

Attachment E: Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)*City Council Issues Matrix, discussed on April 11 and April 25, 2017***Discussion Issues**

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
A. Local Center Designation		
A1. How does a local center compare to an urban center? (Myers)	<u>City Council Discussion</u> 4/11: Councilmembers were satisfied that the recommended policies and regulations for the Marymoor Subarea were driven by the adopted vision. The Council closed the issue. <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 4/7: There are several differences between local centers and urban centers. Local centers are intended to be smaller scale in terms of land area and density than urban centers. The guidance from the Puget Sound Regional Council and King County Countywide Planning Policies on size for urban/regional growth centers is approximately 640 acres. In contrast, the proposed Marymoor Local Center is approximately 175 acres in size. Also, while urban centers have a regional role as places to focus a significant share of the region's population and employment growth, that is not the intent of local centers. While local centers will be compact and sufficiently dense to support transit use, they are not intended to grow at the same level as urban centers. Urban/regional centers are also intended to have a clear regional role through significant civic, cultural or employment functions. The role of local centers is to serve a more focused local or community population. The work underway at the Puget Sound Regional Council on the Regional Centers Framework Update will likely further reinforce the distinctions between regional growth centers (urban centers) and smaller scale or local centers.	Opened 4/4 Closed 4/11
A2. Would it be appropriate to designate this area an urban center? (Myers, Padhye)	<u>City Council Discussion</u> 4/11: The Council was satisfied with the staff response and closed this issue. <u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 4/7: Staff believes it is not appropriate to designate the Marymoor Subarea as an urban center for the reasons described above. It is smaller in scale, is not intended to have a regional role, and is intended to accommodate growth though not at the intensity or level of Downtown or Overlake. This approach is consistent with current regional policy and regional policy and direction under consideration by the Puget Sound Regional Council.	Opened 4/4 Closed 4/11

Attachment E: Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)

City Council Issues Matrix, discussed on April 11 and April 25, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
B. Land Use and Zoning Standards		
B1. What are appropriate height and FAR standards in this area? What are the City's transit-oriented development goals? (Myers)	<p><u>City Council Discussion</u> 4/11: Councilmembers noted that the Marymoor Subarea will continue to have a wide range of uses for a potentially long period of time. Councilmembers described it as being a "multifaceted" area. Councilmembers were satisfied with the staff response and closed this issue.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 4/7: The current zoning for the Marymoor Subarea is Manufacturing Park. The MP zone allows 4-5 stories in height and FAR ranging from 0.25 to 1.0.</p> <p>The recommended Marymoor Design District standards would increase the allowed quantity and type of development. Maximum height would range from 3 stories along the park edge to 6 stories near the light rail station. Maximum FAR would range from 0.5 to 3.0. Allowed uses would be expanded to include mixed-use, multifamily, and other non-residential uses not currently allowed in the MP zone.</p> <p>Adopted and recommended policies describe the City's transit-oriented development (TOD) goals for this area as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Creating a walkable subarea with ample connections to Marymoor Park, transit, and the rest of the neighborhood (N-SE-36) • Focusing employment growth in a mixed-use context nearest the light rail station (N-SE-39) • Incorporating housing into the area that is walkable to the station (N-SE-40) 	<p>Opened 4/4</p> <p>Closed 4/11</p>
B2. How will manufacturing and mixed-use/multifamily uses co-exist? To what extent does the City expect land use conflicts? (Margeson, Padhye)	<p><u>City Council Discussion</u> 4/11: Councilmembers expected that the Marymoor Subarea would evolve into an eclectic mix of uses and would attract people looking for that mix. At the same time, Councilmembers acknowledged that, despite both design and communication efforts, there would likely be complaints from new residents about noise or other impacts from living near</p>	<p>Opened 4/4</p> <p>Closed 4/11</p>

Attachment E: Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)

City Council Issues Matrix, discussed on April 11 and April 25, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>manufacturing uses, and that clear communication would be critical. Councilmembers then closed this issue.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 4/7: The recommended amendments would require new uses to mitigate possible impacts between differing, adjacent uses through site design and communication. Site design standards are briefly described below in topic C1. In addition, recommended Comprehensive Plan policy N-SE-35.5 and RZC 21.13.210 MDD Transition Strategy call for notice to promote awareness among potential new residents that there are existing and potential new manufacturing park and regional park uses located nearby when prospective residents are considering purchasing or leasing homes in the Marymoor Design District. These measures may not eliminate conflict, but are expected to allow lessees and purchasers to better understand the subarea context before moving in.</p>	
C. Existing Manufacturing Businesses		
<p>C1. Describe the anticipated ability of manufacturing businesses to continue to operate (Shutz)</p>	<p><u>City Council Discussion</u> 4/11: Councilmembers noted that there will be ebb and flow in market pressure for redevelopment over time in this area, and pointed out that construction of light rail and related facilities and access would likely impact how and when property owners make decisions about their properties. Councilmembers then closed this issue.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 4/7: The recommended amendments are consistent with Council adopted Resolution 1415 which calls for a transition strategy or other innovative zoning approach that allows for the continued economic vitality of existing and future manufacturing uses and encourages the reasonable expansion, modification and re-leasing of existing properties over their useful economic lives.</p> <p>The recommended Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code amendments provide support for manufacturing businesses to continue to operate and allow for additional uses such as residential; some commercial uses; some arts, entertainment, and recreation uses; and some transportation and utility uses. In addition, the proposed use table in the Zoning Code supports the location of new manufacturing businesses in this area provided that Subarea standards are met through building and site design and through infrastructure</p>	<p>Opened 4/4</p> <p>Closed 4/11</p>

Attachment E: Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)

City Council Issues Matrix, discussed on April 11 and April 25, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	improvements such as access, parking, and stormwater management, and that the new manufacturing uses are not materially detrimental in terms of operational impacts with nearby mixed use/residential development.	
D. Catalyst for Change		
D1. What will prompt changes / catalyze redevelopment? What is the anticipated trigger for redevelopment? (Shutz, Margeson)	<p><u>City Council Discussion</u> 4/11: There was agreement among Councilmembers that change would happen at some point, and that construction of light rail and related facilities and access would be one driver of change. Councilmembers then closed this issue.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 4/7: With the recommended amendments, redevelopment will be triggered when property owners decide that they want to redevelop their land. Many factors will likely influence property owners' decisions, such as land values, lease terms, property specific limitations, and overall economic conditions and outlook. This approach is not unlike redevelopment decisions in other parts of Redmond.</p> <p>Binding site plans and easements also play a role in portions of the Subarea for any new development and modifications to existing sites. These are managed between individual property owners and can involve aspects including common areas, designated parking, and access. In the area south of NE 65th Street, comprised of 13 building over approximately 19 acres, all but three buildings are involved in a binding site plan. The individual property owners involved in these binding site plans do not individually own surface water management facilities, parking, ingress/egress, or other common area elements, in a manner conceptually similar to condominium associations.</p> <p>The recommended amendments reflect the South Marymoor Subarea Committee's careful consideration of this topic and their belief that timing triggers would be an inappropriate tool because of a risk for confusion between property and business owners and tenants. Instead, the recommendation is a market-based approach that is based on the Committee's development of Transition Strategy Concepts and Factors including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allowed Uses • Thresholds 	<p>Opened 4/4</p> <p>Closed 4/11</p>

Attachment E: Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)

City Council Issues Matrix, discussed on April 11 and April 25, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Timing • Incentives • Compatibility <p>The recommended transition strategy incorporates a market-based approach whereby owners would redevelop at a time that they desired, time-based requirements would be avoided, and incentives would balance community and owner/developer benefits and infrastructure needs. The benefits include affordable housing, parks and gathering places, density, height, and flexibility. Leaving the question of when properties should be developed to property owners is similar to the process for property owners elsewhere in Redmond.</p> <p>In addition to the opportunities provided via expanded allowed uses and incentives, new development and modifications to existing sites would conform to building, fire, infrastructure, and certain planning standards such as fire suppression, seismic, ADA accessibility, and ingress/egress based on proposed tenant uses.</p>	
<p>D2. What are the investment thresholds that would require compliance with zoning standards? (Margeson)</p>	<p><u>City Council Discussion</u></p> <p>4/11: Councilmembers noted that the NE 116th Street trail still has gaps due to its piecemeal construction, and that the same could happen to the Marymoor Subarea perimeter trail if built in segments as properties redevelop. On the other hand, Councilmembers acknowledged that building the trail in large segments or all at once would likely require property acquisition, though the amount of property acquisition could be reduced if the trail were partially or wholly built within Marymoor Park. The Council then closed this issue.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p>4/7: Currently, conformance with building, fire, infrastructure, and some planning standards is required based on the amount or type of improvement being proposed by the property owner or tenant. The Subarea plan does not recommend any changes to these standards.</p> <p>While each application for modification is different, the South Marymoor Subarea Committee considered this question and the following types of possible changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change of use from an existing permitted use to another permitted use 	<p>Opened 4/4</p> <p>Closed 4/11</p>

Attachment E: Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)

City Council Issues Matrix, discussed on April 11 and April 25, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Change of use from an existing permitted use to a newly permitted non-residential use • Change of use from an existing permitted use to multifamily • Additional floor area that expands the building's footprint • Additional floor area that maintains the building's existing footprint <p>In general, existing conditions and the proposed magnitude of change would determine required upgrades and enhancements. Additions of floor area and other structural modifications totaling over 100% of the existing appraised value would require compliance with dimensional and urban design standards.</p>	
E. Subarea Identity		
<p>E1. What is the intended identity for this subarea? How can the identity leverage Marymoor Park or other opportunities? What design standards will reinforce this identity? (Margeson, Stilin, Birney)</p>	<p><u>City Council Discussion</u></p> <p>4/25: Councilmembers considered the preferred design outcome for the Marymoor subarea in comparison to current citywide design standards. Regarding desired design outcomes, Councilmembers spoke to a high level of eclectic, creative and artistic designs; variety to avoid repetition and sameness, flexibility and innovation; and design that reflects the area's proximity to Marymoor Park. Councilmembers supported staff's proposed approach to recommend design standards for the Marymoor subarea as part of the existing effort to update the City's urban center and citywide design standards. Councilmembers also expressed interest in a more distinctive name for the Marymoor subarea while maintaining "Marymoor" as part of the name to keep a strong connection to Marymoor Park and the future light rail station. Staff will follow up on both of these topics.</p> <p>4/11: Councilmembers were in general agreement that design standards for the area should strive to allow a variety of building designs to be consistent with the idea of this area as "eclectic," with a wide variety of uses. The vision for the area was also described as a "mosaic," where one design would not fit all, and where experiments in design might be appropriate. Councilmembers also suggested a new name for the subarea to better reflect its identity. Councilmembers expressed that there should be a focused identity for the light rail station area in particular.</p>	<p>Opened 4/4</p> <p>Closed 4/25</p>

Attachment E: Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)

City Council Issues Matrix, discussed on April 11 and April 25, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p>4/21: Staff will provide a series of building images at the Council’s April 25, 2017 study session for Councilmembers to indicate their preference regarding key defining qualities including overall building form, modulation, material, roof line, and color. Councilmembers’ preference will guide staff in subsequent development of specific design standards including emphasis on specific areas of creative design. Staff will also seek Council’s direction for incorporating the Marymoor design standards in the Urban Centers design standards update, a separate Zoning Code amendment process that is currently underway.</p> <p>4/7: The Marymoor Subarea is intended to be a place where a diversity of enterprises from high-tech manufacturing to brewing and art can operate, adapt, and grow and where residents and employees have frequent transportation connections to the neighborhood, City, and region. Its location and natural setting lend toward a long-term vision where the environment is integrated and supportive to neighboring Marymoor Park. The addition of light rail is anticipated to bring more interest in establishing businesses as well as living in the Subarea.</p> <p>RZC Map 13.5 Height Overlay Area calls for the edge of the Subarea, adjacent to Marymoor Park, to be limited to three stories of building height. The intent, described in RZC 21.13.170 MDD Design Standards, is to take advantage of Marymoor Park as a visual and recreational amenity such as with large windows placed facing the park and non-motorized connections provided between the Subarea and the Park.</p>	
E2. What industries does the City anticipate in this area? (Stilin)	<p><u>City Council Discussion</u></p> <p>4/25: Councilmember Stilin suggested combining this discussion with item #E1 in the context of what would encourage people to relocate to the subarea and agreed to close this item.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u></p> <p>4/7: General business interests expressed regarding the Marymoor Subarea include arts, recreation, prototyping, other commercial and light manufacturing; however, no applications for new development have been submitted recently. The recommended Zoning Code amendments would allow a variety of manufacturing uses to locate in this area provided</p>	<p>Opened 4/4</p> <p>Closed 4/25</p>

Attachment E: Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)

City Council Issues Matrix, discussed on April 11 and April 25, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	they are not materially detrimental in terms of operational impacts with nearby mixed use/residential development. A few examples of potential industries consistent with the Zoning Code include research and development, software and interactive media among many others.	
F. Station and Park-and-Ride		
F1. What is the planned access to serve the park-and-ride and the area overall? (Carson, Margeson)	<p><u>City Council Discussion</u> 4/25: Councilmembers reiterated their concerns regarding vehicular movement in association with the park-and-ride structure, expressed interest in solutions that facilitate getting people to the light rail station, and some expressed interest in having more than one park and ride structure. They also agreed that this and some of the subsequent items in the issues matrix regarding the station and park-and-ride would be part of ongoing discussions.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 4/7: The City developed a recommended street network for the Marymoor Subarea assuming that a light rail station and transit parking would be located in the northwestern part of the subarea. Parking could be provided in one garage or multiple garage structures. The specific location of the garage(s) will be addressed during the preliminary engineering phase, which will occur from summer 2017 to summer 2018.</p> <p>The transportation analysis conducted as part of the Marymoor Subarea planning work shows that the internal street network can accommodate local traffic and vehicles accessing the parking garage(s). Access improvements to accommodate park-and-ride trips are Sound Transit's responsibility as documented in the East Link Record of Decision (ROD) and would be completed before the station opens in 2024. Sound Transit will be updating its environmental documentation to take account of changed conditions since 2011. The City is recommending an alternative set of improvements known as the "Station Area and Access Project" in the Marymoor Subarea Infrastructure Plan. These improvements map to required mitigation in the ROD and are consistent with the recommended subarea street network. The improvements are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Station access via NE 70th St and (new) 173rd Ave NE • Extending 176th Ave NE to Redmond Way, creating a new access to/from the subarea • Constructing a roundabout at the intersection of 176th Ave NE and NE 70th St 	<p>Opened 4/4</p> <p>Closed 4/25</p>

Attachment E: Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)

City Council Issues Matrix, discussed on April 11 and April 25, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>The precise configuration of streets will depend in part on where the parking garage(s) is/are actually located; the City's recommended street plan can accommodate refinements based on specific site planning, both for Sound Transit and private redevelopment.</p> <p>At the same time, City staff recognize that the Redmond Way corridor adjacent to the Marymoor Subarea is congested today. The City Council authorized \$150k in the 2017-18 budget to develop engineering and operational solutions for complex intersections in the area. Staff anticipates bringing a scope of work for this study to the City Council by the end of June 2017.</p>	
<p>F2. What light rail alignment alternatives were evaluated? (Stilin)</p>	<p><u>City Council Discussion</u> 4/25: Councilmembers agreed that the question had been answered and closed this item.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 4/7: Sound Transit began evaluating alternative East Link alignments in 2006 with the participation of the City and the community. During the alternatives evaluation phase Sound Transit considered three alignments for the section from Overlake to Southeast Redmond and Downtown, known as Segment E. All alternatives are the same from NE 40th St to the W Lk Samm Pkwy interchange on SR 520. From there:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E1: proceeds elevated along W Lk Samm Pkwy, then east at grade along Redmond Way and then the RCC corridor to a station near Redmond Town Center (164th/166th), then elevated over Bear Creek and through the 520-202 interchange to an elevated terminus station in the E Lk Samm Trail corridor between NE 65th St and NE 70th St. • E2: proceeds elevated across the Sammamish River alongside SR 520, coming to grade with a station in Southeast Redmond, then turning to go through the 520-202 at grade, with a station in the Redmond Central Connector (RCC) corridor near Leary Way. A "design option" for E2 shows a Downtown station in the RCC corridor near Redmond Town Center (164th/166th) and a terminus station on 161st at the Redmond Transit Center. • E4: proceeds elevated northwest along W Lk Samm Pkwy, then elevated northeast along Leary Way, then at grade in the RCC corridor with a station near Redmond 	<p>Opened 4/4</p> <p>Closed 4/25</p>

Attachment E: Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)

City Council Issues Matrix, discussed on April 11 and April 25, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	<p>Town Center (164th/166th), then over Bear Creek, then at grade through the 520-202 interchange to an at-grade terminus station in the E Lk Samm Trail corridor between NE 65th St and NE 70th St.</p> <p>In 2011 the Sound Transit Board selected E2 as the preferred alternative and the federal government publishing a Record of Decision (ROD) in 2011. The City supported the E2 alternative at the time and has since based in transportation and land use planning in Downtown and Southeast Redmond on the assumption that the E2 <i>alignment</i> would be built.</p> <p>In May the Sound Transit Board will update the preferred alternative. The Board will be considering refinements to <u>station location</u> and <u>vertical profile</u> (at grade, elevated, etc.) within the E2 <i>alignment</i> based on changes in conditions since the project was first adopted in 2011.</p> <p>In 2016 Sound Transit developed a “representative alignment” for the ST3 ballot measure, based on the ROD, for the purpose of developing a project budget for the ballot measure. The ST3 project description uses the same <i>alignment</i>, but is elevated across Marymoor Park, Southeast Redmond, and the SR 520 interchange, coming to grade in Downtown.</p> <p>Sound Transit is assuming the E2 <i>alignment</i> because changes to the alignment would make the project unaffordable and delay design and construction of light rail to Southeast Redmond and Downtown. Light rail would not open to Downtown in 2024. As noted, the City has supported the E2 alignment in letters to Sound Transit during the alternatives analysis and in advance of the ST3 ballot measure. The City’s bus-rail integration work in the Downtown TRAIN, and Marymoor Subarea land use and transportation planning work, assume the E2 alignment.</p> <p>The alignment through Downtown is straight, which allowed the City to consider other station locations for which previous environmental review had been completed. The alignment in Southeast Redmond is constrained by Marymoor Park to the west and SR 520 to the north over a short distance, heavily constraining the station location. Sound Transit is evaluating both at-grade and elevated stations in Southeast Redmond, and there are a</p>	

Attachment E: Marymoor Subarea Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments & Local Center Designation (LAND-2016-02061)

City Council Issues Matrix, discussed on April 11 and April 25, 2017

Issue	Discussion Notes	Status
	number of important trade-offs to consider in that evaluation, which staff will include as a focus for the Council's 4/25 study session on the light rail station area.	
F3. What opportunities exist to co-locate transit or parking with other uses, like housing? (Margeson)	<p><u>City Council Discussion</u> 4/25: Councilmembers indicated that transit oriented development is a priority, agreed that the question had been answered and closed this item.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 4/7: It is too early to know the scope of potential creative co-location opportunities. Staff will seek these out during the preliminary design phase, which will begin once the Sound Transit Board has updated the preferred alternative, which is expected to occur in May, and will last until summer 2018. The City Council has previously communicated to Sound Transit that the Southeast Redmond station is the City's highest priority for transit-oriented development in this extension of light rail.</p>	<p>Opened 4/4</p> <p>Closed 4/25</p>
F4. What is the role of the Bear Creek Park-and-Ride in the future? (Margeson)	<p><u>City Council Discussion</u> 4/25: Councilmembers encouraged staff to continue discussing this question with Metro. Councilmembers agreed to close this item.</p> <p><u>Staff Response/Recommendation</u> 4/7: Staff is aware that this is an important and as-yet-unresolved issue. Staff raised this topic during the development of METRO CONNECTS (Metro's long-range transit plan). Metro's long-range service plans continue to route transit on streets near the Bear Creek P&R, however the specific issue of the park-and-ride was not addressed.</p>	<p>Opened 4/4</p> <p>Closed 4/25</p>