

Attachment D

Project & Non-Project Questions/Comments

Below is a breakout of the feedback received that the City has limited authority in requiring or conditioning as part of the Seritage application.

Directly Project Related feedback that has been responded to, but that the City cannot take additional action on as part of the Seritage project proposal.

Feedback Item Received	Why Further Action by the City Cannot be Required as part of the Project Proposal.
Please install bike lanes on 20 th and 24 th	Cannot require bike lanes on 20 th street TMP does not have bike lane requirements in adopted functional plan. At buildout both 24 th street and (new) Alhazen will have west-east bike lanes.
Less parking as part of the design.	The code requires a minimum and has a voluntary process for an applicant to request reduction. City cannot require applicant to go below the minimum.
Have this project and other maximize density more.	The OV3 zone places a maximum on FAR, but not a minimum. The City cannot require greater density without an update to code and process.
SEPA approach and traffic study approach are incorrect.	Staff has illustrated and provided substantial data and information that confirms wholly that the approach and study are in compliance. The City cannot require additional analysis or a different SEPA process. Staff has also shared clarified and informed all misunderstandings shared on how the SEPA process works and the City's adopted standards and authority regarding transportation.
Sears is being displaced	Sears is voluntarily closing. The City does not have authority to require businesses stay in operation or that leases are continued.
Park should be tripled in size and should be reforested	A park is not required and is an element provided voluntarily by the applicant. The City cannot require a large park and the applicant has exceed public benefit proportionality on the project. The City cannot allow a forest to be planted due to the vault and the community's desired function ability of the open space as shown within the adopted vision and plans for OV.
Art budget is not enough at \$1 million dollars.	The City does not have the authority to require additional funds for art. This amount exceeds that provided by any recent projects and will have a significant role in the place making of open spaces available to the public.
Performance and entertainment centers should be included within the project.	The City does not have the authority to require this.
A residential parking system for adjacent neighborhoods.	This would need to be separate initiative applied for to the traffic department. Anyone is allowed to park on any public street at anytime. Public parking within adjacent neighborhoods cannot be modified by a private project proposal.
Provide more amenity and community services.	Applicant is considering voluntarily providing additional community meeting space. The City does not have the authority to require community services if not chosen by the applicant as an incentives request for height or FAR. The applicant has already exceeded public benefit proportionality on the project. A

	Development Agreement does not give the applicant or the City the authority to circumvent the code or exceed adopted authority. The DA and Master Plan have been reviewed not only by Technical Staff but also have been through a legal review to ensure minimum proportionality of public benefit has been met.
Site could have better uses and senior housing.	The City has adopted a set of permitted uses allowed within the zone. The Zoning Code does not give the City authority to require a specific mix of uses for this site. Site is proposing office, retail, housing, hotel, general commercial and restaurant uses.
City of Bellevue's comment letter on requesting additional analysis.	The applicant has voluntarily completed additional analysis's. The City has confirmed that no further analysis can be required at this time and Bellevue has not provided any data to warrant additional studies. They reviewed the EIS and were part of the planning process.

Non-Project related feedback that has been responded to, but that the City cannot take additional further action on as part of the Seritage project proposal.

Feedback Item Received	Why Further Action by the City Cannot be Required as part of the Project Proposal.
Height limits are too low in urban centers	There are maximum height restrictions adopted. The City does not have the authority to require a project to be larger than the adopted zoning tables.
Height limits are too high in the City.	The City has a max height adopted and cannot limit height of applications meet requirements.
Outreach to the public insufficient.	The City has adopted standards of public outreach as does the state. Additionally, the City has adopted additional voluntary options by which an applicant can provide expanded outreach. The City is limited by the adopted state and local regulations currently in place. Staff has worked consistently to provide access to project information at all times and to be available to answer any and all questions on projects currently under review in the City. Outreach and notification of projects cannot exceed current adopted code regulations and must be applied consistently and fairly amongst all applications.
Not enough Affordable Housing or low enough.	The City does not have the authority to require more Affordable Housing than adopted within the Redmond Zoning Code. There are strict state provisions and case law that place limitations on expanding required affordable housing thresholds.
Bikes with advertisements.	The City does not have the authority to require this and it may violate current adopted sign codes as suggested.
Affordable Commercial in the City.	The City does not have the authority to require this within any zone at this time and it is not included within any incentive programs.
Microsoft's future plans have unrealistic transportation forecast.	The City does not have the authority to make limiting decisions on any project currently under review with a vested application based upon planned development proposals that have not yet been applied for. The future development's proposal will need to address and show how they meet all compliance for the area including current applications under review or approved and not developed.

Per Council Member Birney Request, the below are items from the public feedback that are best discussed and addressed through the City's amendment cycles:

1.)	Please install bike lanes on 20 th
2.)	Lower parking requirements
3.)	Minimum require FAR
4.)	Increased minimum park sizes
5.)	Higher public art requirements
6.)	Require urban forests
7.)	Performance and entertainment centers should be required
8.)	Update residential neighborhood parking programs
9.)	Require more amenity space and community services
10.)	Require senior housing
11.)	Require minimum heights to get taller buildings
12.)	Reduce maximum heights on buildings
13.)	Expand outreach policies and website access
14.)	Increase affordable housing
15.)	Require bikes be staged with advertisements
16.)	Require affordable commercial