



## Legislation Text

File #: SS 18-193, Version: 1

**MEMO TO:** Members of the City Council

**FROM:** Mayor John Marchione

**SUBJECT:**

RZC Amendment: Development Agreements for High Capacity Transit Facilities

### **I. RECOMMENDED ACTION**

Consider the Planning Commission recommendation to adopt an ordinance amending the Redmond Zoning Code (RZC) to authorize the City Council to approve deviations from development standards via development agreements for high capacity transit facilities.

### **II. DEPARTMENT CONTACTS**

Erika Vandenbrande, Director, Planning, and Community Development	425-556-2457
Don Cairns, P.E., Manager, Transportation Planning and Engineering	425-556-2834
Jae Hill, AICP, CFM, Manager, Long-Range Planning	425-556-2414
Jeff Churchill, AICP, Transportation Strategic Advisor	425-556-2492
Judy Fani, Senior Planner	425-556-2406

### **III. DESCRIPTION/BACKGROUND**

Some design and dimensional standards in the zoning code are incompatible with light rail station designs under development for Marymoor Village and Downtown. For example, the proposed parking garage is taller than would otherwise be allowed, and the station is unlikely to meet minimum floor area ratio requirements in the MDD1 zone.

#### Planning Commission Recommendation

In light of the issue described above, the Planning Commission recommends adopting a zoning code amendment that would allow the City Council to approve deviations from development standards through a development agreement (Chapter 36.70B RCW) for high capacity transit facilities constructed by a regional transit authority established by Chapter 81.112 RCW. The Planning Commission Report for this item was distributed separately and is available online at [www.redmond.gov/PCReports](http://www.redmond.gov/PCReports) <<http://www.redmond.gov/PCReports>>.

The Commission's recommendation excludes authorizing surface parking lots through development agreements. The Commission concluded that permitting surface parking lots where they are currently

prohibited - the MDD1 zone in Marymoor Village - should not be a deviation that the Council would be authorized to approve through a development agreement. Instead, the Commission concluded that surface parking lots only be permitted through a code amendment process.

#### Council Discussion

On August 28, 2018, the City Council considered the concept of a single, larger parking structure for the Marymoor Village station. A majority of Council Members agreed that a single, larger structure was preferable while identifying a number of concerns to be addressed as the design progresses, including concerns related to access, neighborhood traffic, and adequacy of overall parking count in Marymoor Village. Because Sound Transit will pursue a single, larger structure consistent with Council input, the Commission's exclusion of surface parking lots from its recommendation will not affect the permitting process for the station.

Council Members considered the Commission's recommendation at the Committee of the Whole meeting on September 11, 2018, and asked that this item be discussed at the September 25, 2018, study session. Questions Council Members would like to explore, along with initial staff responses, are listed below.

- *What would happen if a property owner in the MDD1 zone proposed a surface parking lot?*

New surface parking lots are prohibited in the MDD1 and MDD2 zones (they are permitted in the MDD3, 4, and 5 zones). If an applicant proposed a surface parking lot in a redevelopment application, staff would flag the use as prohibited by the zoning code. The process to change the list of permitted uses is a zoning code amendment is a Type VI permit which requires a Planning Commission public hearing and recommendation to City Council which is the decision-making authority for a Type VI permit.

- *What would happen if a change is proposed in the height of the Sound Transit parking structure?*

Staff anticipates that the Council will set a height limit for the parking garage in a development agreement with Sound Transit, based on garage design to date. If the design-builder proposes a height that exceeds the limit in the development agreement, then the Council could consider amending the development agreement. Council could also choose - with height limits or other standards - to delegate authority for amendments to staff, within parameters set by the Council in the agreement.

- *What are some examples of how the recommended zoning code amendment would be applied to the light rail extension project?*

The example of parking structure height is described in the previous question. Another example concerns the minimum floor area ratio in the MDD1 zone. Because the station consists of very little area that would be considered "floor area" (parking does not count), the station will not meet the minimum requirement in the code. Instead, Council would authorize approval of a deviation to waive that standard in the development agreement. A third example concerns setback requirements in the Anderson Park zone, where the Downtown Redmond station will be located. The current requirements in the zoning code are written for traditional multifamily/mixed-use development and assume street frontage. The Downtown station will be

in the Redmond Central Connector corridor and not fronting a street, so these standards don't neatly apply. The Council, through the development agreement, could also waive these requirements.

At the study session, staff will review the Commission's recommended amendment and be available to answer questions from the Council.

#### **IV. PREVIOUS DISCUSSIONS HELD**

June 12, 2018: City Council Committee briefing in advance of Planning Commission review.

September 11, 2018: City Council Committee briefing on Commission's Recommendation

#### **V. IMPACT**

##### **A. Service/Delivery:**

The recommended amendment would streamline the permitting process for the Downtown Redmond Link Extension project and allow the City to be more responsive to innovative ideas from Sound Transit's design-builder.

##### **B. Fiscal Note:**

There is no anticipated fiscal impact.

#### **VI. ALTERNATIVES TO STAFF RECOMMENDATION**

Staff recommends adopting the Commission's recommendation at a future business meeting for the reasons described in the Planning Commission Report. The Council could also modify or reject the Commission's recommendation, or send the issue back to the Commission for further proceedings consistent with Council direction.

#### **VII. TIME CONSTRAINTS**

Sound Transit will advertise a design-build request for proposals this fall. Council action on this amendment prior to RFP advertisement reduces risk as design-build teams develop proposals.

#### **VIII. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS**

**Attachment A.** Planning Commission Recommended RZC Amendment for Development Agreements for High Capacity Transit Facilities

**Attachment B.** Presentation