

Issue / Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue status
	<p>proposal in 2007 identified how the maximum density of 215 dwelling units for the Bear Creek Design District was calculated and that the current proposal could exceed that. She reiterated her concern for environmental impacts to the wetland area with increased residential density.</p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> 8/6/14: Commissioner Murray requested that staff address Ms. Wilkins' issues in the Issues Table for further consideration by the Planning Commission.</p> <p>8/20/14: Commissioner Murray was satisfied with the staff response.</p>	
<p>2. Should the Planning Commission confirm that current uses allowing 0.8 FAR are appropriate for the BCDD1? (Sanders)</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> The purpose of this recommended amendment is to remove the age restriction that was placed on this zoning designation when it was created in 2007. The FAR of 0.8 was established in the density/site requirements in 2007. The Planning Commission report of October 3, 2007 identifies the action that was proposed for the creation of the Bear Creek Design District:</p> <p>This proposal would:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Change the land-use designation for a 126-acre site commonly known as the Keller Farm from Semi-Rural, Single-Family Urban, and Business Park to Design District. 2. Change the zone of the site from RA-5, R-6, and BP to Bear Creek Design District (BCDD) 3. Replace zoning regulations for the area. <p>The Planning Commission recommended approval as described in the 10/3/07 report for reasons including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) It permanently protects a highly significant contiguous stream/wetland ecosystem and provides for its enhancement; 2) It provides for public access to natural areas in Redmond, closing gaps in the City's trail system, balanced with the goal of maximizing the ecological value of the Keller Farm; 3) It clusters development on less than nine acres of a 126-acre site, whereas current regulations would permit development of up to 35 acres of the site. 	<p><u>Opened</u> 8/6/14</p>

Issue / Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue status
	<p>The recommended amendment would maintain existing regulations that require easements to allow the City to connect to City trails and requirements for protection of the groundwater, such as “Permanent intrusion of parking garages, basements or similar structures into the groundwater is prohibited.” The opportunity for senior housing was also cited in the 2007 Planning Commission report. The City continues to be challenged with the demand for housing; the proposed amendment would create housing consistent with the community’s vision to increase the supply of housing and to do so in an area that has been identified for several years as appropriate for multifamily residential use. This location is near to the Downtown and other employment, has access to an arterial and is suitable for this density. Having multi-family residential use at this location is consistent with policies in the Land Use Element and with the Bear Creek Neighborhood Plan.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u> 8/20/14: Two persons testified at the public hearing who expressed their concerns about the appropriateness of the BCDD1 area for the existing zoning, as well as potential flooding and other environmental impacts due to a possible increase in residents from allowing a non-age specific multifamily use.</p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> 8/6/14: Commissioner Sanders asked if the Planning Commission should consider the appropriateness of the existing zoning and if the Bear Creek Design District 1 is a good location for retirement residence and/or multifamily land use. She noted other lower density residential uses nearby and asked the Commission to confirm that the existing zoning was the place to begin consideration of the proposed amendments.</p> <p>8/20/14: Commissioner Sanders requested that this issue remain open to obtain more information about potential impacts.</p>	
3. Are there alternatives to using a Development Agreement to	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> Staff has explored a variety of methods to ensure the creation of, and continued viability of publically accessible community meeting space within a future development. The City Attorney has advised that the use of a development agreement between a developer and the City would clearly identify roles, responsibilities and maintenance and liability issues for the duration of such a use in a legally appropriate manner. A development agreement</p>	<p><u>Opened</u> 8/6/14</p>

Issue / Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue status
<p>create publically accessible community meeting space?</p> <p>(Sanders)</p>	<p>requires City Council approval and would be approved at the same time as the proposed Zoning Code amendment. Once approved, the development agreement runs with the land, and is required regardless of subsequent changes in ownership of the property.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u> none.</p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> 8/6/14: Commissioner Sanders requested more information about alternatives for the creation of community meeting space and how it would be managed with a development agreement.</p> <p>8/20/14: Commissioner Sanders was satisfied with the staff response.</p>	<p><u>Closed</u> 8/20/14</p>
<p>4. Have there been changes to the flood storage capacity of the area surrounding the BCDD1 zone since 2007 when the Bear Creek Design District was created?</p> <p>Several</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 8/20/14: The BCDD1 is outside the 100-year floodplain and has been determined to be appropriate for development at the level currently zoned. Jon Spangler, Natural Resources Manager for the City will provide additional information at the 8/27/14 Planning Commission meeting.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u> Ms. Wilkins provided written and oral testimony and provided photos to the Planning Commission showing areas with flooding. She stated her concerns regarding the potential for flooding in the areas surrounding the BCDD1 zone as well the zone itself. She also stated that the potential for flooding is likely to be greater since the Bear Creek Design District was established in 2007, due to additional development in Downtown and nearby.</p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	<p><u>Opened</u> 8/20/14</p>

Issue / Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue status
<p>5. What is the status of the wetland mitigation bank proposed for the Bear Creek Design District – performance area 2?</p> <p>Murray, several</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> The Bear Creek Design District was created in 2007 by Ordinance 2370 which identified Performance Area 2 for the purpose of a wetland mitigation bank. Regulations which were adopted at that time and still in place, state:</p> <p>“The purpose of the Bear Creek Design District is to provide development potential on the upland portion of the Bear Creek Design District in the northwest portion of the site in a comprehensive master plan that would allow for the permanent protection of Bear Creek, its riparian corridor, and associated wetlands and floodplains. The Design District provides for the location of Retirement Residence Facilities, associated limited support services, and affordable employee multi-family housing. The Design District will provide critical links in the Bear Evans Creek Greenway System, an important planned regional trail along Bear and Evans Creeks. The balance of the undevelopable portion of this District shall be established as a wetland mitigation banking site.”</p> <p>The City of Redmond has an agreement to purchase Performance Area 2 (the undevelopable portion) to be effective January 2015 and City staff are now working to develop a plan for establishing the wetland mitigation bank. Background information is provided below about what a wetland mitigation bank is, and how it would operate:</p> <p>Wetlands Mitigation is codified in Chapter 90.84 RCW. It is the preservation, enhancement, restoration or creation of a wetland, stream, or habitat conservation area which offsets, or compensates for, expected adverse impacts to similar nearby ecosystems. The goal is to replace the function and value of wetland habitats that would be adversely affected by other proposed development activities or projects. Once approved by regulatory agencies, a mitigation bank may sell credits to developers whose projects will impact these various ecosystems.</p> <p>Mitigation banks place a perpetual conservation easement on the land, with a trust fund specifically dedicated to long term management of natural resources.</p> <p>The benefits of mitigation banking are: potential consolidation of piecemeal mitigation projects into one contiguous unified system (consolidation encourages greater diversity of habitat and wetland functions and</p>	<p><u>Opened</u> 8/20/14</p>

Issue / Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue status
	<p>creates more sustainable systems); reduces temporal losses since mitigation banking projects must be implemented in advance of impacts; provides a planning tool for meeting wetland needs within a watershed, basin or particular landscape; uses economic incentives to increase compliance because the bank providers shoulder the burden of demonstrating up front that the mitigation effort is successful; increases efficiency in permitting since mitigation is already constructed and functioning; assembles and applies extensive financial resources, planning, and scientific expertise not always available to many permittees' responsible for compensatory mitigation proposals. From an ecological perspective, there isn't a downside to wetland mitigation banking because these banks typically restore or enhance degraded wetland ecosystems. All projects within the City of Redmond would be required to go through city adopted mitigation sequencing of avoidance, minimization, and mitigation.</p> <p>The existing drainage ditches would be eliminated as part of the wetland mitigation design.</p> <p>Control of the mitigation bank lies in the banking instrument, which is a legally binding document between the bank sponsor, Department of Ecology (DOE), and the City of Redmond. The mitigation bank cannot be constructed without the City's consent. The City will have control with respect to Redmond development projects' ability to use the mitigation bank since all projects must go through mitigation sequencing per City requirements and be approved through the entitlement or plat processes.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u> Commissioners requested information about wetland mitigation proposal and status.</p>	
6. What are possible impacts to schools associated with	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> The Lake Washington School District (LWSD) Capital Facilities Plan (CFP) uses a multiplier to plan for the number of students (elementary through high school) from multifamily and single family developments during the upcoming 6 year period. This multiplier is based on data that District staff collect each year regarding developments in the district and the number of students from these developments who attend LWSD schools.</p>	<u>Opened</u> 8/20/14

Issue / Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue status
<p>the proposed change to non-age specific multifamily land use?</p> <p>Murray</p>	<p>The 2014-2019 CFP published in May, 2014 uses a multiplier of 0.083 students per multifamily unit. Assuming 347 dwelling units (possible maximum build out using 0.8 FAR and average dwelling unit sizes of 700 square feet per unit) the estimated number of school aged children is 29 students. The multiplier is for all sizes of multifamily units – studios through 2+ bedrooms. In recent buildings in Downtown Redmond, about 70 to 80% of the units are studio or 1 bedroom units and 20 to 30% of the units are 2 or more bedrooms. Over the past several years, the proportion of 2+ bedroom units in multi-family developments has been decreasing. This pattern is reflected in the data that the District staff have with regard to students; for example, there are many fewer students associated with Downtown multi-family development compared to single-family development.</p> <p>The City of Redmond collects school impact fees from builders on behalf of the Lake Washington School District. The School District’s most recent calculation of how much to charge builders in impact fees takes into account expected increases in school enrollment through 2019. Consistent with state law, this calculation can only include the cost of facilities necessitated by new development. That does not include needs due to aging schools or existing deficiencies.</p> <p>School enrollment fluctuates over time and the Lake Washington School District does not build schools sufficient to accommodate the peak demand. During peak times, the School District has a variety of ways to accommodate the needs, including use of portables and split shifts, as well as building additional schools.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u> Two persons testified at the public hearing of 8/20/14 expressing concern over school crowding in the Lake Washington School District and that non-age specific additional residences would result in more school children in an already crowded district.</p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	
<p>7. What are</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 8/20/14: The SEPA analysis for the proposal to allow non-age</p>	<p><u>Opened</u></p>

Issue / Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue status
<p>anticipated impacts to traffic due to the proposed change to non-age specific multifamily land use?</p> <p>Murray</p>	<p>specific multi-family residences uses Institute of Traffic Engineers (ITE) data. In order to determine maximum potential build out and thus determine possible traffic generation, the FAR of 0.8 for the site was converted to total maximum square feet of buildable area, subtracted a percentage for common area such as hallways and utility areas and then divided by 700 square feet – an average unit size for multifamily development. The number derived is 347 units based on these assumptions – but the build out figure of 0.8 FAR or 303,526 – 20% for common areas = 242,821 square feet is based on current zone and is not proposed to change.</p> <p>However, the ITE rate of traffic generation is higher for non-age specific multifamily than for senior independent multifamily development. Calculating the difference in pm peak trips between the existing land use (senior multifamily) and proposed non-age specific multifamily, the number of additional pm peak trips on Avondale is estimated to be 128 trips. In terms of overall daily trips, the increase would be 2.66%. The number of total daily trips for Avondale in this location is 40,800 trips (2012). According to existing and proposed zoning regulations for BCDD1, any future development would need to provide access by extending the eastern leg of the intersection of Avondale Road and 180th Avenue NE. Currently, there is a traffic signal and crosswalk at this intersection. For pedestrian connectivity, the current/proposed zoning regulations require easements to be provided by any development to connect to City trails, as depicted on the Bear and Evans Creek Confluence-Open Space Plan and Bear Creek Neighborhood Connections Map.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u> Mr. Thompson testified that the traffic volume along Avondale was extremely high and was problematic for nearby residents to cross or get out of their driveways safely. He expressed concern that the City’s efforts to address these issues along Avondale have not solved the problems. He stated that at the neighborhood meeting held on June 12, 2014 the majority of comments and concerns were about additional traffic and difficult access.</p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	8/20/14
8. What trail connections are	<u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 8/20/14: The current/proposed zoning regulations require easements to be provided by any development to connect to City trails, as depicted on the Bear	<u>Opened</u>

Issue / Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue status
<p>proposed for the area?</p> <p>Sanders</p>	<p>and Evans Creek Confluence-Open Space Plan and Bear Creek Neighborhood Connections Map. Ultimately, pedestrian access across the Sammamish Valley/Keller Farm area to Perrigo Park and connection with the Bear Evans Creek trail is the goal.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	<p>8/20/14</p>
<p>9. Is the proposal consistent with Bear Creek Neighborhood Plan policies?</p> <p>Several</p>	<p><u>Staff Comment/Recommendation:</u> 8/20/14: Bear Creek Neighborhood Plan policies N-BC-21 and N-BC-22 anticipates future uses for the BCDD1 zone. Policy N-BC-22 states:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider approving rezones from Single-Family Urban or Bear Creek Design District Performance Area 1 to Multifamily Urban on the east side of Avondale Road between NE 88th Place and the entrance to Avondale Green development when the following conditions are met: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ At least 2.5 acres of land outside the 100-year floodplain are owned or controlled by one entity and are part of a single development proposal; ➤ The applicant submits a conceptual site plan for approval concurrently with the rezoning application; ➤ The site plan shows a single vehicular access point to Avondale Road or to another single ingress/egress; ➤ The development provides a way for future adjacent redevelopment to use the same single vehicular access point to Avondale Road or another single ingress/egress; ➤ The rezone proposal includes a provision for an indoor gathering place for the general public, whether publically or privately owned; and, ➤ The rezone application meets all other criteria for Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code Amendments. <p>This policy indicates intent for possible future uses of the BCDD1 and indicates the conditions that</p>	<p><u>Opened</u></p> <p>8/20/14</p>

Issue / Commissioner	Discussion Notes	Issue status
	<p>must be complied with for any proposed changes. The staff recommended amendment is consistent with this policy.</p> <p>Staff recommends the proposal because it facilitates implementation of Comprehensive Plan policies and goals, and also because it is consistent with plans dealing with salmon run and watershed restoration. Staff also recommends the proposal because it continues to ensure that the vast majority of the Keller farm would be permanently protected from urban development, and enhanced through wetland mitigation banking.</p> <p><u>Public Comment:</u></p> <p><u>PC Comments:</u></p>	