleman stated that a similar issue in Marin, California was worth researching and that the Issue could be closed. Transportation Planning Manager Hintze replied that the Issue would be closed with the understanding that language changes will be made.

Regarding Issue 12, neighborhood connections, Commissioner Gagner stated that the Issue could be closed.

Regarding Issue 14, bike level traffic stress, Chair Weston stated that the Issue could be closed, and having heard positive comments from members of the biking community about the change.

Regarding Issue 15, a Street Plan table on page 50, Chair Weston stated that the Issue could be closed.

Regarding Issue 16, first and last mile micro-mobility, Commissioner Coleman stated that the presentation of information needs more work. Commissioner Aparna replied with an example, difficulty navigating the Go Redmond site, and suggested that all Mobility Hub options be listed in one place, a web page on Redmond.gov. Chair Weston suggested using a different term than *Mobility Hub*. Vice-Chair Woodyear stated that there is an opportunity for Redmond to become more digital for cell phones used while navigating transit rather than laptops used at home. Chair Weston suggested that there needs to be beginner content that is neighborhood specific. Transportation Manager Hintze replied that the feedback is great and will be shared with the Go Redmond team, but not pertinent to closing the TMP Issue and asked if the Issues could be closed. Commissioner Coleman stated that the TMP should be as clear as the Go Redmond site becomes. Chair Weston stated that an option is to make an amendment to the recommendation at this meeting and asked for a Motion.

- *Motion by Commissioner Coleman for an amendment to include further verbiage for clarity.*

Redmond Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
December 17, 2025

Transportation Planning Manager Hintze stated that different specific neighborhood scenarios in the TMP will not be where people look for the information, and that the most appropriate location for more neighborhood-based and more easily accessed real-time information is Go Redmond and not the TMP. Senior Transportation Planner Liburdy stated that the TMP is meant to be a longer-range document and bus routes can change before the TMP is updated again.

➤ *Motion seconded by Vice-Chair Woodyear.*

Chair Weston stated understanding that additional education is needed.

Vice-Chair Woodyear stated that wayfinding components could be included in the TMP to guide people, from an infrastructure standpoint.

Commissioner Aparna stated that a way to communicate navigation possibilities needs to be enshrined in the TMP. Transportation Planning Manager Hintze replied that there are numerous strategies and actions focused on educating different populations including schools and older adults. Commissioner Aparna stated that information is included but separate. Transportation Planning Manager Hintze replied that the TMP is the Action Plan for what City Staff will work on over the next several years to achieve the goals, and educating the public is a real-time effort done through Go Redmond and engagement with the public. Chair Weston stated hearing that the number of separate pieces in the TMP is the issues, and the community is expressing that while some people know how to use Light Rail, most people are in neighborhoods not near Light Rail; what is being asked for is that the TMP states that education is needed for people not in Centers. Chair Weston asked if Commissioners would like to add a bullet point to the recommendation. Commissioners Aparna and Coleman stated agreement.

*Chair Weston asked for a vote on an added bullet point to the recommendation and the addition received five yays and one abstention (Commissioner Van Niman).*

Commissioner Coleman stated that Issue 16 could be closed.

Regarding Issue 19, Commissioner Van Niman stated that the Issue could be closed.

Regarding Issue 21, Commissioner Aparna stated that the Issue could be closed.

Regarding Issue 22, safety and roundabouts, Chair Weston stated that the Issue could be closed.

Redmond Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
December 17, 2025

Regarding Issue 23, Commissioner Aparna stated that the word *consider* should be replaced with *commit to*, and that the Issue could be closed. Chair Weston clarified that both the Capital Facilities Plan and Fire Plan have the language.

Regarding Issue 24, in the absence of Commissioner Copley, Chair Weston closed the Issue. Transportation Planning Manager Hintze replied that the word *group* was changed to *program*.

Commissioner Coleman stated that Issue 13 had been closed via email, but thanked staff for the response.

- *Motion by Commissioner Van Niman to approve the Planning Commission Recommendation on the 2025 Transportation Master Plan as published in the staff packet, with edits and Issues Matrix items 10 and 23 and the amendment in Issue 16. Motion seconded by Commissioner Coleman. The Motion passed unanimously.*

Chair Weston stated that Final Report approval will be voted on at the next meeting when the changes have been incorporated.

## 7. Staff & Commissioner Updates

Senior Planner Cardenas stated that the normal schedule of meetings on second and fourth Wednesdays will resume next month. The next meeting is January 14, 2026.

Senior Planner Coil will be the Commission Liaison for the next quarter, January to March 2026, and Senior Planner Cardenas will return as Liaison in summer 2026.

Chair Weston thanked Senior Planner Cardenas for work as Liaison during the last quarter.

Commissioner Aparna stated there is a program called Adopt-A-Drain to involve residents in keeping street drains clear of needles and leaf debris. The commitment includes tools and tips.

## 9. Adjourn

- *Motion to adjourn at 9:02 p.m. by Commissioner Coleman. There was no Second. The Motion passed.*

Redmond Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
December 17, 2025

Minutes approved on:

1/29/2026

---

Planning Commission Chair

Signed by:

*Susan Weston*

2E665184026E4A6...

---



December 16, 2025

***Via Email ([PlanningCommission@Redmond.gov](mailto:PlanningCommission@Redmond.gov))***

Redmond Planning Commission  
Redmond City Hall  
15670 NE 85th Street  
Redmond, WA 98052

*Re: Columbia Pacific Advisors Rezone and Comprehensive Plan Amendment  
Proposal for 6900 188th Avenue NE*

Dear Planning Commissioners:

Our firm represents Columbia Pacific Advisors ("Columbia Pacific"), the beneficial owner of the property located at 6900 188th Avenue NE in Redmond (King County Parcel No. 128630-0012) (the "Property"). We were enthused to hear the Planning Staff's presentation on Columbia Pacific's proposal to legalize residential uses on the Property through a concurrent Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment and Zoning Code Amendment (together, the "Proposal") at the Commission's study session on November 19. This comment letter builds on our previous written public comments and responds to several questions raised during the study session.

**A. Proposal Overview.**

Columbia Pacific is proposing a rezone and redesignation of the Property on the Zoning Map and Comprehensive Plan Map to Corridor Mixed Use ("CMU") and Citywide Mixed Use, respectively. The Proposal will remove the split zoning and Comprehensive Plan designation on the Property and will allow for appropriately dense, urban housing to be constructed on the Property. See Redmond Zoning Code ("RZC") 21.04.0100. At 5.8 acres, the Property offers a rare opportunity to deliver a transformative housing project. Its location adjacent to Southeast Redmond Park and property owned by the Lake Washington School District makes the Property ideally suited for residential development that promotes community connectivity and livability as envisioned in the Comprehensive Plan.

**B. The provision of dense, urban housing units (including affordable housing) should be allowed on the entire Property as it is well-suited to accommodate this growth.**

During the study session on November 19, concern about the loss of non-residential land was expressed by members of the Commission. This is a valid apprehension in Redmond, but the unique split-zone condition and the limited scope of Columbia Pacific's request to

unify the zoning and Comprehensive Plan designation across the entire parcel will yield the dense, urban housing so desperately needed by current and future Redmond residents.

Columbia Pacific appreciates the hard work of the Planning Commission and Planning Staff as they endeavored to strike the right balance of uses as part of the Redmond 2050 process and corresponding Code update for the future of the City. Columbia Pacific's Proposal is a minor adjustment which will catalyze residential development, allowing a meaningful amount of dwelling units to be brought online, including affordable housing units. In this limited scenario, prioritizing residential uses over industrial is warranted given the scope of the request, the need for housing, and neighborhood adjacencies which support residential uses.

**C. Columbia Pacific continues to coordinate with the Department of Ecology on cleanup strategies for the Property.**

From a procedural standpoint, the Proposal before the Planning Commission to rezone and redesignate the Property is separate from the legally required environmental remediation of the Property per the Model Toxics Control Act ("MTCA"). This is why Columbia Pacific's written and in-person public comment has focused on how the Proposal satisfies the narrow rezone and designation criteria set forth in the Redmond Zoning Code as this will ultimately inform the Planning Commission's recommendation to the City Council. Further, the Technical Committee has concluded that the Proposal complies with all criteria for a rezone and Comprehensive Plan amendment, and identified no environmental concerns in its Report and Recommendation to the Planning Commission on the Proposal.

We appreciate the Department of Ecology ("Ecology") providing feedback on the Proposal. However, Ecology's initial "SEPA Comment" outlined in its December 2 letter is misguided as the Proposal to rezone and redesignate the Property does not trigger a "full cleanup." **Rather, should the Proposal be adopted, corresponding cleanup strategies would be thoughtfully coordinated with the entire expert team as part of a future residential development as required by law, not the rezone and redesignation before the Planning Commission.** As stated in Ecology's December 10 clarification letter, the Property's enrollment in Ecology's Expedited Voluntary Cleanup Program ("VCP") is still active, and "Ecology would need to review and approve a revised cleanup action plan to confirm that the proposed changes meet the substantive requirements of MTCA." **Columbia Pacific fully understands the environmental condition of the Property and is committed to meeting the cleanup standards required by law for redevelopment.**

Columbia Pacific would like to underscore that it does not view the Proposal in a vacuum separate from the environmental concerns on the Property. The channel to address environmental remediation (through MTCA) is parallel to but ultimately separate from

Redmond Planning Commission  
December 16, 2025  
Page 3 of 3

Columbia Pacific's Proposal to rezone and redesignate the Property. Through this separate channel, Columbia Pacific is addressing remediation head-on by seeking out the Expedited VCP, a process which has higher expectations, fees, and cost recovery rates than the Standard VCP, and ultimately yields a more efficient cleanup timeline. Columbia Pacific remains committed to the cleanup process and diligently following direction from Ecology with the utmost respect for the agency.

**D. Conclusion.**

Thank you for the opportunity to provide continued public comment on Columbia Pacific's Proposal to remove the split zoning and Comprehensive Plan designation and thus allow residential uses on the Property. We look forward to tomorrow's study session and would be happy to answer any other questions you may have on the Proposal.

Very truly yours,



Rachel Mazur

RMM:smd  
E-Mail: [rachel.mazur@hcmp.com](mailto:rachel.mazur@hcmp.com)  
Direct Dial: (206) 470-7667  
Fax: (206) 623-7745

CC: Director Carol Helland, [chelland@redmond.gov](mailto:chelland@redmond.gov)  
Long Range Planning Manager Jeff Churchill, [jchurchill@redmond.gov](mailto:jchurchill@redmond.gov)  
Senior Planner Glenn Coil, [gcoil@redmond.gov](mailto:gcoil@redmond.gov)

ND: 22739.008 4908-9475-2386v3

January 9, 2026

***Via Email ([PlanningCommission@Redmond.gov](mailto:PlanningCommission@Redmond.gov))***

Redmond Planning Commission  
Redmond City Hall  
15670 NE 85th Street  
Redmond, WA 98052

*Re: Columbia Pacific Advisors Rezone and Comprehensive Plan Amendment  
Proposal for 6900 188th Avenue NE*

Dear Planning Commissioners:

Our firm represents Columbia Pacific Advisors (“Columbia Pacific”), the beneficial owner of the property located at 6900 188th Avenue NE in Redmond (King County Parcel No. 128630-0012) (the “Property”). We appreciate the Commission’s careful study of Columbia Pacific’s proposed Comprehensive Plan Map Amendment and Zoning Code Amendment (together, the “Proposal”). This comment letter summarizes the reasons the Proposal satisfies the criteria set forth at Redmond Zoning Code (“RZC” or “Code”) 21.76.070.J.9 and responds to several of the discussion points which came up at the Planning Commission meeting on December 17.

**I. THE PROPOSAL MEETS ALL CRITERIA FOR CITY COUNCIL RECOMMENDATION AND APPROVAL.**

Per RZC 21.76.070.J.9, the Proposal must “be reviewed with consideration” by the Planning Commission with respect to the criteria listed below. **The City’s analysis and technical memorandum dated November 12, 2025 confirms that all criteria has been satisfied, but we now offer additional clarification through this comment letter.**

**a. Consistency with the Growth Management Act (GMA), the State of Washington Department of Commerce Procedural Criteria, Vision 2050 or its successor, and the King County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs);**

*Growth Management Act*

The Proposal is directly aligned with the requirements and goals of the Growth Management Act (“GMA”). Specifically, the GMA’s planning goals encourage “development in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient manner” and promotion of “a variety of residential densities and housing types[.]” RCW 36.70A.020. The Property is located within an urban area and is an appropriate location for development.

*State of Washington Department of Commerce Procedural Criteria (WAC 365-196)*

A “major feature[]” of the GMA’s framework includes the “determination that planning and plan implementation actions should address difficult issues that have resisted resolution in the past, such as ... [p]roviding adequate and affordable housing for all economic segments of the population.” Washington Administrative Code (“WAC”) 365-196-010. Columbia Pacific appreciates the hard work of the Planning Commission, elected officials, and staff in their efforts to create the Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan. The Comprehensive Plan is a thoughtful, balanced document which presents an ambitious future for Redmond. The Proposal is a minor adjustment to the Comprehensive Plan’s Future Land Use Map and Zoning Map to resolve the split land use and zoning designations and to allow residential uses across the entire Property, instead of just a portion of the Property. The proposed designation is a mixed-use zone, which allows both commercial and residential uses. If there was market demand for commercial uses, then the proposed consolidated designation will continue to allow commercial use. The Department of Commerce’s Procedural Criteria presents no obstacles which would prevent the Planning Commission from recommending the Proposal.

*Vision 2050*

The Proposal aligns with the following goals from Vision 2050. Many of these goals are related to housing because that is the region’s most pressing issue, as supported by the Vision 2050 goals. But the Proposal is primarily about addressing a split-zoned condition and allowing an underutilized site the opportunity to redevelop:

- MPP-RGS-4: Accommodate the region’s growth first and foremost in the urban growth area.
- MPP-RGS-6: Encourage efficient use of urban land by optimizing the development potential of existing urban lands and increasing density in the urban growth area in locations consistent with the Regional Growth Strategy.
- MPP-DP-1: Develop high-quality, compact urban communities throughout the region’s urban growth area that impart a sense of place, preserve local character, provide for mixed uses and choices in housing types, and encourage walking, bicycling, and transit use.
- MPP-DP-4: Support the transformation of key underutilized lands, such as surplus public lands or environmentally contaminated lands, to higher-density, mixed-use areas to complement the development of centers and the enhancement of existing neighborhoods.

- MPP-H-2: Provide a range of housing types and choices to meet the housing needs of all income levels and demographic groups within the region.

King County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs)

The Proposal aligns with the following CPPs:

- DP-2: Prioritize housing and employment growth in cities and centers within the Urban Growth Area, where residents and workers have higher access to opportunity and high-capacity transit. Promote a pattern of compact development within the Urban Growth Area that includes housing at a range of urban densities, commercial and industrial development, and other urban facilities, including medical, governmental, institutional, and educational uses and schools, and parks and open space.
- H-15: Increase housing choices for everyone ... [e]nsure there are zoning ordinances and development regulations in place that allow and encourage housing production at levels that improve jobs-housing balance throughout the county across all income levels.
- H-16: Expand the supply and range of housing types, including affordable units, at densities sufficient to maximize the benefits of transit investments throughout the county.

**b. Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan policies and the designation criteria;**

The following Comprehensive Plan policies support the Proposal:

- FW-LU-2: Ensure that the land use pattern in Redmond meetings the following objectives ... [e]ncourages a mix of uses that create complete neighborhoods ... [p]romotes sufficient density for development pattern and urban design that enable people to readily use a variety of accessible and active forms of travel[.]
- FW-HO-2: Zone sufficient buildable land to accommodate Redmond's projected housing need and meet allocated housing growth targets.
- FW-HO-3: Increase housing choices in more areas of the city.
- FW-HO-5: Evaluate and refine tools and processes to improve housing related outcomes.

- LU-5: Provide an appropriate level of flexibility through development regulations to promote efficient use of buildable land. Balance this flexibility with other community goals and the need for equity.
- LU-26: Promote walkable, welcoming, attractive, and safe complete neighborhoods with a variety of housing types to serve our culturally and economically diverse community.
- FW-CD-2: Use development regulations and review processes to achieve desired design outcomes for our city, neighborhoods, and public spaces while providing flexibility where appropriate.

**c. Potential impacts to vulnerable community members;**

Building more housing directly benefits vulnerable community members by increasing the supply of affordable, stable places to live in Redmond. Recommending the Proposal to the City Council is a crucial step towards increasing Redmond's housing supply. When housing options expand, all Redmond residents have a better chance of finding homes that meet their needs and budgets. Greater supply also helps reduce rent pressures overall. In addition, the Proposal will allow the construction of new housing with improved accessibility features, energy-efficient units with lower utility costs, and proximity to community resources. This is the type of housing and larger community envisioned in the Comprehensive Plan. Building more homes, made possible through this Proposal, will strengthen stability, support health and safety, and foster greater opportunity for those most at risk of being priced out of Redmond.

**d. Potential economic impacts;**

The Proposal will have several positive potential economic impacts. As you know, approving the Proposal will ultimately allow dense residential housing to be built on the Property. Addressing the split-zoned condition makes the Property more likely to redevelop. The resulting development on the Property will stimulate Redmond's economy by generating jobs, increasing demand for construction materials, and supporting a wide network of related local industries (architects, engineers, contractors, etc.). This activity will create a powerful multiplier effect that will circulate new spending throughout Redmond. Further, new housing will increase local tax revenue through the income generated during construction and the long-term property taxes associated with newly built homes on the Property. Increasing the housing supply also helps moderate upward pressure on housing costs, which will allow households to retain more disposable income for spending in local businesses which is another net positive economic impact.

**e. Potential impacts to the ability of the City to provide equitable access to services;**

City Staff confirmed in their technical memorandum for the Proposal that no impacts have been identified related to the ability of the City to provide equitable access to services.

**f. Potential impacts to the natural environment, such as impacts to critical areas and other natural resources;**

The Proposal to rezone and redesignate the Property will not yield any impacts to the natural environment. The Property is not burdened by critical areas according to County records.

**g. The capability of the land for development, including the prevalence of environmentally critical areas;**

The Property is currently unimproved and is well suited for development given the neighborhood adjacencies, including Southeast Redmond Park and a parcel owned by the Lake Washington School District slated for school development. According to King County records, there are no environmentally critical areas burdening the Property.

**h. Whether the proposed land use designations or uses are compatible with nearby land use designations or uses;**

The Proposal seeks to redesignate the eastern half of the Property to address the split-zoned condition so that it is fully designated Citywide Mixed-Use. The Property already being partially designated Citywide Mixed-Use is strong evidence of the compatibility with nearby designations, which include Parks & Open Space immediately to the south, and Neighborhood to the east. Further, redesignating the Property so that it is fully Citywide Mixed-Use will remove the split designation and create an appropriate transition between the Business Park-designated land to the north and Southeast Redmond Park. More specifically, along 188th Avenue NE to the north, the development of a school property will also meaningfully contribute to the transformation of this neighborhood and create additional transition between uses. This redesignation will thus create a larger mixed-use area outside of Redmond's centers that supports adjacent land uses as envisioned in Comprehensive Plan Policy LU-36. See Comprehensive Plan at p. 28.

**i. If the amendment proposes a change in allowed uses in an area, the need for the land uses that would be allowed and whether the change would result in the loss of the capacity to accommodate other needed land uses;**

During last month's Study Session, some Commissioners expressed concern about a loss of Business Park land as it represents a small percentage of all land in Redmond.

Columbia Pacific understands these concerns but would like to reiterate that the Proposal will increase the percentage of Citywide Mixed-Use-designed land, which is only 0.9 percent of all land area in Redmond (whereas Business Park is 4.6 percent of all land area). Further, the Citywide Mixed-Use designation (and Corridor Mixed-Use zoning) is inherently vibrant and diverse through its encouragement of a range of development intensities and uses. These designations still allow commercial uses. The Proposal should not be viewed in zero-sum terms; instead, the Proposal will allow greater flexibility for this underutilized Property and increase the likelihood of redevelopment in accordance with the integrated purpose of Citywide Mixed-Use.

**j. Consistency with the preferred growth and development pattern in the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan;**

The City has confirmed that the Proposal is consistent with its preferred growth pattern. This underscores that that vision of Redmond 2050 is not changing.

**k. The proposed amendment addresses significantly changed conditions.**

Columbia Pacific has previously shared that in the years since the pandemic, the demand for manufacturing and commercial spaces has not recovered to pre-2020 levels. Additionally, the demand for residential (and particularly affordable housing units) remains strong amidst the ongoing housing crisis. As City Staff correctly concluded in their technical memorandum, the Proposal is intended to address these changed conditions, address a split-zoned condition, and increase the likelihood of redevelopment.

Because the Proposal satisfies the above Code criteria, Columbia Pacific respectfully requests that the Planning Commission recommends approval for the Proposal to the City Council.

**II. THE PLANNING COMMISSION, CITY COUNCIL, AND CITY STAFF HAVE CONFIRMED THAT A CONCURRENT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT AND REZONE IS THE PROPER PROCESS TO ACHIEVE THE PROPOSAL'S GOAL TO ALLOW RESIDENTIAL USES ON THE PROPERTY.**

As a brief reminder, Columbia Pacific has been advocating for residential uses to be maintained on the Property since September 2024, when the Applicant learned of the removal of these uses from the BP zone as part of the Code rewrite. The Proposal is not a knee-jerk reaction. Columbia Pacific has endeavored to maintain residential uses on the Property since that time – first through a limited Code change, and then through the current Proposal at Staff's suggestion. The Comprehensive Plan is a thoughtful and nuanced document which was designed with flexibility to achieve its goals while accommodating site-specific amendments. The vision of Redmond 2050 will not be

Redmond Planning Commission  
January 9, 2026  
Page 7 of 7

diminished by the Proposal to remove a split zoning and land use designation and enable market and affordable housing units to be constructed on the Property.

### **III. CONCLUSION.**

Thank you for taking the time to consider these comments. Please let us know if we can answer any questions. We remain appreciative of the Planning Commission's thorough analysis of our Proposal. We urge you to recommend the Proposal to the City Council so that the Property can be developed with market rate and affordable housing units.

Very truly yours,



Rachel Mazur

RMM:smd

*E-Mail:* [rachel.mazur@hcmp.com](mailto:rachel.mazur@hcmp.com)

*Direct Dial:* (206) 470-7667

*Fax:* (206) 623-7745

CC: Director Carol Helland, [chelland@redmond.gov](mailto:chelland@redmond.gov)  
Long Range Planning Manager Jeff Churchill, [jchurchill@redmond.gov](mailto:jchurchill@redmond.gov)  
Senior Planner Glenn Coil, [gcoil@redmond.gov](mailto:gcoil@redmond.gov)

ND: 22739.008 4927-4430-1701v3

David Morton, PhD  
206-909-5680  
Redmond 98053

I'd like to talk about the proposed [land use and zoning amendments for 6900 188th Avenue Northeast, aka Redmond Flex](#).

The city's urgent need for housing is understandable, but the long-term economic implications of converting nearly five acres of Business Park land to residential use is concerning. This is more than a zone change—it's a strategic choice about Redmond's future economic base.

Staff recognize that [this undermines job creation and business land supply policies](#). That's significant. [Business Park zones support the research, development, and advanced manufacturing sectors](#) that have made Redmond economically resilient. Once you convert employment land to residential, you rarely get it back.

This property sits in a [Critical Aquifer Recharge Area](#). While [staff notes residential use poses lower environmental risk than manufacturing](#), that's an argument for better environmental standards in Business Park zones, not elimination of employment land.

The rationale is troubling. The property owner cites [difficulty attracting viable tenants for manufacturing space](#). But is a temporary market softness sufficient reason to permanently eliminate employment capacity? Economic cycles change. The tech sector is cyclical. Making irreversible land use decisions based on current market conditions seems shortsighted.

The fiscal impact deserves closer examination. The report mentions [potential loss of business and occupation tax revenue](#), noting it [might be "offset" by commercial components in mixed-use development](#). That's speculative. What's needed is concrete analysis of the tax revenue differential between a functioning business park and residential development, including long-term implications for the city's ability to fund services.

The Commission might consider whether this proposal is strategic or simply reactive. Does Redmond have adequate Business Park capacity elsewhere to meet twenty-year employment projections? Is this conversion a last resort, or is it a premature response to market headwinds?

The [split-zone challenge](#) is real, but there may be creative solutions short of complete conversion. Could you adjust the Business Park standards to allow more flexibility while preserving employment capacity? Could you require substantial commercial components in any mixed-use development to maintain job generation?

Housing is critical, but so is economic diversity and fiscal sustainability. Please ensure this decision advances Redmond's complete long-term interests, not just immediate development pressures.

I'd like to address the [\*\*cumulative effects analysis for just the 6900 188th Avenue NE land use amendment\*\*](#) as it relates to Redmond's strategic planning priorities.

The [\*\*Analysis of Cumulative Effects document\*\*](#) acknowledges that converting nearly five acres of Business Park land "[\*\*may reduce employment as well as related business taxes\*\*](#)." This understated language masks a significant policy tension. Redmond 2050 explicitly prioritizes both housing growth and economic vitality. This proposal advances one at the expense of the other.

The cumulative effects analysis suggests job losses might be "[\*\*mitigated by the creation of jobs and businesses in the Mixed-Use zone\*\*](#)." This optimistic assumption deserves scrutiny. Business Park zones support research, development, and advanced manufacturing, which offer middle-to-upper wage employment with substantial tax revenue generation. Mixed-use zones typically generate retail and service jobs at lower wage scales with correspondingly lower fiscal benefits.

It's stated that this amendment "[\*\*may not advance\*\*](#)" several Economic Vitality policies, including [\*\*EV-2 on job growth targets\*\*](#), [\*\*EV-3 on economic development\*\*](#), and [\*\*EV-26 on diversified businesses\*\*](#). These aren't peripheral policies; they're foundational to Redmond's economic sustainability.

The cumulative effects matrix rates the overall docket as having "[\*\*positive impact on economic vitality\*\*](#)," yet the only docket item affecting employment land has acknowledged negative economic consequences. This apparent contradiction warrants explanation.

Consider the timing. The [\*\*Technical Committee Report\*\*](#) notes the property owner cited "[\*\*less demand for manufacturing and commercial uses\*\*](#)" and "[\*\*challenges attracting a viable tenant\*\*](#)." Is Redmond making permanent land use decisions based on cyclical market conditions? The tech sector experiences regular fluctuations. Will Redmond regret eliminating employment capacity when market dynamics shift?

What's the quantified difference in tax revenue between a functioning business park and residential development? How does this affect Redmond's long-term service delivery capacity? The Commission needs concrete numbers, not speculation about potential offsets.

Could Business Park standards be modified to preserve job-generating uses while making development more viable?

Please ensure that your recommendation to Council reflects careful consideration of whether this conversion serves Redmond's complete long-term interests or simply responds to immediate development pressures.

I'd like to comment on the proposed [Land Use and Zoning Map amendments for 6900 188th Ave NE](#).

I urge you to carefully consider the [contamination issue](#) before making your recommendation. The Washington Department of [Ecology's December 10th letter](#) reveals a critical fact: [residential development requires a revised cleanup plan](#), likely necessitating [full removal of PAH-contaminated soils](#) rather than the [capping method](#) approved for business development. This changes the economics of this site.

Under current Business Park zoning, Ecology has already issued a "[No Further Action Likely](#)" opinion allowing contaminated soils to be capped. This is an economically feasible cleanup approach. Full soil removal—required for residential use—means excavating and disposing of potentially tens of thousands of cubic yards of contaminated material at hazardous waste facilities. The cost difference is enormous.

Here's the irony: the site contamination makes Business Park development more practical, not less. Yet you're considering a rezone that will likely mandate the most expensive cleanup scenario. When facing massive remediation costs, developers maximize residential density to recoup expenses, making the "mixed-use" aspect unlikely. The result will likely be 100% residential development on contaminated industrial land that was better suited for its current designation.

The owner cites [difficulty attracting commercial tenants](#) as justification for [changed circumstances](#). But market conditions may be temporary, and commercial development under BP zoning faces far lower cleanup costs than residential conversion.

This proposal also threatens employment land capacity. Business Park zoning serves specialized employment functions that cannot be replicated in residential zones. Once converted and developed with housing, this land will never return to employment use.

Staff acknowledges this amendment [may not advance comprehensive plan policies](#) regarding [job growth targets](#), [economic development](#), and [diversified mix of businesses](#). [The 2014 Southeast Redmond Neighborhood Plan deliberately split this zoning](#) to balance residential amenities with local employment. That vision remains sound.

Residential development on this site is more expensive and eliminates practical employment land. The contamination issue indicates that this site should remain designated as Business Park.

I urge you to recommend [denial of the proposal](#). Thank you.

David Morton, PhD  
206-909-5680  
Redmond 98053

**From:** [David Morton](#)  
**To:** [Planning Commission](#); [Tara Van Niman \(City Volunteer\)](#)  
**Cc:** [Odra Cardenas](#); [Glenn Coil](#); [Susan Weston \(City Volunteer\)](#); [Jeannine Woodyear \(City Volunteer\)](#); [Adam Coleman \(City Volunteer\)](#); [Bryan Copley \(City Volunteer\)](#); [Aparna Varadharajan \(City Volunteer\)](#); [Denice Gagner \(City Volunteer\)](#); [Jeff Churchill](#); [Michael Hintze](#); [Francesca Liburdy](#); [Carol Helland](#); [Aaron Bert](#); [Becky Frey](#); [Sustainability](#); [Jenny Lybeck](#); [Micah Bonkowski](#); [Erin O'Mara](#); [Valeria Cosgrove](#); [Ameé Virelle](#); [Micheal Despaigne \(MED Enterprises\)](#); [Lauren Alpert](#); [Amanda Balzer](#); [Aaron Moldver](#); [Ian Lefcourte](#); [Tim McHarg](#); [Tom W. Hardy](#); [David Lee](#); [Nancy T. Logan](#); [Michael Vermeulen](#); [Rheya Wren](#); [Caitlin Reck](#); [Katie Pratt](#); [Erik Bedell](#); [Zwanzig Macy](#); [Marilyn Subala](#); [Brandon Leyritz](#); [Brian Buck](#); [Kim Dietz](#); [Haritha Narra](#); [PLAN - Redmond 2050 - Technical Advisory Committee](#); [Cameron Zapata](#); [Todd Rawlings](#); [Lauren Anderson](#); [Josh Mueller](#); [MayorCouncil](#); [Council](#); [Mayor \(Internet\)](#); [Chris Stenger](#); [Malisa Files](#); [Jill E. Smith](#); [Cheryl D. Xanthos](#); [Seraphie Allen](#); [City Clerk](#); [eugene.radcliff@ecy.wa.gov](#); [Oneredmond Info](#); [Patrick Jurney](#); [Andrea Martin](#); [pwilliams@redmond.gov](#); [Mike Brent](#); [Andy Swayne](#); [David Hoffman](#); [jor\\_mig\\_santos@hotmail.com](#); [Anastasiya Warhol](#); [James Terwilliger](#); [David Baker](#); [Milton Curtis](#); [Joe Marshall](#); [Nigel Herbig](#); [Mellor Caroline \(ECY\)](#); [Melanie OCain](#); [Andrew McClung](#); [Jon Culver](#); [David Barnes](#); [Brian Stewart](#); [Arielle Dorman](#); [Kim Faust](#); [Tom Hitzroth](#); [Marilyn Lazaro \(City Volunteer\)](#); [Yeni Li](#); [Christy Sanders-Meena](#); [David Bain](#); [Marissa Aho](#); [Claudia Balducci](#); [Sarah Perry](#); [Prideacrossthebridge Info](#); [Axton Burton](#); [Jessica Atlakson](#); [Tess Larson](#); [Brian Coats](#); [Ernest C. Fix](#); [Vanessa Kritzer](#); [gwolff@redmond.gov](#); [Kelley Cochran](#); [Loreen Hamilton](#); [David Tucheck](#); [Gary Smith](#); [Gary Smith](#); [Gary and Kerry Smith](#); [Gary Smith](#); [Tom Markl - Economic Development Board of Directors](#); [Shannon Braddock](#); [Shannon Braddock](#); [frank.winslow@ecy.wa.gov](#); [david.unruh@ecy.wa.gov](#); [dunr461@ecy.wa.gov](#); [kelli.price@ecy.wa.gov](#); [chrisc@soundearthinc.com](#); [treasure.mitchell@ecy.wa.gov](#)  
**Subject:** Clarification on My Public Comments Regarding 6900 188th Ave NE - Aquifer Protection Priority  
**Date:** Thursday, December 18, 2025 11:48:19 AM

**External Email Warning!** Use caution before clicking links or opening attachments.

Dear Commissioner Van Niman,

Thank you for speaking with me at last night's Planning Commission meeting regarding the proposed Land Use and Zoning Map amendments for 6900 188th Ave NE. I appreciate your question about my logic, as it highlighted that I didn't clearly communicate my primary concern: protecting Redmond's drinking water aquifer.

I want to clarify my position and offer what I believe is a better recommendation.

### **My Concern About the Staff Analysis**

The Planning Department memo states: "This Ecology requirement has no impact on the Land Use/Zoning map amendment as the impacts would be related to the costs to the property owner to clean up and prepare the site for development."

I respectfully disagree. The contamination issue has everything to do with this land use decision because **the zoning determines which cleanup approach is acceptable to Ecology—and therefore which approach protects Redmond's aquifer.**

The staff memo also acknowledges: "Most PAHs generally have low mobility in soil and tend to stay localized. Capping the site reduces potential contaminant migration and is a protective approach, **full contaminant removal is the most protective.**" [emphasis added]

### **Why I Initially Recommended Denial**

My recommendation to deny the proposal was based on concern that:

1. Approving the rezone without cleanup conditions creates no mechanism to require full remediation

2. Market forces alone (expensive cleanup costs) shouldn't determine environmental protection
3. The City was treating contamination as merely a private cost issue rather than a public aquifer protection issue
4. Business Park zoning with capping leaves contamination in place indefinitely above a Critical Aquifer Recharge Area

However, as you correctly perceived, this recommendation contradicts my stated priority of aquifer protection.

### **A Better Approach: Conditional Approval**

Upon reflection after our conversation, I believe the Planning Commission should recommend **conditional approval** that turns the contamination issue into an aquifer protection requirement rather than an obstacle to rezoning.

### **Recommended Motion Language:**

*"The Planning Commission recommends approval of the Land Use and Zoning Map amendments for 6900 188th Ave NE, contingent upon the following condition:*

*Prior to any development permit issuance or final rezone effectiveness, the applicant shall provide documentation from the Washington Department of Ecology confirming that all PAH-contaminated soils have been fully removed to standards protective of unrestricted use and groundwater quality, as verified through Ecology's approval of a revised cleanup action plan meeting the substantive requirements of MTCA.*

*The Planning Commission makes this recommendation recognizing that while 'capping the site reduces potential contaminant migration,' as noted in staff analysis, 'full contaminant removal is the most protective' approach for a site located in Critical Aquifer Recharge Area II. Complete remediation serves both public health and aquifer protection regardless of final land use."*

### **Why This Approach is Superior**

**1. Aquifer Protection is Guaranteed.** Rather than hoping residential development economics force cleanup, the City explicitly requires it as a condition of approval. This removes contamination that is sitting above Redmond's aquifer.

**2. Addresses Long-Term Risk.** Staff notes that PAHs "generally have low mobility in soil and tend to stay localized"—but "generally" and "tend to" provide no certainty over the 50+ year timeframe these contaminants could remain capped. Soil conditions change, caps can fail, and future development could disturb capped areas. Complete removal eliminates risk permanently.

**3. Prevents Future Contamination.** Business Park zoning allows manufacturing and industrial uses that could introduce *new* contamination pathways beyond the existing PAHs. Residential use poses virtually no risk of adding industrial contaminants to a CARA II area.

**4. Advances Multiple Comprehensive Plan Goals.** This approach serves both housing goals (allowing residential development) and environmental protection goals (requiring complete cleanup) without sacrificing either.

**5. Reasonable Economic Expectation.** If residential development is economically infeasible without full cleanup anyway (per Ecology's December 10 letter), making it a condition simply formalizes what market reality already dictates. If cleanup costs make the project unviable, the owner retains Business Park development rights with capping as an option—but contamination remains.

**6. The City Leads, Rather Than Defers.** The staff memo states: "The City recognizes the long-term benefit of full clean-up of the site but defers to Ecology on the best mitigation for any given site."

Deference is appropriate for technical cleanup standards, but the City shouldn't defer on *whether* to require the most protective approach when Redmond's aquifer is at stake. Ecology's December 10 letter doesn't mandate full removal—it simply explains that residential use would trigger review of a revised plan. The City can and should use its land use authority to require full remediation as a condition of rezoning.

### **Context: Twelve Contaminated Sites Above Redmond's Aquifer**

As I mentioned, there are currently twelve documented MTCA contaminated sites within Redmond's designated Critical Aquifer Recharge Areas—the zones specifically designated to protect drinking water sources. Ten of these are in CARA I, where groundwater reaches public wells within five years. Two are in CARA II, including the Redmond Flex site.

Forty percent of Redmond's drinking water depends on aquifer integrity. Each contaminated site in a CARA represents a potential pathway for pollutants to migrate into drinking water supplies. When there is an opportunity to permanently remove contamination from above Redmond's aquifer—rather than simply capping it and hoping for the best—the opportunity should be seized.

The Planning Commission has both the authority and responsibility to ensure that land use policies adequately protect this vital resource.

### **Addressing Employment Land Concerns**

My public comment also emphasized employment land preservation, which may have muddied my message. While I do believe Business Park land serves important economic functions, **aquifer protection is my primary concern.** If full cleanup can be guaranteed through conditional approval, that outcome better serves public health than maintaining Business Park zoning with capped contamination indefinitely.

The employment land question—whether Redmond can afford to lose 2.8% of SE Redmond's Business Park capacity—is a legitimate policy discussion. But it's secondary to ensuring that industrial contamination is not left sitting above Redmond's drinking water aquifer for the next 50 years when you have the leverage to require its complete removal.

### **Conclusion**

I apologize for the confusion my initial recommendation created. My priority is and has always been protecting Redmond's aquifer.

The Planning Commission should recommend **conditional approval requiring full soil**

**remediation documented by Ecology** before the rezone becomes effective. This approach:

- Guarantees the most protective cleanup method
- Removes contamination from above Redmond's aquifer
- Prevents future industrial contamination in a CARA II area
- Allows housing development if economically viable after cleanup
- Uses the City's land use authority proactively for environmental protection

The contamination at 6900 188th Ave NE is not merely a private cost issue for the property owner—it's a public health issue for everyone who drinks Redmond water. The Planning Commission has an opportunity to ensure this site is fully cleaned up, and I urge you to take it.

Thank you for your time and consideration. I'm happy to discuss this further or provide additional information.

Respectfully,

David Morton, PhD  
206-909-5680  
Redmond 98053

**From:** [Aspen Richter](#)  
**To:** [Planning Commission](#)  
**Subject:** Regarding 6900 188th Ave NE Land Use Map and Zoning  
**Date:** Wednesday, January 7, 2026 12:58:27 PM

---

**External Email Warning!** Use caution before clicking links or opening attachments.

I see that "Land Use Map and Zoning Map Amendments for 6900 188th Ave NE – study session and recommendation" is on the Planning Commission upcoming agenda.

As a resident of the developments a few blocks to the south, my *ardent* request is that zoning and any construction there includes the ability to have restaurants, small grocers, and a coffee shop.

I admit I have not been following the Planning Commission discussions closely, so apologies if this is not in the scope of the current agenda item.

Best,  
Aspen Richter  
Redmond resident (98052)

----- Forwarded message -----

**From:** City of Redmond <[Cityofredmond@public.govdelivery.com](mailto:Cityofredmond@public.govdelivery.com)>  
**Date:** Wed, Jan 7, 2026 at 12:20 AM  
**Subject:** City of Redmond Washington Daily Digest Bulletin  
**To:** <[aspend@gmail.com](mailto:aspend@gmail.com)>

I'd like to comment on Agenda Item 6.

The toxic contamination from mining and land filling operations at the Redmond Flex site must be addressed before any development proceeds, regardless of zoning designation.

RZC 21.64.010.A.6 states the City's purpose is to “protect critical aquifer recharge areas (CARAs) by avoiding land use activities that pose potential contamination.” Leaving PAH-contaminated soils capped in place directly above Redmond's aquifer, even if Ecology permits it, contradicts this protective purpose. The aquifer provides 40% of Redmond's drinking water. Under current Business Park zoning, Ecology permits indefinite capping. The staff memo acknowledges that while capping “reduces potential contaminant migration,” full removal is "the most protective" approach.

The City should use its CARA protection authority to ensure that the most protective cleanup occurs. Under RZC 21.64.010, Redmond has explicit authority to protect CARAs. While Ecology regulates MTCA cleanup, the City has independent authority to condition land use approvals to protect aquifer recharge functions.

Before development permits are issued, I ask the Commission to recommend that any zoning approval be conditioned on Ecology's documented verification that the cleanup plan adequately protects Redmond's CARA. Regardless of whether the Council approves the proposed rezone, a Development Agreement could provide an additional mechanism to require full soil removal as a condition of development. The Commission and the City should advocate with Ecology for the most protective cleanup possible given this site's location directly above Redmond's drinking water source.

**Here's the bottom line.**

- ✓ Redmond CAN condition land use approvals to protect CARAs under RZC 21.64.010.F.1.
- ✓ Redmond CAN require coordination with Ecology.
- ✓ Redmond CAN require Ecology's verification that cleanup meets CARA protection standards.
- ✗ Redmond CANNOT override Ecology's MTCA cleanup determinations.
- ✗ Redmond CANNOT unilaterally require full removal if Ecology approves a less stringent plan.

Preserving employment land is indeed a concerning issue. **Conditional approval of the proposed amendment better protects Redmond's drinking water aquifer** and addresses housing needs.

Invoking the City's use of its CARA protection authority to ensure full removal of the toxic PAH-contaminated soils, regardless of zoning, is the MOST PROTECTIVE approach.



# TECHNICAL COMMITTEE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION TO THE PLANNING COMMISSION

November 12, 2025

**Project File Number:** LAND-2025-00259; SEPA-2025--00258

**Proposal Name:** Land Use Map and Zoning Map Amendments - 6900 188<sup>th</sup> Ave NE

**Applicant:** City of Redmond

**Staff Contacts:** Jeff Churchill, Long Range Planning Manager 425-556-2492  
Glenn Coil, Sr. Planner 425-556-2742

## TECHNICAL COMMITTEE COMPLIANCE REVIEW AND RECOMMENDATION

Technical Committee shall make a recommendation to the Planning Commission for all Type VI reviews (RZC 21.76.060.E). The Technical Committee’s recommendation shall be based on the decision criteria set forth in the Redmond Zoning Code. Review Criteria:

- A. RZC 21.76.070.J Comprehensive Plan Map
- C. RZC 21.76.070.AF Zoning Code Amendment - Map

## REDMOND COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT SUMMARY

The property located at 6900 188<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, in SE Redmond, parcel number 128630-0012, also known as Lot 7 in the Taylor-Magnussen Development Agreement, and also known as Redmond Flex, is 5.82 acres in size, with the western 1.0 acre having a land use designation of Citywide Mixed Use and the remainder 4.82 acres designated on the Land Use Map as Business Park.

The proposal is to redesignate Business Park to Citywide Mixed-Use, so the whole parcel has consistent land use.

This amendment is concurrent with a zoning map amendment for the same property.

Current and proposed Land Use Designations adopted in the Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan - [Land Use Chapter](#):

### Citywide Mixed-Use

#### LU-36

Maintain and enhance a well-distributed system of mixed-use areas at a variety of scales outside of Redmond’s centers. Encourage land uses that support or provide services to adjacent land uses and that encourage accessible and active transportation and transit use.

#### LU-37

Ensure that mixed-use areas are located, designed, and developed to:

- o Locate businesses rather than parking areas along the street;

- o Provide housing;
- o Encourage compact development and use of accessible and active transportation;
- o Avoid impacts on adjacent residential uses, including impacts that could result in pressure to convert these adjacent uses to commercial uses.

*LU-38 - Citywide Mixed-Use Designation*

- Purpose.
  - o Provide for housing and businesses that offer goods and services for the greater Redmond community. Locate and develop these mixed-use areas outside of designated centers.
- Allowed Uses.
  - o Implement this designation throughout the mixed-use zones to allow a range of development intensity between neighborhood-scale intensities and center-scale intensities, to provide goods and services to the community.
  - o Permit housing, retail, service, cultural and recreational amenities, and other businesses that serve the needs of the community in these zones.

**Business Park**

*LU-39 - Business Park Designation*

- Purpose.
  - o Provide for business and manufacturing employment opportunities that involve limited outdoor storage and include compatible uses that serve employees of the immediate area.
- Allowed Uses.
  - o Permit uses such as research and development, software development, advanced technology industries, wholesale businesses, adult entertainment, certain manufacturing businesses, associated offices, schools, and similar uses.
  - o Permit support services and uses that reinforce the creation of complete neighborhoods.
  - o Examples of compatible uses include business services that directly support surrounding businesses and limited retail and service activities, such as restaurants, day cares, and fitness centers, that serve employees and residents in the immediate areas.

<b>RZC 21.76.070.J COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT CRITERIA</b>		<b>MEETS/ DOES NOT MEET</b>
<i>(Full staff analysis attached as Attachment A)</i>		
a.	Consistency with the Growth Management Act (GMA), the State of Washington Department of Commerce Procedural Criteria, Vision 2050 or its successor, and the King County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs);	MEETS
b.	Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan policies and the designation criteria;	MEETS
c.	Potential impacts to vulnerable community members;	MEETS
d.	Potential economic impacts;	MEETS
e.	Potential impacts to the ability of the City to provide equitable access to services;	MEETS

<b>RZC 21.76.070.J COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENT CRITERIA</b>	<b>MEETS/ DOES NOT MEET</b>
<i>(Full staff analysis attached as Attachment A)</i>	
f. Potential impacts to the natural environment, such as impacts to critical areas and other natural resources;	MEETS
g. The capability of the land for development, including the prevalence of environmentally critical areas;	MEETS
h. Whether the proposed land use designations or uses are compatible with nearby land use designations or uses;	MEETS
i. If the amendment proposes a change in allowed uses in an area, the need for the land uses that would be allowed, and whether the change would result in the loss of the capacity to accommodate other needed land uses;	MEETS
j. Consistency with the preferred growth and development pattern in the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan;	MEETS
k. The proposed amendment addresses significantly changed conditions. In making this determination, the following shall be considered:	
i. Unanticipated consequences of an adopted policy, or	
ii. Changed conditions on the subject property or its surrounding area, or,	MEETS
iii. Changes related to the pertinent plan map or text; and	
iv. Where such a change of conditions creates conflicts in the Comprehensive Plan of a magnitude that would need to be addressed for the Comprehensive Plan to function as an integrated whole.	

**REDMOND ZONING CODE MAP AMENDMENT SUMMARY**

The property located at 6900 188<sup>th</sup> Ave NE, in SE Redmond, parcel number 128630-0012, also known as Lot 7 in the Taylor-Magnussen Development Agreement, and also known as Redmond Flex, is 5.82 acres in size, with the western 1.0 acre zoned Corridor Mixed Use and the remainder 4.82 acres zoned Business Park.

The proposal is to rezone the Business Park to Corridor Mixed-Use, ensuring the entire parcel has consistent zoning.

Current and Proposed Zones:

**RZC 21.08.100. C. Mixed-Use Zones.**

There are two citywide mixed-use zones: Corridor Mixed-Use (CMU) and Urban Mixed-Use (UMU). The integration of residential, commercial, and recreational spaces fosters vibrant, walkable, and economically robust areas that cater to the diverse needs of our community.

1. Corridor Mixed-Use Purpose. This zone accommodates a broad mix of commercial uses and low- to medium-density mixed-use housing along transit corridors.

**RZC 21.14.030 Business Park.**

A. Purpose. The purpose of the Business Park (BP) zone is to provide business and manufacturing employment opportunities that complement commercial activities typically found in Downtown, involve limited outdoor storage, and include a high level of amenities. The Business Park zone provides areas to locate research and development, software development, advanced technology industries, wholesale businesses, manufacturing businesses with largely indoor operations, offices associated with these uses, and uses that require large floor plates, such as major medical facilities. Compatible uses that directly support surrounding business park uses, such as restaurants, fitness centers, and cannabis retail sales, are allowed. This zone is not intended for uses that primarily serve the general public.

<b>RZC 21.76.70.AF - MAP AMENDMENT CRITERIA</b>		<b>MEETS/ DOES NOT MEET</b>
1	The amendment complies with the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map, policies, and provisions;	<b>MEETS</b>
2	The amendment bears a substantial relation to the public health and safety;	<b>MEETS</b>
3	The amendment is warranted because of changed circumstances, a mistake, or because of a need for additional property in the proposed zoning district;	<b>MEETS</b>
4	The subject property is suitable for development in general conformance with zoning standards under the proposed zoning district;	<b>MEETS</b>
5	The amendment will not be materially detrimental to uses or property in the immediate vicinity of the subject property;	<b>MEETS</b>
6	Adequate public facilities and services are likely to be available to serve the development allowed by the proposed zone;	<b>MEETS</b>
7	The probable adverse environmental impacts of the types of development allowed by the proposed zone can be mitigated, taking into account all applicable regulations or the unmitigated impacts are acceptable; and	<b>MEETS</b>
8	The amendment complies with all other applicable criteria and standards in the RZC.	<b>MEETS</b>

**STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (SEPA)**

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that the requirements of environmental analysis, protection, and mitigation measures have been adequately addressed through the City’s regulations and Comprehensive Plan together with applicable state and federal laws. Additionally, the lead agency has determined that the proposal does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment as described under SEPA. An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required

under RCW 43.21C.030(2). This decision was made after review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency.

- ❖ In accordance with WAC 197-11-340(2) an opportunity for comment and appeal period was provided from November 19, 2025 to December 18, 2025.

---

### STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Based on the compliance review of the decision criteria set forth in

- A. RZC 21.76.070.J Comprehensive Plan Map
- C. RZC 21.76.070.AF Zoning Code Amendment - Map

Staff recommends **approval** of the proposed amendments. Staff compliance review and analysis is provided in Attachment A.

---

### TECHNICAL COMMITTEE RECOMMENDATION

The Technical Committee has reviewed the proposed amendments and finds the amendments as shown in Attachment B to be **consistent** with review criteria identified below:

- A. RZC 21.76.070.J Comprehensive Plan Map and/or Policy Amendment
- C. RZC 21.76.070.AF Zoning Code Amendment - Map

---

### REVIEWED AND APPROVED BY



---

Carol Helland,  
Planning and Community Development  
Director



---

Chris Stenger, Deputy Public Works Director  
for Aaron L. Bert, Public Works Director

#### Attachments

- a. Staff Compliance Review and Analysis
- b. Proposed Amendments to the Land Use Map and Zoning Map - 6900 188th Ave NE
- c. SEPA Threshold Determination



**ATTACHMENT A: STAFF COMPLIANCE REVIEW AND ANALYSIS  
 Land Use Map and Zoning Map Amendments - 6900 188<sup>th</sup> Ave NE  
 LAND-2025-00259; SEPA-2025-00258**

**Comprehensive Plan Amendment Criteria (RZC 21.76.070.J)**

CRITERIA	ANALYSIS
<p>a. Consistency with the Growth Management Act (GMA), the State of Washington Department of Commerce Procedural Criteria, Vision 2050 or its successor, and the King County Countywide Planning Policies (CPPs);</p>	<p>This proposal is consistent with GMA planning goals (RCW 36.00A.030), including:</p> <p>(1) Urban growth. Encourage development in urban areas where adequate public facilities and services are available or can be provided efficiently.</p> <p>(2) Reduce sprawl. Reduce the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling, low-density development.</p> <p>(4) Housing. Plan for and accommodate housing affordable to all economic segments of the population of this state, promote a variety of residential densities and housing types, and encourage preservation of existing housing stock.</p> <p><b>Vision 2050 multicounty planning goals</b> this proposal is consistent with include:</p> <p><b>Development Patterns</b> goal: The region creates healthy, walkable, compact, and equitable transit-oriented communities that maintain unique character and local culture, while conserving rural areas and creating and preserving open space and natural areas.</p> <p><b>Housing</b> goal: The region preserves, improves, and expands its housing stock to provide a range of affordable, accessible, healthy, and safe housing choices to every resident. The region continues to promote fair and equal access to housing for all people.</p> <p>King County CPPs this proposal is consistent with and helps advance include:</p>

CRITERIA	ANALYSIS
	<p>Development pattern policies that support housing and walkability, including DP-3, DP-4 and DP-5.</p> <p>Housing policies aimed at increasing housing supply, accessibility to transit and employment, and expanded housing and neighborhood choice, including HO-10, H-12, H-15, H-16, H-18, and H-25.</p> <p>Economic policies such as EC-19 and EC-26.</p> <p>King County CPP's this proposal may not advance as strongly, including those around the economy, providing middle-wage jobs, business development, and an adequate supply of land, include EC-2, EC-6, and EC-22.</p>
<p>b. Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan policies and the designation criteria;</p>	<p>This proposal aligns with the Redmond 2050 Comprehensive Plan's policies.</p> <p>Policies this proposal strongly advance include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• FW-LU-2: "Ensure that the land use pattern in Redmond meets the following objectives ... [e]ncourages a mix of uses that create complete neighborhoods ... [p]romotes sufficient density for development pattern and urban design that enable people to readily use a variety of accessible and active forms of travel[.]"</li> <li>• FW-HO-2: "Zone sufficient buildable land to accommodate Redmond's projected housing need and meet allocated housing growth targets."</li> <li>• FW-HO-3: "Increase housing choices in more areas of the city."</li> <li>• FW-HO-5: "Evaluate and refine tools and processes to improve housing related outcomes."</li> </ul> <p>Policies this proposal may not advance or as strongly include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EV-2 - Provide for a mix of land uses in a range of zones that enables Redmond to</li> </ul>

CRITERIA	ANALYSIS
	<p>meet its job growth targets and attract and retain businesses that meet the needs of the community.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• EV-3 - Prioritize efficient use of land and infrastructure by directing economic development within existing retail, office, manufacturing, and mixed-use areas and in designated centers.</li> <li>• EV-26 - Develop and maintain land use, zoning, and design regulations that attract and support a diversified mix of businesses from multinational corporations to small, locally owned and innovative neighborhood shops.</li> </ul>
<p>c. Potential impacts to vulnerable community members;</p>	<p>Proposal may have a positive impact on vulnerable populations, as residential development would increase the city’s housing stock and results in affordable housing through mandatory inclusionary zoning provisions.</p> <p>It is also adjacent to a neighborhood park and approximately 1,400 feet (10-minute) walk from a bus stop served by Metro route 269.</p>
<p>d. Potential economic impacts;</p>	<p>There could be a potential loss of manufacturing/commercial uses, and related jobs, as well as B&amp;O taxes. Some of this loss may be offset if new development includes mixed-use/commercial development.</p>
<p>e. Potential impacts to the ability of the City to provide equitable access to services;</p>	<p>No impacts have been identified.</p>
<p>f. Potential impacts to the natural environment, such as impacts to critical areas and other natural resources;</p>	<p>No impacts have been identified, including to the Critical Aquifer Recharge Area. Staff noted that a rezone to mixed use/residential has lower risk to the environment than the current Business Park zoning. Businesses/uses allowed in the BP zone have the potential to use materials and processes in manufacturing that could contaminate the CARA. Businesses/uses associated with mixed</p>

CRITERIA	ANALYSIS
	<p>use/residential are retail and service industry based and pose a low risk to the environment.</p>
<p>g. The capability of the land for development, including the prevalence of environmentally critical areas;</p>	<p>The property is located in a former quarry that has been targeted for redevelopment. It is currently subject to a development agreement that allows for the construction of a 135,000 sq ft building with manufacturing and wholesale trade uses, as well as some commercial uses. No concerns were identified regarding the land's capability for development in the analysis of this project. The land is located on CARA II, but no concerns have been raised about the proposed use (residential).</p>
<p>h. Whether the proposed land use designations or uses are compatible with nearby land use designations or uses;</p>	<p>The proposed use is compatible with nearby uses; the proposal would have the entire parcel retain the land use and zoning designations that already exist on the western third of the parcel. Nearby uses include a neighborhood park, residential (single-family and townhomes), and manufacturing. Lake Washington School District also owns an adjacent property to the north with potential for a new school.</p>
<p>i. If the amendment proposes a change in allowed uses in an area, the need for the land uses that would be allowed and whether the change would result in the loss of the capacity to accommodate other needed land uses;</p>	<p>The proposal would change the allowed uses for approximately 83% (4.82 acres) of the 5.82-acre parcel, from business park uses to multifamily and mixed-use.</p> <p>Allowed uses lost include research and development, software development, advanced technology industries, wholesale businesses, adult entertainment, certain manufacturing businesses, associated offices, schools, and similar uses.</p> <p>Uses gained include housing, retail, service, cultural, and recreational amenities, as well as other businesses that serve the community's needs in these zones.</p> <p>Although the City would benefit from additional uses to accommodate housing</p>

CRITERIA	ANALYSIS
	growth, it would also lose land area for business park uses.
j. Consistency with the preferred growth and development pattern in the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan;	The proposal is consistent with the City's preferred growth pattern. This proposal expands an existing Citywide Mixed-Use designation into a Business Park designation. It does not directly impact a nearby manufacturing & industrial growth center.
k. The proposed amendment addresses significantly changed conditions. In making this determination, the following shall be considered: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Unanticipated consequences of an adopted policy, or</li> <li>ii. Changed conditions on the subject property or its surrounding area, or,</li> <li>iii. Changes related to the pertinent plan map or text; and</li> <li>iv. Where such change of conditions creates conflicts in the Comprehensive Plan of a magnitude that would need to be addressed for the Comprehensive Plan to function as an integrated whole.</li> </ul>	<p>This proposal addresses significantly changed conditions on the subject property.</p> <p>The property is split-zoned, with the Business Park share not allowing residential uses. This amendment will allow residential development on the whole 5.82 acre parcel.</p> <p>The previous/current zoning was adopted to ensure adequate capacity for job-producing uses. During the Redmond 2050 update, this was identified as a continuing City priority, along with the need for additional housing.</p> <p>More recently, the property owner identified changed conditions - including less demand for manufacturing/commercial uses, and challenges attracting a viable tenant, as well as increased need and demand for housing. This proposal is intended to satisfy this changed condition.</p>

### Zoning Map Amendment Criteria (RZC 21.76.070.AF)

CRITERIA	MEETS/ DOES NOT MEET
a. The amendment complies with the Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map, policies, and provisions;	<b>MEETS</b> This proposal is concurrent with and complementary to a Land Use Map change from Business Park to Citywide Mixed Use.
b. The amendment bears a substantial relation to the public health and safety;	<b>MEETS</b>

CRITERIA	MEETS/ DOES NOT MEET
	<p>This proposal is not expected to have a substantial effect on public health or safety.</p>
<p>c. The amendment is warranted because of changed circumstances, a mistake, or because of a need for additional property in the proposed zoning district;</p>	<p><b>MEETS</b>                      This proposal reflects changed conditions.</p> <p>The 2007 Land Use Map for the City designated this parcel as Multi-Family Urban. This changed for the Redmond 2030 Comp Plan, where the 2019 Land Use map designates the property as Neighborhood Commercial and Design District, and allows flexibility for residential uses. The specific zoning though, divided the parcel into two zones, Neighborhood Commercial, which allowed residential uses, and NE Design District 2, which did not allow residential development and was intended to promote commercial/industrial development adjacent to other residential areas to promote local employment.</p> <p>Redmond 2050 continues this intention, even after land use and zoning consolidation that removed Design Districts and rezoned this property to Corridor Mixed Use and Business Park.</p> <p>The split zone aspect of the property has been a challenge for redevelopment as it allows both residential and commercial/business park uses that may not be compatible or feasible within one parcel or development. This proposal would make the Corridor Mixed Use aspect of the property potentially more viable for redevelopment.</p>
<p>d. The subject property is suitable for development in general conformance with zoning standards under the proposed zoning district;</p>	<p><b>MEETS</b>                      As a split zoned property, it would expand a land use/zoning designation that was previously reviewed to be suitable for development on the site.</p>
<p>e. The amendment will not be materially detrimental to uses or property in the immediate vicinity of the subject property;</p>	<p><b>MEETS</b></p>

CRITERIA	MEETS/ DOES NOT MEET
	<p>The proposal may complement properties in the vicinity, such as single and multi-family homes, a city park, trails, as well as a potential school.</p>
<p>f. Adequate public facilities and services are likely to be available to serve the development allowed by the proposed zone;</p>	<p><b>MEETS</b>                      Staff reviewed utilities and services in the area and found all adequate to support the proposed land use and zoning.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transportation: adequate</li> <li>• Utilities:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Water - adequate</li> <li>○ Wastewater - adequate</li> <li>○ Stormwater - adequate</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Parks/Trails: The property is adjacent to SE Redmond Park, and is also served by dedicated bike lanes on 188<sup>th</sup> Ave NE. In addition, the property has access to the Evans Creek Trail, located about 500 feet to the east. SE Redmond Park adjacent to the south is planned to be developed in 2027.</li> <li>• Schools - served by LWSD and may be served by a future school on a property adjacent to the north.</li> <li>• Transit - The property is located about a 10-minute walk from KC metro route 269.</li> </ul>
<p>g. The probable adverse environmental impacts of the types of development allowed by the proposed zone can be mitigated, taking into account all applicable regulations or the unmitigated impacts are acceptable; and</p>	<p><b>MEETS</b>                      The property is located in the CARA II designation. The proposed use for the new zone, residential, may have less environmental impact than the current zoning, Business Park on the underlying CARA, which allows uses that may not be compatible or would require mitigation.</p> <p>Staff noted that this proposal is not an issue from the natural resources and CARA perspective, since mixed-use as a land use has lower potential for environmental impacts.</p>
<p>h. The amendment complies with all other applicable criteria and standards in the RZC.</p>	<p><b>MEETS</b></p>

## Comp Plan LU Map & Zoning Map Amendments: 6900 188<sup>th</sup> Ave. NE





# STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (SEPA) DETERMINATION OF NON-SIGNIFICANCE

For more information about this project visit [www.redmond.gov/landuseapps](http://www.redmond.gov/landuseapps)

## PROJECT INFORMATION

**PROJECT NAME:** 6900 188th Ave NE Map Amendment

**SEPA FILE NUMBER:** SEPA-2025-00258

**PROJECT DESCRIPTION:**

Associated with LAND-2025-00259

**PROJECT LOCATION:**

**SITE ADDRESS:** 6900 188TH AVE NE  
REDMOND, WA 98052

**APPLICANT:** Rachel Mazur

**LEAD AGENCY:** City of Redmond

The lead agency for this proposal has determined that the requirements of environmental analysis, protection, and mitigation measures have been adequately addressed through the City's regulations and Comprehensive Plan together with applicable State and Federal laws.

Additionally, the lead agency has determined that the proposal does not have a probable significant adverse impact on the environment as described under SEPA.

An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required under RCW 43.21C.030(2)(c). This decision was made after review of a completed environmental checklist and other information on file with the lead agency. **This information is available to the public on request.**

## CITY CONTACT INFORMATION

**PROJECT PLANNER NAME:** Glenn Coil

**PHONE NUMBER:** 425-556-2742

**EMAIL:** [gcoil@redmond.gov](mailto:gcoil@redmond.gov)

## IMPORTANT DATES

### **COMMENT PERIOD**

Depending upon the proposal, a comment period may not be required. An "**X**" is placed next to the applicable comment period provision.

There is no comment period for this DNS. Please see below for appeal provisions.

**'X'** This DNS is issued under WAC 197-11-340(2), and the lead agency will not make a decision on this proposal for 14 days from the date below. Comments can be submitted to the Project Planner, via phone, fax (425)556-2400, email or in person at the Development Services Center located at 15670 NE 85th Street, Redmond, WA 98052. **Comments must be submitted by 12/03/2025.**

### **APPEAL PERIOD**

You may appeal this determination to the City of Redmond Office of the City Clerk, Redmond City Hall, 15670 NE 85th Street, P.O. Box 97010, Redmond, WA 98073-9710, **no later than 5:00 p.m. on 12/18/2025**, by submitting a completed City of Redmond Appeal Application Form available on the City's website at [www.redmond.gov](http://www.redmond.gov) or at City Hall. You should be prepared to make specific factual objections.

**DATE OF DNS ISSUANCE:** November 19, 2025

**For more information about the project or SEPA procedures, please contact the project planner.**

**RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:** Carol V. Helland  
Planning Director

SIGNATURE: 

**RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:** Aaron Bert  
Public Works Director

SIGNATURE: 

**Address:** 15670 NE 85th Street Redmond, WA 98052