



Legislation Text

File #: SS 21-075, Version: 2

TO: Members of the City Council

FROM: Mayor Angela Birney

DEPARTMENT DIRECTOR CONTACT(S):

Planning and Community Development	Carol Helland	425-556-2107
------------------------------------	---------------	--------------

DEPARTMENT STAFF:

Planning and Community Development	Jeff Churchill	Long Range Planning Manager
Planning and Community Development	Becky Frey	Principal Planner
Planning and Community Development	Caroline Chapman	Senior Planner
Planning and Community Development	Glenn Coil	Senior Planner
Planning and Community Development	Ian Lefcourte	Planner

TITLE:

Redmond 2050 Quarterly Update - Third Quarter 2021

OVERVIEW STATEMENT:

Staff provided a quarterly update on the Redmond 2050 periodic review of the Comprehensive Plan at the City Council’s September 21, 2021 business meeting. The main topics to be covered are policy options and alternatives for housing, economic vitality, and transportation.

At the Council’s September 28 study session, staff will seek Council input on those topics so that staff can incorporate that direction into the first draft of updated Housing, Transportation, and Economic Vitality elements. Staff anticipates that those drafts will be published in the first quarter of 2022.

Additional Background Information/Description of Proposal Attached

REQUESTED ACTION:

Receive Information       Provide Direction       Approve

REQUEST RATIONALE:

- **Relevant Plans/Policies:**  
Redmond Comprehensive Plan, Redmond Transportation Master Plan, implementing functional and strategic plans, and Redmond Zoning Code.
- **Required:**

The Growth Management Act requires that Washington cities and counties periodically review and, if needed, revise their comprehensive plans and development regulations every eight years. For King County cities the periodic review must be completed by June 30, 2024, per WAC 365-196-610.

- **Council Request:**  
The City Council requested quarterly reports on project milestones, staff progress, and public involvement.
- **Other Key Facts:**

**Third and Fourth Quarter Activities and Initiatives**

Third Quarter Activities	Fourth Quarter Activities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Continued community engagement on Redmond 2050 themes</li> <li>• Community engagement on policy options and alternatives for housing, economic vitality, and transportation</li> <li>• Community engagement on Overlake Plan update: equity, sustainability, and resiliency in the built environment</li> <li>• Preparation of Parks, Arts, Recreation, Conservation, and Culture (PARCC) Element policy considerations and policy options and alternatives</li> <li>• Transforming growth scenarios into complete citywide growth alternatives suitable for analysis in the draft environmental impact statement (analysis has begun)</li> <li>• Base-year and future-year land use data preparation for environmental analysis travel demand modeling</li> <li>• Base-year travel demand modeling</li> <li>• Future-year travel demand modeling</li> <li>• Development of draft transportation project recommendations</li> <li>• Identification of the methodologies and data sources for the Climate Vulnerability Assessment and development of a proposal for the interactive GIS tool that will be developed</li> <li>• Monthly CAC meetings</li> <li>• Monthly Planning Commission meetings</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Preparation of first drafts of policies and regulations for housing, economic vitality, and transportation</li> <li>• Community engagement on PARCC policy considerations and policy options and alternatives</li> <li>• Continued community engagement on Overlake Plan update: equity, sustainability, and resiliency in the built environment</li> <li>• Continued travel demand modeling</li> <li>• Continued environmental analysis</li> <li>• Preparation of growth alternative report cards</li> <li>• Preparation of preliminary environmental impact statement</li> <li>• Community engagement on the initial outputs from the Climate Vulnerability Assessment</li> <li>• Continued development of draft transportation project recommendations</li> <li>• Monthly CAC meetings</li> <li>• Monthly Planning Commission meetings</li> <li>• Technical Advisory Committee kick-off</li> </ul>

**OUTCOMES:**

The key outcome from work conducted over the last quarter is a refined understanding of community priorities related to housing, economic vitality, and transportation. During the past quarter staff identified policy topics where there were tensions between themes, values, or adopted plans. Staff then sought additional community input on how to address such tensions. The areas of tension on which staff sought feedback are listed in the table below. See Attachment B for additional details.

Housing	Economic Vitality	Transportation
---------	-------------------	----------------

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accommodating additional “missing middle housing,” as called for in the Housing Action Plan, <i>is in tension with</i> existing neighborhood plan policies that restrict such housing</li> <li>• Prioritizing energy efficiency and sustainability requirements <i>is in tension with</i> prioritizing lower construction costs</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strengthening protections for manufacturing land uses and jobs <i>is in tension with</i> allowing for additional flexibility in manufacturing and industrial areas</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Prioritizing access to light rail <i>is in tension with</i> prioritizing low stress/high comfort facilities</li> <li>• Prioritizing the use of “flexible” revenue sources for system maintenance <i>is in tension with</i> prioritizing the use of “flexible” revenue sources for completing new mobility improvements</li> </ul>
---	--	--

The table below summarizes community input on these topics provided in a variety of forums over the past quarter. See Attachment C for details.

Topic	Community Input Summary
Housing: Missing Middle Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community acknowledges the nexus between different housing types and housing affordability and was curious about the aesthetics of different typologies.</li> <li>• Community sentiment is to encourage flexibility in “missing middle” housing types across the City. However, the community is almost evenly split on whether existing neighborhood-specific policies that restrict “missing middle” should be kept or removed.</li> <li>• From Questionnaire Comments on <b>Missing Middle</b>:                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ “I do not want to see low income housing in my neighborhood. This would lower property values and impact my ability to resell the home that I've worked hard to own. Should my tax dollar go to help someone else buy a home? No.”</li> <li>○ “Allowing density is our local way to help fight climate change and increase housing affordability. Allowing the free market to develop duplexes and triplexes is one of the best ways to do this, with minimal negative impact to quality of life. I also like how Kirkland has promoted subdividing properties and building new high-quality modern housing, and I wonder why builders like Merit Homes aren't doing the same in Redmond.”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

<p>Housing: Sustainability and Affordability</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• From the questionnaire, to date the community sentiment is to prioritize green building incentives and requirements (53%) over affordability (35%).</li> <li>• Many comments discussed a desire to do both sustainability and affordability in the building stock.</li> <li>• From Questionnaire Comments on <b>Sustainability and Affordability</b>:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ “Given today’s climate issues, I believe all new building projects should utilize as much ‘green’ technologies as possible.”</li> <li>○ “Being green is important, but folks working on their own carbon footprint is a drop in the bucket versus the top 100 companies on earth that make &gt;70% of all our carbon emissions. So it's more important for us to focus on getting people housed near their work than it is to micro-focus on being green. Of course if we can also get sustainability, that's fine. But I think the housing problem is more tractable at the local level than the green problem.”</li> <li>○ “Lowering housing and building emissions is paramount to our region. I don't feel that it has to be done at the exclusion of multiuse, density, affordability, and urban quality. Doing away with the car parking requirements would also help.”</li> <li>○ “I think we can do both here - denser zoning, smaller footprints for each housing unit can lead to less developed land and therefore more open green space. Multiunit housing can also include green building standards and be encouraged with tax incentives.”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>Economic Vitality: Manufacturing Land Uses and Jobs</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community sentiment is to encourage flexibility in manufacturing areas but maintain manufacturing uses.</li> <li>• Preserving family wage jobs is seen as important to Redmond’s vitality, as is being flexible in a changing market.</li> <li>• From Questionnaire Comments:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>For Protections</b>: “I would prefer that Redmond allowed retail/office space to go vertical in places with great highway/transit accessibility (office parks = sprawl). And let the existing manufacture stay put. It's important to Redmond's vitality.”</li> <li>○ <b>For Flexibility</b>: “Since we don't know the future, it seems smart to be flexible, and not lock ourselves into a situation that doesn't work down the road. We should prioritize manufacturing, which creates more and better paying jobs than retail, while allowing for potential changes in the future.”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>Transportation: Prioritizing New Mobility Investments</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community sentiment is split on what kinds of new investments to prioritize, with a plurality of questionnaire respondents preferring to give equal weight to different types of projects.</li> <li>• One strategy would be to lean into light rail access in the early years of the next Transportation Facilities Plan (TFP), and then focus on other investments in the later years of the TFP. Another strategy would be to prioritize different kinds of projects based on the needs of different neighborhoods.</li> <li>• From questionnaire comments:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <b>For high comfort/low stress facilities</b>: “Higher comfort options will encourage diverse transit strategies far more than painted bike lanes and stressful road crossings. Trust me, the extra time it takes to build these facilities will pay dividends back to the community.”</li> <li>○ <b>For access to light rail</b>: “I feel like light rail is going to be key to reducing car traffic and emissions in our region, so I'm willing to make this tradeoff to kickstart it.”</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

Transportation: Balancing Maintenance and New Mobility Improvements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Community sentiment leans toward prioritizing “flexible” revenues for maintenance.</li><li>• From questionnaire responses:<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>○ <b>For maintenance:</b> “What is the point of adding new infrastructure if you can’t take care of the current [infrastructure].”</li><li>○ <b>For new mobility improvements:</b> “Redmond desperately needs to both expand and connect existing bike paths and transit options together in a safe and efficient way.”</li><li>○ <b>Other:</b> “This is a difficult dilemma...I would say you can’t skip one in favor of the other, but instead strive for a balance of maintaining what you have while adding to the inventory.” “This trade-off seems to be a bit of a false choice - in general, we should prioritize the projects that will provide the most return on our investments in terms of achieving our vision for Redmond. Sometimes that means maintaining existing infrastructure... and sometimes that means building new multimodal infrastructure.”</li></ul></li></ul>
---	---

Completion of periodic review of the Comprehensive Plan, Redmond 2050, on schedule with state mandated deadlines will result in compliance with Growth Management Act requirements. Additionally, third and fourth quarter work, identified here, will contribute to ensuring updates to the Comprehensive Plan reflect the community’s vision for the future of Redmond.

**COMMUNITY/STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH AND INVOLVEMENT:**

- **Timeline (previous or planned):**
  - Previous and Current (Q3 2021)
    - Redmond 2050 themes (continued)
    - Housing, economic vitality, and transportation policy options and alternatives
    - Overlake: equity, sustainability, and resiliency in the built environment
  - Planned (Q4 2021)
    - PARCC policy considerations and policy options and alternatives
    - Overlake: equity, sustainability, and resiliency in the built environment (continued)
    - Climate Vulnerability Assessment outreach
- **Outreach Methods and Results:**

Outreach methods have included or will include:

  - Press release
  - Social media
  - Posters & yard signs
  - Emails to City eNews, Redmond 2050, and Parks & Recreation lists
  - Emails to partner organizations
  - Stakeholder input
  - Redmond 2050 Website
  - Let’s Connect questionnaires
  - Hybrid and remote workshops, focus groups, and interviews
  - Tabling at community events
  - Translation of selected materials
  - Community Advisory Committee input
- **Feedback Summary:**

See Attachment C for a summary of Q2-Q3 2021 community involvement. Summaries of specific engagement activities can be found online at [Redmond.gov/1495/Engagement-Summaries](http://www.redmond.gov/1495/Engagement-Summaries) <<http://www.redmond.gov/1495/Engagement-Summaries>>.

**BUDGET IMPACT:**

**Total Cost:**

\$4,535,222 is the total appropriation to the Community and Economic Development offer and is where most staff expenses related to Redmond 2050 are budgeted. A portion of this budget offer is for consultant contracts that the Council authorized with IBI Group for visioning (\$190,000) and BERK for State Environmental Policy Act analysis (\$290,000).

**Approved in current biennial budget:**       Yes       No       N/A

**Budget Offer Number:**

000250 - Community and Economic Development

**Budget Priority:**

Vibrant and Connected

**Other budget impacts or additional costs:**       Yes       No       N/A

**If yes, explain:**

N/A

**Funding source(s):**

General Fund

**Budget/Funding Constraints:**

N/A

Additional budget details attached

**COUNCIL REVIEW:**

**Previous Contact(s)**

Date	Meeting	Requested Action
10/6/2020	Business Meeting	Approve
11/17/2020	Business Meeting	Receive Information
3/16/2021	Business Meeting	Receive Information
3/23/2021	Study Session	Provide Direction
6/15/2021	Business Meeting	Receive Information
6/22/2021	Study Session	Provide Direction
9/21/2021	Business Meeting	Provide Direction

**Proposed Upcoming Contact(s)**

Date	Meeting	Requested Action
------	---------	------------------

	None proposed at this time	N/A
--	----------------------------	-----

**Time Constraints:**

All Phase I and Phase II updates to the Comprehensive Plan must be completed no later than June 30, 2024.

**ANTICIPATED RESULT IF NOT APPROVED:**

Staff is not requesting action at this time.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

Attachment A: Redmond 2050 Overview

Attachment B: Housing, Economic Vitality, and Transportation Policy Options and Alternatives

Attachment C: Community Involvement Summary - Q2-Q3 2021

Attachment D: Presentation Slides

Attachment E: Council Questions on Policy Options & Alternatives

Attachment F: Study Session Slides