



CITY OF KIRKLAND
Planning and Community Development Department
123 Fifth Avenue, Kirkland, WA 98033 425.587.3225
www.ci.kirkland.wa.us

MEMORANDUM

Date: January 21, 2010

To: David Ramsay, City Manager

From: Paul Stewart, Deputy Planning Director
Eric Shields, Planning Director

Subject: City Council/Planning Commission Joint Meeting and 2010 –
2012 Planning Work Program (File MIS09-00010)

RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends the following:

- Conduct the annual joint meeting with the Planning Commission
- Review the proposed 2010 - 2012 Planning Work Program and direct staff to bring back a final work program for adoption
- Discuss other items as appropriate

BACKGROUND

Each year the City Council and Planning Commission conduct a joint meeting. The primary purpose of this meeting is to review the proposed Planning Work Program. It is also an opportunity to review the progress on major long range planning projects and to discuss other topics as appropriate. Following the joint meeting with direction from the Council, staff will bring back for Council's consideration at a regular meeting a resolution adopting the work program.

The Planning Commission held their annual retreat on December 10th. 2009. At the retreat the Planning Commission reviewed the Draft 2010-2012 Planning Work Program. At the January 14th Planning Commission meeting the Commission reviewed a revised work program and recommended it to the City Council. The Commission also discussed other items of interest which is noted in the Planning Commission's transmittal memo.

Attachment 1 is the transmittal memo from the Planning Commission to the City Council. Attachment 2 is the *Draft 2010 - 2012 Planning Work Program* as reviewed and recommended by the Planning Commission. Attachment 3 is a summary of the tasks noted in the work program. (Note: For background purposes, Attachment 4 is the previous 2009-2011 work program adopted by the City Council in May 2009).

In 2009, the Commission addressed several major issues. Attachment 5 is the list of the meeting topics that were on the Planning Commission's agenda for 2009. The major

projects the Commission worked on in 2009 included updates to the City's Shoreline Master Program, Tree Regulations and Affordable Housing Regulations – all which were reviewed and adopted by the City Council.

Proposed 2010 – 2012 Planning Work Program

Introduction

The draft Planning Work Program as recommended by the Planning Commission is shown in Attachment 2. The work program outlines the major long range tasks for the next three years with the focus on 2010. It shows a general schedule for each task along with a project manager and the staffing levels (noted as FTE – full time equivalent staff).

The major projects to be addressed in 2010 include:

- Updating the Comprehensive Plan including the capital facilities element and, where appropriate, general amendments as a result of annexation.
- Preparing a Supplemental EIS and revising the Planned Action Ordinance for the Touchstone (Park Place) project to comply with the decision from the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board.
- Completing work on the Lakeview and Central Houghton Neighborhood Plans.
- Consolidating the City's code enforcement provisions and undertaking another bundle of miscellaneous Zoning Code amendments.
- Completing work on the Shoreline Master Program (currently being reviewed by DOE) and incorporating the annexation area SMP into the City's program.
- Conducting the tree canopy analysis and initiating work on the urban forestry management plan.
- Incorporating new standards to promote low impact development and green codes.
- Annexation related projects and tasks.

For a more detailed description of these tasks and the other projects noted in the work program, please see Attachment 3: *Summary of Tasks*. Some of the key projects and policy issues are highlighted below.

Comprehensive Plan (Task 1)

Under the current state schedule per the GMA, the City is required to update its Comprehensive Plan and Critical Area Regulations (Task 6) by December 1, 2011. Due to state budget shortfalls, the WA Department of Commerce has withdrawn all GMA grant funding to update comprehensive plans and development regulations. With the legislature in session there is already a draft bill to extend the deadline for these updates to 2014.

Staff believes there is support for this bill and there will likely be an extension (although never guaranteed). In addition, the City has experienced significant budget reductions. Annexation will also require staff resources and attention over the next couple years and beyond. Staff is suggesting that work on the GMA Comprehensive Plan update be

scheduled beginning in 2013 which then would also include the annexation area. This would be a major effort addressing a new planning horizon year (2031), new growth targets for housing and employment, a revised Transportation Plan, new level of service standards and an updated Capital Facilities Element. We would also want to prepare a new Environmental Impact Statement since the last EIS was prepared in 2004.

In 2010, however, we would still need to update the Comprehensive Plan to incorporate the next capital improvement program into the Capital Facilities Element. Staff is also looking at general elements to determine if there are some needed amendments to be in place with annexation.

Neighborhood Plans (Task 2)

In late 2009, staff initiated work on the Lakeview and Central Houghton Neighborhood Plans. An open house was held on October 29, 2009 and citizen advisory groups have been appointed and will have met for the first time on January 26th. Since both neighborhoods are within the jurisdiction of the Houghton Community Council (HCC), the HCC is taking the lead and guiding the preparation of the neighborhood plans. Expected completion date is by the end of 2010. Attachment 7 is a memo providing a status update on the neighborhood plan process.

With the major update to the Comprehensive Plan deferred, this opens up the availability of staff to undertake the next round of neighborhood plans beginning in late 2010 with completion by 2011. The current schedule has Bridle Trails and South Rose Hill in the queue. Attachment 6 shows the schedule of neighborhood plans and the most recent completion dates of previous neighborhood plans.

Another consideration is the timing of preparing the neighborhood plans for the annexation area. An initial step would be to confirm or redefine the neighborhood boundaries. This process will occur in 2010 for inclusion in the Comprehensive Plan and is part of the annexation work program. Staff is recommending that the neighborhood plans for the newly annexed neighborhoods occur sometime following the effective date of annexation due to budget and staffing considerations. This would also enable those neighborhoods to be more fully engaged as part of the City. This could occur prior to either the Everest/Moss Bay or North Juanita/South Juanita plans or afterwards. The Council should discuss their preferences regarding the neighborhood plan schedule.

Staff would also suggest that since the GMA Comprehensive Plan update (which is scheduled to occur in 2013/2014 pending legislative action) is such a major citywide planning effort, that it take precedence over other long range tasks (including neighborhood plans) for that two-year period.

Code Amendments (Task 3)

Task 3 consists of two subtasks. The first one is underway and would consist of consolidating our code enforcement regulations and processes. Part of this is a follow-up to the tree regulations. The second task is our annual miscellaneous code amendment project. Attachment 8 is the list of potential Zoning Code amendments that

would occur in 2010. At a future meeting, staff will be discussing with the Commission those priority amendments to consider this year.

Housing (Task 4)

The City Council adopted affordable housing requirements at their December 15th meeting. As part of the ordinance, the City Council exempted the area within the jurisdiction of the HCC from the mandatory provisions. The HCC will review the City Council's ordinance and will have taken action on January 26th (staff will report on this at the joint meeting). The City Council expressed a strong interest in the HCC revisiting this issue possibly as part of the Lakeview and Central Houghton neighborhood plan updates which are underway. (Note: the City Council and Houghton Community Council will hold a joint meeting on February 16th).

While there is still interest from King County in looking at the South Kirkland Park & Ride as a transit oriented development, the economic downturn and lack of interest from Bellevue has resulted in a slowdown on this effort. The County is exploring the potential for a "Kirkland-only" project. At the appropriate time, staff will continue the discussions with King County and the City Council Housing Committee.

With work on the affordable housing regulations completed, staff would like to focus on two items in 2010. One item is preservation housing which staff will be discussing with the Housing Committee. Secondly, staff is preparing handouts and guidelines on the City's housing regulations (e.g. cottage housing, affordable housing, etc.). Staff will also continue to work with ARCH on its overall housing strategies.

Natural Environment/Environmental Stewardship (Task 5)

There are a variety of sub-tasks here that reflect the City's commitment to sustainability and environmental stewardship.

Work on the Shoreline Master Program (SMP) continues. The Council approved the SMP on December 1st and it has been transmitted to the State Department of Ecology (DOE). They will hold a public hearing on February 9th at City Hall and will have a public comment period open from February 1 through March 5, 2010. Following this comment period, DOE will request responses from city staff. DOE will then either approve the SMP (which then becomes effective) or request changes. Depending on DOE's action this could come back to the City in late spring of 2010.

As a result of annexation, the City will need to incorporate the annexed area into the City's SMP. Staff is recommending this occur following final approval of the City's SMP by DOE. The County is currently in the process of updating their SMP for its entire jurisdiction (including Finn Hill). Staff will need to meet with the County to determine the level of effort the City needs to undertake to integrate the area into the City's SMP. While this will take some work, it will not need the same level of effort that was required for the recent City update process.

Under the current deadline, revisions to the City's Critical Area Regulations (wetland, streams, etc.) would need to be completed by December, 2011. However, this would fall under the same standard as the GMA Comprehensive Plan update. As noted, this schedule will likely be extended to 2014.

On December 15th, 2009 the City Council adopted revised tree regulations. By the time the February 2 joint meeting occurs, the Houghton Community Council will have taken action on this ordinance. Staff will report on this at the joint meeting. The regulations will go into effect on April 1, 2010. Over the next couple of months the Urban Forester will be updating forms, preparing educational brochures and meeting with staff and interested parties to ensure a smooth transition.

With the adoption of the updated regulations, staff will turn its attention to conducting the canopy analysis that was discussed by the City Council. This will be a several month process and will take close coordination with the City's GIS staff and require consulting services. Staff is suggesting the City's forestry account be the funding source for this project. Staff will also be exploring the potential for grants, cost sharing or other sources.

In 2010, the City's Urban Forester will also initiate work on a voluntary "landmark" or "heritage" tree recognition program. At the appropriate time, staff will provide the Council with options and request direction of the approach to this program.

Efforts to adopt new standards to promote low impact development techniques and green codes have been deferred in the past due to staffing resources. It has been Kirkland's intent to move forward when feasible. Staff is available in 2010 to undertake this task in conjunction with the Public Works Department.

Annexation (Task 8)

Annexation will result in a fundamental shift in resources and effort over the next several years. With approval of annexation, there are a number of long range tasks that will need to be undertaken prior and subsequent to the effective date (June 1, 2011).

Planning staff is still determining the tasks, schedule and resources. We are working with an interdepartmental team to strategize on the approach and overall effort. Some tasks involve the Planning Commission while others are administrative. Task 8 shows a general list of the major tasks: updating base maps, amending some of the general elements of the Comprehensive Plan, looking at neighborhood boundaries, conducting a census, and updating our regulations as appropriate.

Conclusion and Policy Questions

Staff resources are available in 2010 to accomplish the planning work program as proposed. However, the annexation related work program tasks is still being determined which could affect the timing and staffing levels for other projects. Due to budget considerations the work program as drafted will not have funding for special studies, public outreach or professional analysis with three exceptions:

- The Shoreline Master Program: Additional costs for environmental analysis depend on the response from DOE to the City's submittal and on the level of effort needed to incorporate the annexed area into the City's master program. While we have some limited available funds, we may need to discuss additional funding with the Council once we have a response from DOE and when we have more information on the County's SMP.
- Tree canopy analysis: Cost estimates need to be developed. Funding could come from the City's forestry account, grants, cost sharing with other jurisdictions or other sources.
- Annexation: Work program tasks and costs related to annexation are in the process of being determined. The annexation service packages are currently being prepared.

Policy questions on the proposed Planning Work Program for the City Council are:

- Do these projects reflect the priority for the City Council?
- Is the timing and sequence of neighborhood plans appropriate?
- Are there other work program tasks or projects that should be considered?

Attachments

1. Planning Commission Transmittal Memo
2. Draft 2010 – 2012 Planning Work Program
3. Summary of Work Program Tasks
4. Adopted 2009-2011 Planning Work Program
5. Planning Commission Agenda Topics
6. Neighborhood Plan Schedule
7. Memo On Lakeview and Central Houghton Neighborhood Plans
8. Potential Zoning Code Amendment List



CITY OF KIRKLAND
Planning and Community Development Department
123 Fifth Avenue, Kirkland, WA 98033 425.587.3225
www.ci.kirkland.wa.us

MEMORANDUM

Date: January 21, 2010

To: Kirkland City Council

From: Andy Held, Chair
Kirkland Planning Commission

Subject: Joint Meeting with the City Council and Planning Work Program

Introduction

On behalf of the Planning Commission we look forward to our annual joint meeting with the City Council on February 2, 2010. The joint meeting is an opportunity for the Commission to check in with the Council, review the proposed 2010 – 2012 Planning Work Program and to discuss other topics of interest.

On December 10th, 2009 we held our annual retreat to reflect on our work over the past year as well as to review the draft planning work program as proposed by staff. The Commission met again on January 14th to review a revised work program. The revisions were a result of two changes in the planning landscape – annexation and the increasing likelihood of the legislature extending the deadline for the City to update its Comprehensive Plan to 2014 (instead of 2011 as it currently stands). Staff and the Commission agreed on the revisions to the work program and we are recommending the City Council adopt the Planning Work Program as proposed.

Of special note is recognition for outgoing Commission Member Carolyn Hayek. Her term will expire in March. Carolyn has been a member of the Commission since January 2002. She has been an exemplary member of the Commission and has been involved in many of the major planning efforts affecting the City. Not only has Carolyn been on the Planning Commission, but she has contributed her personal time to numerous other city activities (e.g. the Downtown Advisory Committee) and events. She will be missed and the Commission would like to extend our sincere appreciation to her for her time and commitment to the city.

At the joint meeting we would propose the following agenda format:

- Staff Overview
- Introductory Comments (Andy Held)
- Planning Work Program Comments (C. Ray Allshouse)
- Neighborhood Plans (Byron Katsuyama and Jay Arnold)
- Other Discussion Topics

2009 Projects

The Council may recall that in 2008, the Commission had a demanding workload schedule with the Touchstone private amendment request dominating our Commission agendas. In 2009, the meeting schedule was more reasonable. As noted in Attachment 5 we met twenty times in 2009 (compared to twenty-eight in 2008). The majority of these meetings in 2009 were devoted to three main topics: the Shoreline Master Program, an update to the Tree Regulations and revisions to the City's affordable housing regulations.

The City Council reviewed all of these in October, November, and December, and on December 1st, the Council approved the Shoreline Master Program and on December 15th adopted ordinances on trees and housing. With the exception of a couple of issues (primarily in response to the Houghton Community Council), the City Council approved these projects consistent with the Planning Commission's recommendations.

In 2009, we also completed work on minor amendments to the Comprehensive Plan, conducted a threshold review of a couple of private amendment requests and initiated work on two neighborhood plans – Lakeview and Central Houghton.

Proposed 2010 – 2012 Planning Work Program

The Commission reviewed the work program at our retreat and again on January 14th. We concurred with the list of projects and general schedule. For 2010, the Planning Commission will be focusing on the following projects:

- Updates to the Comprehensive Plan (including the Capital Facilities Element and initial changes as a result of annexation).
- Supplemental EIS and revisions to the Touchstone Planned Action Ordinance.
- The Lakeview and Central Houghton Neighborhood Plans.
- Zoning Code amendments.
- Incorporating the annexed area into our shoreline master program.
- Low Impact Development and Green Codes
- Annexation related tasks as appropriate

As staff noted in their cover memo, it is likely that the deadline for the GMA required update to the City's Comprehensive Plan will be extended by the legislature from December 2011 to 2014. This will work nicely with the City's schedule; it will enable the City to include the annexation area into that major update.

In addition, the postponement of the GMA mandated updates presents the opportunity to take on the next round of neighborhood plans which, under the current schedule, would be Bridle Trails/South Rose Hill (see Attachment 6).

Annexation raises the question of when to undertake the neighborhood plans for the annexation area. There are two significant items here: designating neighborhood boundaries and inserting the new neighborhoods in the neighborhood plan update schedule. Neighborhood boundaries are established in the Comprehensive Plan. Our

recommendation is for the Planning Commission to consider and review these in 2010 through a public process that has yet to be designed. The results will come to you in a recommendation along with other Comprehensive Plan updates.

Following the designation of the neighborhood boundaries, we will recommend a schedule for the development of the neighborhood plans. We recognize the timing as a significant policy issue. Our current thoughts are indicated in the attached schedule; this schedule reflects our recommendation that we update the very out-of-date existing neighborhood plans if they can be underway before annexation, and then move to the annexation area neighborhoods as soon as they are in the City. We would appreciate any guidance you may have at this time.

A final item on neighborhood plans: as the City grows, it may be appropriate to more broadly revisit neighborhood boundaries. Fewer, larger neighborhoods, may lead to more frequent updates. Here, too, we would appreciate any direction you may choose to give at this time. We can discuss the possibility of reviewing all the neighborhood boundaries as one of our tasks in preparation for annexation.

We also want to let you know about our enthusiasm for the Transportation Commission's effort to engage the community in the "transportation conversations". A representative from the Transportation Commission was at the January 14th Planning Commission meeting to provide an overview on this approach. We had a highly interactive discussion with Public Works staff and the Transportation Commission representative.

The Planning Commission is supportive of this approach and is interested in this process. We would like to work closely with the Transportation Commission since the link between transportation and land use is fundamental to good planning. Joint work on transportation and land use will lead to improvements in our Comprehensive Plan and development regulations.

Other Topics

Planning Commission/City Council Interaction

The Commission wanted to check in with the Council to see if the Commission is meeting the expectations of the Council. The Commission spends a considerable amount of time on planning projects that often involve complex or controversial issues prior to making our recommendations to you. We appreciate the opportunity to transmit our recommendations and rationale to the Council either at regular meetings or at study sessions.

The Shoreline Master Program is a good example. We think it was very helpful for the Planning Commission to meet with the Council during your study sessions on this topic in order to provide you with background and the Commission's discussion for your consideration when it comes to adoption. We would encourage this process to continue on future projects and would request any feedback or comments on our process or on how we transmit our recommendations to you.

The SMP also allowed us to try some innovative approaches to public involvement. We hope to continue exploring more opportunities for the public to be involved in our processes and to provide input and comment. We will continue to use different techniques and strategies including electronic methods (e.g. on-line surveys, etc.) and we will update you on their effectiveness.

Houghton Community Council

An area of concern for the Commission is the potential for conflicting or separate standards within Houghton's jurisdiction. This became an issue with the tree regulations, affordable housing regulations and to some extent the shoreline master program. The City Council was faced with significant differing recommendations from the Planning Commission and the HCC. While we recognize the current statutory authority, we would hope that the City would strive to have consistent standards on some of the major issues that have citywide applicability – particularly with annexation on the horizon.

Board and Commission Training

The Planning Commission would suggest the Council again consider providing training opportunities for board and commission members - perhaps annually. As new members come on and with the city facing annexation, it is important for board and commission members to have a good understanding of their roles and responsibilities, participating in and running meetings, rules of conduct, and appearance of fairness/ethic issues.



2010-2012 PLANNING WORK PROGRAM

Summary of Tasks

Planning & Community Development

January, 2010

POLICIES, PLANS & REGULATIONS

Task 1: Comprehensive Plan Update (1.8 FTE)

Comprehensive Plan

In 2009 we initiated a number of amendments to the Comprehensive Plan including minor housekeeping amendments, an updated Capital Facilities Plan and policies regarding the Totem Lake Urban Center. The amendments were adopted in October 2009.

The Growth Management Act (RCW 36.70A.130) (GMA) requires cities and counties to review and if needed, revise their comprehensive plans and development regulations every seven years. Under the existing GMA the schedule for King County and all cities in the County (including Kirkland) is December 1, 2011. In order to meet this time frame, this task would need to begin in mid 2010. However, due to the state's budget shortfall, GMA grants to update Comprehensive Plans have been cancelled. There is a draft bill that will likely be considered by the 2010 legislature to extend the time frame to Dec. 1, 2014. Staff is supporting a time extension. This will also give us a chance to better incorporate the annexation area into the Comprehensive Plan.

The City is currently engaged in a process to allocate new housing and employment targets for 2031 to all the cities and King County through the countywide planning process. As part of the plan update, Kirkland will need to determine how and where to accommodate the targets in the land use plan. As a result we would also be considering a revised transportation plan based on the new horizon year of 2031 along with possible amendments to our level of service standards for capital facilities. Depending on the scope of the update, this could include a revised vision statement, a new Environmental Impact Statement and updated land use, transportation and capital facilities plans.

With the major update to the Comprehensive Plan potentially deferred to 2014, we would still need to undertake an annual Comprehensive Plan process in 2010 to incorporate the revised capital improvement program into the Capital Facilities Element.

Transportation Principles and Policies

Public Works has indicated an interest on the part of the Transportation Commission to explore a new direction on transportation that does not focus on the automobile. The initial effort would be to establish principles to form the basis decision-making and recommended policy changes. These principles are:

- Move people
- Be sustainable
- Create partnerships
- Link to land use

Once these principles are agreed upon, amendments to the City's Comprehensive Plan and concurrency system would occur. This would also guide CIP projects and

transportation funding. The Transportation Commission met with the Planning Commission on January 14th to discuss this approach in more detail.

Private Amendment Requests

December 1, 2010 is the deadline for private amendment requests applications to be submitted (every two years).

Touchstone SEIS and Planned Action Ordinance

Davidson Serles & Associates filed two appeals and challenges on the Park Place project – one to King County Superior Court and the other to the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board (the Board). Both matters are described below.

1. Davidson Serles & Assoc. v. City of Kirkland, et al., King County Superior Court No. 09-2-02204-6:

This was an action for declaratory and injunctive relief. The action challenged the adequacy of the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) prepared for the Planned Action Ordinance, Master Plan, Comprehensive Plan amendments, and Zoning Code related to the Touchstone and Altom private amendment requests. The action alleged that the EIS failed to identify, consider, and evaluate a full range of alternatives for the proposed action.

The plaintiff sought to have the Court declare that the EIS was inadequate and to have the City enjoined from taking action to implement the ordinances referenced above. Touchstone filed a motion seeking the dismissal of the Superior Court action in which the City joined. A hearing on the motion was held May 1, 2009. On June 4, 2009, the Judge issued her decision granting summary judgment and dismissing the case. The plaintiff filed a motion to ask the Judge to reconsider her decision which was denied. The plaintiff has filed an appeal with the Court of Appeals.

2. Davidson Serles & Assoc. v. City of Kirkland, et al., Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board No. 09-3-0007c:

This is the petition before the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board (Board). The petitioners, Davidson Serles and Continental Plaza, sought review of Ordinance Nos. 4170 and 4171 which amended the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code, respectively, in association with the private amendment request for the Parkplace project. Among other grounds, the petitioners challenged the ordinances for: lack of compliance with the State Environmental Policy Act; inadequate service by transportation and other public facilities; lack of financing plans for capital improvements; intensity of development inconsistent with the County-wide Planning Policies for King County; and inadequate public facilities. A hearing was held before the Board on August 10, 2009.

The Board issued its Final Decision and Order (Order) on October 5, 2009. While it upheld the ordinances with respect to a number of the petitioners' objections, the Board found that the City should have considered additional alternatives to

the Parkplace project and that it needed to more specifically address how necessary traffic improvements would be financed. The Board did not invalidate the ordinances; rather, it remanded them to the City for the purpose of correcting the issues identified by the Board. The Board established April 5, 2010, as the deadline for the City to take appropriate legislative action to comply with the Board's Order. [Need to describe here.]

Ordinances No. 4170 and 4171 remain valid during the remand period. RCW 36.70A.300(4) provides:

Unless the board makes a determination of invalidity as provided in RCW 36.70A.302, a finding of noncompliance and an order of remand shall not affect the validity of comprehensive plans and development regulations during the period of remand.

The City requested that the Board reconsider the portion of its decision finding the City's environmental review for Ordinance Nos. 4170 and 4171 was insufficient for failure to assess reasonable alternatives to the Touchstone Parkplace proposal, including additional alternatives. The Board denied the reconsideration. Both the City and Davidson Serles have also filed an appeal to some parts of the Board's decision to Superior Court.

Staff is currently developing a scope of work and schedule to prepare a Supplemental EIS and revise the Planned Action Ordinance to comply with the Board's decision. This will likely take several months with the Planning Commission reviewing the proposed SEIS and making a recommendation to the City Council following a public hearing.

Task 2: Neighborhood Plans (2.0 FTE)

The City initiated work on the Lakeview and Central Houghton Neighborhood Plans in late 2009. The Planning Work Program calls for completing those plans by the end of 2010. The work program anticipates that the GMA deadline will be extended beyond 2011 to 2014. If that is the case, the City could undertake two additional neighborhood plans. Next in line under the current schedule are Bridle Trails and South Rose Hill. The timing and priority for the annexed neighborhoods should also be considered. Even though the Potential Annexation Area identified three neighborhoods (Kingsgate, North Juanita and Finn Hill) there is interest in looking at the neighborhood boundaries more closely and perhaps revising them. The work program calls for establishing neighborhood boundaries as part of the 2010 Comprehensive Plan update.

Task 3: Code Amendments (.4 FTE)

Code Enforcement Consolidation

The City is currently working to consolidate all of the City's code enforcement regulations, including tree code enforcement, into the Kirkland Municipal Code. Background information is being gathered by staff on how other jurisdictions regulate and process code enforcement actions. This project is currently underway with

proposed changes coming before the Planning Commission and City Council in early 2010.

Miscellaneous Code Amendments

We continue to maintain an extensive list of potential amendments and, as new issues arise, we are constantly adding to and updating the list. We strive to have an on-going code update task each year. The work program shows this beginning in February.

Task 4: Housing (.6 FTE)

Affordable Housing Regulations

Affordable housing is a priority for the City. The City Council created a Council Committee on housing which continues to meet. In 2004, the City adopted a package of incentives including density bonuses, tax exemptions and fee waivers, however to date the voluntary incentives have not been used. In 2009 the Planning Commission recommended ordinances establishing mandatory affordable housing requirements. The City Council reviewed these on December 1 and took action to adopt on December 15th.

Transit Oriented Development (TOD) at Park and Ride Facilities

In December 2008, the City Council adopted amendments to the Comprehensive Plan that support "transit oriented development" including affordable housing at the South Kirkland Park and Ride facility. On January 26th, 2009 the Houghton Community Council approved the amendments but expressed strong interest in ensuring that their concerns and issues are addressed to their satisfaction with the zoning and design regulations. Part of the park and ride lot is located in Bellevue. Bellevue has indicated they are not interested in pursuing this issue; however staff is continuing to explore the potential for a Kirkland-only project.

Housing Preservation

For 2010 staff would like to focus specifically on preservation housing. This would entail an inventory of potential properties, contacting property owners to gauge interest and exploring options for preservation of existing housing.

Affordable Housing Strategies

There are a number of other on-going staff efforts on housing including working with ARCH (A Regional Coalition for Housing) on the Housing Trust Fund, preservation of affordable housing, funding programs, and education.

Task 5: Natural Resources/Environmental Stewardship (2.7 FTE)

Shoreline Master Program (SMP)

On December 1, the City Council approved the Shoreline Master Program generally in accordance with the Planning Commission's recommendation. The City will be transmitting the SMP to the Department of Ecology along with a required checklist that shows how the SMP meets the adopted State guidelines. DOE will then have a public comment period and will hold a public hearing. Following the hearing, DOE will review the SMP and prepare a decision letter with their findings along with any recommended or required changes. These are transmitted to the City for consideration. If changes

are necessary, the City Council could take action in response to DOE and either agree to the proposed changes or submit an alternative proposal for DOE's approval. This will likely take several months.

In addition, with annexation, Kirkland will need to incorporate the annexed area into the SMP. We anticipate that this will take some work but will not be nearly as extensive as the current effort. The work program anticipates undertaking this task once we have completed the current SMP process with the Department of Ecology.

Critical Area Regulations

In accordance with state law, the City will need to amend its Critical Area Regulations by 2011. However, similar to the deadline for the Comprehensive Plan update, this timeline will likely be extended in the next legislative session. As a result this effort would occur in 2013-2014. Based on experiences in other jurisdictions and comments from the Department of Ecology, our regulations will need to be revised particularly to address buffer widths and our wetland classification system. This may require funding resources to assist in this update due to the technical, scientific and environmental issues that need to be addressed. This project may also be the appropriate time to review our slope regulations.

Urban Forestry Program

The Planning Commission completed work on the tree regulations in November and transmitted a recommendation of approval to the City Council. The City Council reviewed the proposed regulations at their meeting of December 1 and took action to adopt on December 15th.

In 2010, the focus will shift away from regulations to urban forestry management and education. With City Council's approval staff will undertake a canopy analysis as well as exploring a landmark tree program. The Urban Forester will also begin work on a citywide urban forestry management plan.

Low Impact Development (LID) and Green Codes

Efforts to adopt new standards to promote low impact development techniques and green codes have been deferred in the past due to staffing resources. It has been Kirkland's intent to move forward when feasible. Staff is available in 2010 to undertake this task in conjunction with the Public Works Department.

Green Building Program

In late 2007 the Council approved a green building program. The first phase entailed providing priority processing for certified "green" single family homes that have to meet either a Built Green or LEED standard (Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design). To date, six homes have been reviewed through this process and the City has 5 staff trained and accredited as LEED AP. Staff would like to continue this program. In the fall of 2008, staff provided a report to the Council and received direction to continue the program and to expand it to include multi-family and commercial buildings.

Natural Resource Management Plan and Environmental Stewardship

In 2003 the City adopted a Natural Resources Management Plan. The City has in place a "Green Team" consisting of representatives from several City departments that meet on a regular basis. Over the past year, the team has been coordinating its efforts on implementation actions (education, funding, and programs). We have also broadened our role to address greenhouse emissions in response to the US Mayors Climate Protection Agreement, of which the City is participating. The City Council adopted a climate action plan in April 2009.

<http://www.ci.kirkland.wa.us/Assets/Kirkland+Green/Kirkland+Green+PDFs/Climate+Protection+Action+Plan.pdf>

In 2009, our staff team focused on a variety of environmental stewardship efforts including sustainable communities, green buildings, green businesses and community outreach. In January, we held a "community conversation" on environmental stewardship and sustainability. A second "conversation" on the climate action plan was held on February 24, 2009. The Green Team is currently working on its priorities for 2010.

Task 6: Database Management (.2 FTE)

Database management consists of a number of sub-tasks such as our Community Profile, land use inventory, capacity analysis, housing data, etc. that are used for a variety of purposes including neighborhood plans and the Comprehensive Plan. In addition we are required to provide data on buildable lands and benchmarks to King County. The upcoming 2010 decennial census will require additional staff work over the next couple of years.

Task 7: Regional Coordination (.1 FTE)

This task involves participating on a variety of countywide and regional forums including the Puget Sound Regional Council, the King County Growth Management Planning Council, the Suburban Cities Association and Sound Transit.

Task 8: Annexation (1.5 FTE)

With approval of annexation, there are a number of long range tasks that will need to be undertaken prior and subsequent to the effective date (June 1, 2011). Staff is still determining the tasks, schedule and resources. Some tasks involve the Planning Commission while others are administrative. Task 8 shows a general list of the major tasks such as updating base maps, amending some of the general elements of the Comprehensive Plan, looking at neighborhood boundaries, conducting a census, and updating our regulations as appropriate. Of issue (as noted previously) is when to do the neighborhood plans. Staff would suggest these neighborhood plan updates be undertaken following annexation.

Attachment 5
Planning Commission Agenda Topics for 2009

Meeting Date	Topic	Meeting Type
January 8	Kirkland's Shoreline Master Program Update Non-Motorized Active Transportation Plan Discussion Topics – February 12, 2009 Retreat	Study Session Study Session Study Session
January 22	Kirkland's Shoreline Master Program Update	Study Session
February 12	Planning Commission Retreat and Planning Work Program	
March 12	Kirkland's Shoreline Master Program Update	Study Session
March 26	Bridle Trails Shopping Center PAR Plaza at Yarrow Bay PAR Affordable Housing Regulations TL6 Zone	Study Session Study Session Study Session Study Session
April 9	Kirkland's Shoreline Master Program Update – Focus Group Topics	Study Session
April 23	Kirkland's Shoreline Master Program Update	Study Session
May 14	Draft Amendments to Zoning Code for Affordable Housing – TL6A Affordable Housing Regulations Tree Regulation Amendments	Hearing Study Session Study Session
May 28	Kirkland's Shoreline Master Program Update	Study Session
June 11	Tree Regulation Amendments 2009 CPA Projects	Study Session Study Session
June 25	Kirkland's Shoreline Master Program Update	Study Session
July 9	Kirkland's Shoreline Master Program Update	Study Session
July 23	Kirkland's Shoreline Master Program Update	Hearing
August 13	Kirkland's Shoreline Master Program Update Tree Regulations Affordable Housing Regulations	Hearing Study Session Study Session
August 27	Kirkland's Shoreline Master Program Update	Hearing
September 10	Kirkland's Shoreline Master Program Update Comprehensive Plan Amendments (CPA's) 2009 Central Houghton and Lakeview Neighborhood Plans	Hearing Hearing Study Session
September 24	Tree Regulation Update Affordable Housing Regulations	Study Session Study Session
October 8	Lakeview and Central Houghton Neighborhood Plans	Study Session
November 5	Tree Regulation Update Affordable Housing Regulations	Hearing Hearing
November 16	Affordable Housing Regulations	Hearing
December 10	Planning Commission Retreat	

COMPREHENSIVE PLAN & NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN UPDATE SCHEDULE

January, 2010

Note: Schedule Subject to Change

NEIGHBORHOOD	STATUS	WORK PROGRAM SCHEDULE	NOTES
Lakeview	Completed –1985	2009 – 2010	Plan process underway
Central Houghton	Completed –1985	2009 – 2010	Plan process underway
Bridle Trails	Completed –1986	2010 - 2011	Could combine as one plan with South Rose Hill
South Rose Hill	Completed – 1991 Partial update in 2002	2010 - 2011	
Everest	Completed –1988	2011 - 2012	
Moss Bay	Completed –1989	2011 - 2012	
Annexation Neighborhoods	Boundaries to be determined in 2010.	Could occur prior to Everest/Moss Bay or after North/South Juanita	.
North & South Juanita	Partial Updated Completed –1990	2012 - 2013	Boundaries may be adjusted due to annexation
GMA Comp Plan Update	Major update completed - 2005	2013 - 2014	Time line depends on legislative action
Totem Lake	Completed – 2002	2015	Some Amendments occurred in 2008 & 2009
NE 85 th Street Corridor Plan	Completed - 2001	2016	
North Rose Hill	Completed - 2003	2017	
Highlands	Completed - 2005	2018	Could combine with Market & Norkirk schedule
Market & Norkirk	Completed - 2007	2019	



CITY OF KIRKLAND
Planning and Community Development Department
 123 Fifth Avenue, Kirkland, WA 98033 425.587.3225
www.ci.kirkland.wa.us

MEMORANDUM

Date: January 20, 2010

To: David Ramsay, City Manager

From: Janice Soloff, AICP, Senior Planner
 Angela Ruggeri, AICP, Senior Planner

Subject: **STATUS REPORT ON LAKEVIEW AND HOUGHTON NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN
 UPDATES FILES ZON07-00032 and ZON09-00016**

BACKGROUND

The Planning Commission (PC) takes the lead in the neighborhood plan update process in most cases. They usually appoint an advisory group and after receiving that group's recommendation, the PC holds study sessions, takes public comment, and ultimately makes a recommendation to the City Council. A unique planning process has been developed for the Lakeview and Central Houghton neighborhoods however, because they are both under the jurisdiction of the Houghton Community Council (HCC).

The following approach has been developed after discussions between staff and both the PC and HCC.

- There will be a separate public participation process for each neighborhood.
- An advisory group has been formed for each neighborhood. These groups will explore the issues for their neighborhood and make recommendations to the HCC and the PC.
- The HCC will take the lead in the neighborhood plan process. Staff will work with HCC to prepare draft plans.
- The PC will review the draft plans prepared by HCC.
- For each neighborhood, a joint public hearing between the PC and HCC will be held at the end of the process so that both the PC and the HCC will get a chance to hear all public comment. The PC and the HCC will then deliberate separately.
- The PC and the HCC will make recommendations on the plans to the City Council. After reviewing the recommendations, the City Council will forward its decision on the amendments back to the HCC for final approval.

UPDATE ON THE PROCESS

OPEN HOUSE

Staff held a public open house to kick off the neighborhood planning process on Thursday night, October 29 from 7:00 to 9:00 at Northwest University. The neighborhood update process was introduced and staff got some initial ideas for topics of interest and the vision statements from those

attending. This was done through a unique exercise known as a World Café that involved simultaneous group conversations about the future land use, transportation, housing and retail features, and the 10-20 year vision for each neighborhood. The questions that were asked and participants' responses are included as Attachment A to this memo. Citizens interested in being a part of the advisory groups were also recruited.

ADVISORY GROUPS

Potential members to the advisory groups were asked to submit a brief paragraph to the HCC explaining why they were interested in being a part of the advisory group and what they felt they would contribute to the group. The HCC then appointed the following members to the two groups.

Central Houghton Advisory Group

Houghton Community Council

Betsy Pringle, Chair of Advisory Group

Elsie Webber – alternate

Planning Commission

Byron Katsuyama

Park Board

Colleen Cullen – through March 2010

Transportation Commission

Transportation Commission will send a member to meetings where transportation issues are discussed.

Neighborhood Association

Lisa McConnell

Planning Department Staff

Angela Ruggeri

Dorian Collins

Paul Stewart

Eric Shields

Group Members appointed by the Houghton Community Council

Tom Markl

Frank Rossi

Susan Busch

Rachel Mikulec

Mike Burdo

Steve Sankey

Jeff Nouwens

Carol Buckingham

Spring Vitus

Shawn Etchevers

Brian Staples

Lakeview Advisory Group

Houghton Community Council

John Kappler, Chair of Advisory Group

Elsie Webber – alternate

Planning Commission

Jay Arnold

Park Board

Shelley Kloba

Transportation Commission

Transportation Commission will send a member to meetings where transportation issues are discussed.

Neighborhood Association

Stephen Jackson

Susan Thornes

Planning Department Staff

Janice Soloff

Paul Stewart

Eric Shields

Group Members appointed by the Houghton Community Council

Georgine Foster

Sally Mackle

Robert Style

Nina Peterson

Melinda Skogerson

Dick Skogerson

Karen Levenson

Doug Waddell

NEIGHBORHOOD UNIVERSITY

Staff held two KAN Neighborhood U sessions to discuss neighborhood plans in general including what the expectations are from both the neighborhoods' and the City's perspectives December 8th and 9th. Several of the new advisory group members attended these sessions along with other interested Kirkland residents.

ADVISORY GROUP MEETINGS

There will be series of advisory group meetings to discuss key issues and form draft policies to be written by staff. These advisory group meetings will act as study sessions for the plan amendments. The groups will take public comment and give staff recommendations on the plan policies. When all these meetings have been completed, the recommendations from the advisory groups will be brought back to the HCC for review. The advisory groups' role will be to make recommendations to the HCC and PC, but the PC and HCC will make the final recommendation to the City Council.

A tentative schedule of dates and topics for the advisory group meetings is shown below. The agenda for the January 26 meeting is included as Attachment B.

January 26: Introduction, Visioning

February 23: Environment, Parks, Schools

March 30: Land Use, Housing, Commercial Areas

April 27: Land Use - continued

May 25: Transportation

June 29: Review and comment on concept policies

Tentative location for meetings will be at Kirkland City Hall from 7-9 PM

- Lakeview group will meet in the Rose Hill Room
- Central Houghton group will meet in the Peter Kirk Room

ATTACHMENTS

- A. Word Café questions and comments
- B. Agenda for January 26 advisory group meetings

Cc: Project Files:
ZON07-00032
ZON09-00016

**Lakeview and Central Houghton Open House
October 29, 2009
World Café Exercise Public Comments**

Central Houghton Neighborhood Participants

Table #1

1. *What do you like best about your neighborhood?*

Diversity
 People concentration (pedestrians, runners, boaters, etc.)
 Sense of activity
 Can see out across the lake
 Pedestrian access/walk able
 Rental kayaks
 Public transportation (good bus access/convenient routes)
 Schools
 Public beaches
 Parks
 Grocery store in neighborhood
 Sound of water
 Carillon Point
 Great demographics
 Low density
 Single family
 Greenery
 Proximity to major freeways
 Potential
 Family oriented
 Watershed Park
 Not a lot of traffic (except on 108th)
 Convenient to Bellevue and Downtown Seattle
 NW College
 Restaurants in the neighborhood (coffee, treats, etc. available within walking distance)
 Low crime
 Attention to recycling
 People are amazing
 Quiet (feels like an old neighborhood)
 That 108th is designated a minor arterial
 Starbucks
 Can walk to the essentials/many of the things you need in a few miles (grocery store, drugstore, university, etc.)
 Access to water and recreation
 Full range of lifestyles (good for kids and seniors)
 Old houses and new houses, various sizes (not too many big houses)
 Like existing height limits
 Fire Station in the neighborhood
 Children's School (have both public and private schools)
 Trees and lots of people who like their gardens

2. What character would you like your neighborhood to have 10 to 20 years from now?

If have to increase density – enhance what have and create “village” at 68th.

Want to see a market at 68th with diversity of retail

A trail all the way to Totem Lake that connects the parks

Discourage cars and enhance alternative modes of transportation

Keep the views

More LEED construction (more green)

Preserve green areas

Not like Bellevue

Keep it like it is now (continue appeal that it has today)

Don't want to lose the character

Keep open space and green (greener)

People able to age in the neighborhood

Traffic won't increase from how it is now

More transit options (more reliable and also better transit within Kirkland)

Trail and greenway in Burlington Northern right-of-way

Clean

Stay current, but keep the character (charming)

Minimum of mega houses

More public art

More attractive bus stops

Hardware store

Quality SF housing

Friendly to seniors

Competitive schools (good ratings/reputation)

Active community – citizens engaged

More cultural events

More diversity

Physically active community (pedestrians, bikes, etc.)

Dog park- one person wants one; one person does not

Table #2**1. Describe your vision for the future concerning land use, including parks and recreation in your neighborhood.**

A community garden

BNSFR is a pedestrian and bicycle corridor integrated with shopping connecting to Downtown and transit center

Maintain retail in the existing commercial areas; don't expand

Increase parks and tennis courts

More green space

Increase planting of native trees

Preserve single family homes

Maintain single family character with subtle density increases such as cottage housing

Preserve views as well as vegetation

At South Kirkland Park and Ride provide retail, housing integrated with shopping and transit center; TOD connects to downtown

At South Kirkland Park and Ride no housing only transit

Current uses are preserved

At Houghton shopping center improve center don't expand boundaries

Allow mixed use, higher density development compatible with neighborhoods
 Preserve Watershed Park; consider adding a pea patch
 Increase parks
 Need off leash dog park
 Add a police satellite station at Fire Station

2. *What would you like to see happen at the Houghton Shopping Center (types of uses and role in the neighborhood)?*

Mixed use, more density, structured parking
 Family friendly retail
 Encourage uses such as: grocery store, access to medical needs, drug store, grocery, post office, café for gathering; no bar, a gym.
 Architectural design is in scale with neighborhood; break up the large surface parking lot with buildings but not over developed; provide underground parking; bring buildings to the street.
 Shopping center enhances the community
 Increase art
 Reduce need to drive to shopping center
 Cultural events- maybe use NW University as a resource
 Concerned about 108th Avenue traffic

Table #3

1. *Describe your vision for the future concerning transportation in your neighborhood.*

More frequent bus service and better bicycle connections to work
 Improve bus service to Bellevue
 Enhance alternative transportation routes such as wider bike lanes
 Address potential parking of transit riders in the neighborhood
 At International School there is concern regarding traffic associated with parents dropping off students
 Less reliance on autos
 Bus rider friendly bus stops with lighting, trash collection, shelters
 BNSFR- use for bike and pedestrian trail; no rail; link from Houghton to Totem Lake and Downtown;
 provide pedestrian crossings along the route
 Increase in pedestrian connections through developments and through neighborhood
 Increase sidewalk lighting
 Complete school walk routes around schools
 Improve 108th Avenue
 Don't widen; keep as a minor arterial
 Improve traffic management
 Improve pedestrian crossings such as provide flashing crosswalks
 Widen sidewalks and include landscape strip along curb
 Improve intersection at 108th Avenue and NE 68th streets for pedestrians
 Remove center median; use space to improve sidewalk separation.

2. *Describe your vision for the future concerning housing in your neighborhood.*

Mixed use residential and commercial development along NE 68th St
 Balance and diversity of housing
 Primarily single family residential
 Higher density residential is okay in commercial areas
 Increase detached small housing or cottage housing
 Discourage affordable housing; it is giving away an asset
 Increase housing for aging population

Housing is energy and water efficient, is solar powered or provide sod roofs
 Maintain existing height limits
 Allow transit oriented development only when there are jobs and retail for the residents or users to support the TOD
 People to beautify property with native plant varieties
 Avoid mega houses; explore limiting floor area ratio
 Stagger windows on houses that are located close to each other
 Plant shorter trees
 Maintain historic houses
 Discourage gated developments
 Low scale diversity of houses
 Redevelop Laurel Park multifamily development located north of NE 68th Street

Table #4

1. List any neighborhood concerns that you feel should addressed as part of the neighborhood plan.

Traffic congestion/management @ 108th and 68th
 Pedestrian/bike safety: Safe crosswalks in business district and to schools; Visibility concerns
 Park maintenance on-going
 Retain SF density/residential
 Retain Houghton Center size as is
 No transit oriented design at the Park and Ride
 Where is growth going to go?
 Sprawl
 Transit access
 Local transit needed
 The threat of NW University expansion into the surrounding neighborhood would change the neighborhood's character and impact single family homeowners if the university expands its PLA 1 boundaries.
 Other institutional expansion
 Traffic to ICS
 Scale of redevelopment of Houghton Center
 Impact of changes in Everest Neighborhood (6th Street S)
 More parking at the Park and Ride
 Expand bus routes
 Access from out of town

2. What techniques would work best to keep you engaged in the neighborhood update process?

Resources on-line, no paper
 Questions on a blog
 Summaries of thoughts
 Agenda ahead of time for meetings (post on website)
 Productive meetings
 Give synopsis of progress at CHNA meetings
 Educational materials re: neighborhood planning
 Meeting notes on website (summaries/digests)
 E-mail
 Kirkland Reporter (miss neighborhood sections)
 Questions to answer before committee meetings
 Water at meetings

Telephone call
 On-line information
 Reminder notice of meetings 2 weeks/then 2 days in advance
 Seeing people I know
 Stay on schedule
 Meet at NW University

Lakeview Neighborhood Participants

Table #1

1. *What do you like best about your neighborhood?*

Low density – single family
 Safe
 Pedestrian friendly/lots of things to walk to (lots of nice things: stores, shopping, lake, parks – convenient)
 Elementary school in walking distance
 Good freeway access
 Parks
 Located close to different transit options
 Useful to have shops close by
 Just enough services, but not too much.
 The kids! Family friendly/kid friendly
 Like all the schools and pre-schools
 Views of the lake (Lake View!)

2. *What character would you like your neighborhood to have 10 to 20 years from now?*

Keep it like it is.
 No mega houses/ no increased density

Table #2

1. *Describe your vision for the future concerning land use, including parks and recreation in your neighborhood.*

Preserve expansive views
 BNSFR becomes a park corridor
 BNSFR is designed and functions like the Iron Horse Trail in Danville CA
 LK WASH BLV is a pedestrian corridor
 Safe for pedestrians and bikes
 Keep trees

2. *Do you see a need for increased retail/neighborhood services in the Lakeview Neighborhood?*

No expansion of retail in neighborhood; keep retail uses in existing commercial areas
 Allow retail only at South Park and Ride

Table #3

1. *Describe your vision for the future concerning transportation in your neighborhood.*

BNSFR is a pedestrian –bike trail connecting directly to Downtown; includes crossings
 Traffic congestion helps keep traffic moving slowly, keeps traffic volumes down and increases safety
 Ability to move smaller groups of people

2. Describe your vision for the future concerning housing in your neighborhood.

No specific comments from Lakeview residents.

Table #4**1. List any neighborhood concerns that you feel should be addressed as part of the neighborhood plan.**

Plant the right type of tree in the right place so that views (private and public) of Lake Washington are kept open i.e. Marsh Park they are planted all in a row to block view and cause shade

The proposed SMP tree planting requirement of 3/1 is ridiculous because they will ruin the views of the Lake

Pedestrian safety

Access to Lake

Crosswalk safety

Fast traffic

Connections to lake access

Visitors' parking

Safety on public docks – rescue equipment needed

2. What techniques would work best to keep you engaged in the neighborhood update process?

On-line access

Bring one person to next meeting

Attention getters

Want to know that City Council will pay attention; Meet with 3 during the process

Central Houghton and Lakeview Advisory Groups

First Meeting
January 26, 2010
7-9 pm
Kirkland City Hall
123 Fifth Avenue

Central Houghton group meets in the Peter Kirk Room (lower level).
Lakeview group in the Rose Hill Room (upper level).

Prior to Meeting:

Advisory Group members are asked to do a self guided walking or driving tour of your neighborhood to become familiar with your areas. Prior to your tour, review the preliminary key issues list, neighborhood maps, and neighborhood plan contained in your meeting packet to become familiar with the issues you will be studying.

Agenda

- | | |
|---------|--|
| 7:00 pm | Introduction (Chairs Betsy Pringle and John Kappler) <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Introduction of members2. Advisory Group's Role, Mission, Process3. Agreement on ground rules for participants, meetings and decision making4. Tentative meeting schedule, topics, meeting location |
| 7:30 pm | Neighborhood Overview (staff) |
| 7:45 pm | Review of Existing Neighborhood Plans and Update Tasks (staff) |
| 8:00 pm | Visioning Exercise to begin developing a vision statement (Marie Stake and Scott Guter) |
| 8:50 pm | Next steps |

Three ring binders will be available at the meeting to store your meeting packets.

POTENTIAL ZONING CODE AMENDMENTS - Updated 1/12/10

Section # Description

2010 PROJECTS:

CODE ENFORCEMENT

Chapter 170	Consolidate enforcement procedures for all development services departments
170.40.5.d.1	Change to HE hearing notice period from 17 to 14 days to be consistent with all other notice periods in the code

MISCELLANEOUS CODE AMENDMENTS

Multiple Zones

	Use consistent terminology to regulate gas stations and auto repair.
	Use term "maximum horizontal façade" in all zones where standards appear.
	Amend special regulations for Mini-School/Mini-Daycare use to reference requirements of the State rather than DSHS.
	Clarify ground floor limits for non commercial uses (e.g. residential & assisted living) - allow lobbies, clarify how much nonresidential is OK on ground floor, etc.
	Do we need minimum lot area for certain commercial uses? Eg: neighborhood retail in RM & PR (requires 3600 sf, but office has no requirement); restaurant in WDI; office use in PLA 6B; service station in BC (ES e-mail 9/9/96 and AR).
	Review standards for zero lot line.
	Consider simplification of certain appeal processes. See matrix prepared by Nancy.
	Reduce parking for Assisted Living Facilities from 1.7 stalls/independent unit. Could be chart buster.
	Add parking standard for shopping centers in appropriate zones.

Chapter 5 Definitions

	Define shopping center - for purpose of adding shopping center parking standards.
--	---

Chapters 15 & 17 - RS & RSX Zones

RS & RSX zones	Make special regulation 5 applicable to lots east of Bridle Trails Park - not just north.
----------------	---

Chapter 25 - PR zone

25.10.050 - .80	Make side yards for all these nonresidential uses the same - 10'?
-----------------	---

Chapter 48 - LIT Zone

48.15.190	Delete Special Regulation 1 which requires special buffering for outdoor auto repair.
	Should dance & martial arts training be added as permitted use? Now allowed only if non-profit community facility.
	Add schools as permitted uses.

Chapter 50 - CBD Zone

	CBD 1A & B: Should we eliminate ground floor retail requirement for Parks or Public Utility... uses?
	Codify interpretation 09-1
50.10 +	Change CBD parking requirement for multi-family to one stall per bedroom.

Chapter 53 - Rose Hill Business District Zone

53.59	RH 5C: Eliminate references to 95.25 and 95.43. Revise to reflect original buffer standard (per J Regala),
53.84	RH 8 - Eliminate the special regulations that prohibit retail & restaurant uses above the first floor.

Chapter 60 - Planned Area Zones

60.10	PLA 1: Eliminate references to 95.25. Revise to reflect original buffer standard (per J Regala),
60.180	PLA 16: Eliminate General Reg. 3 which requires installation of a trail, since a trail already exists nearby. See Teresa.

Chapter 90 - Drainage Basins	
Various	Review and reduce approval processes - consistent with reasonable use level of decision.
90.140.8	Eliminate or revise so that lapse of approval is the same as required with underlying review process (Process I or IIA).
Chapter 100 - Signs	
	Eliminate different restrictions for real estate signs than for other commercial signs. Consider restricting location, number, hours.
Chapter 105 - Parking, etc.	
105.103.2.a	Remove DRB from modifications to required number of parking stalls. Should be Planning Official for DR projects.
105.103.3.b	Add modification option for 105.19 - Public Pedestrian Walkways.
105.18.1.d	Clarify or limit the requirement to provide pedestrian connections to all adjacent properties, or provide a modification option.
Chapter 115 - Miscellaneous	
115.08	Move the last sentence to be the third sentence and add at the end "which may further limit its size." - David
115.08	Accessory Structures – Consider eliminating 25' height restriction for detached ADU above a garage in RSX zone.
115.07 and .08	If ADU height in RSX is not increased, reference in 115.07 the ADU height restrictions found in 115.08 - Angela
115.20 Sp Reg 6	Make applicable to lots east of Bridle Trails Park - not just north
115.2	Numerous corrections and reformatting per Teresa Swan
115.95.2	Allow leaf blowers before 8:00 am if associated with public street sweeping.
115.115.5.b & d	Parking in front yards is different for different uses. Why should office and MF be different in same zone? (ES e-mail 08/02/06)
115.95.1.b	Refers to WAC 173-70 for watercraft noise standards. WAC section doesn't exist. Delete entirely or do further research.
115.85.2	Review/ revise Rose Hill Business District lighting standards and consider city-wide.
115.95	Consider not adopting residential to residential noise standards
	Prohibit living in RVs
	Add regulations for electronic vehicle infrastructure per new state law.
Chapter 117 - Wireless	
117	Check review processes for co-location to assure 90 day review time per FCC ruling.
117.65.8	Revise to allow antennas at historic sites & clarify "design requirements." Perhaps add Plng. Official review. See Sean or Nancy
Chapter 120 - Variances	
120.12	Ask HCC to allow administrative variances in Houghton. See Susan or Jeremy for examples.
Chapter 135 - Rezone Process	
135.15 & 25,160.15	Determine best approach for the public to request changes to the Zoning Code (PS)
Chapter 142 - Design Review	
142.35.3.c	Add NRHB (& other design districts?) as subject to design principals in Appendix C. Clarify whether Appendix C is only for stand alone MF or mixed use? (JLB)
Chapter 150 - Process IIA	
150.85	Change "verbal" to "written."
Chapter 155 - Process III	
	Eliminate
Chapter 180 - Plates	
Plates 1- 4 & 8A	Clarify how posts in parking garages are calculated in width of stalls
Municipal Code Title 19 - Street Vacations	
19.16.040	Make application requirements consistent with Zoning Code requirements
Municipal Code Title 22 - Subdivisions	
22.28.040	When lot sizes averaged, prohibit over-sized lots from being later subdivided.

Municipal Code Title 27 - Impact Fees

	Establish single rate for uses in shopping centers. Treat all of downtown as a shopping center
	Consider reduced impact fees for smaller dwelling units (similar to ADUs and cottages).

LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT

115.90	Clarify when to give lot coverage credit for semi-pervious materials. Also, consider greater restrictions on use of brick pavers (8/2/06 e-mail)
105.18	Exempt SF walkways from lot coverage requirements. Require pervious paving.
	Standards for green parking lots - per Seattle?
	Should pools/pool covers be exempt from lot coverage calculations. Should pool covers be included in FAR? (TS)
	Potential code amendments for solar and green roofs (and wind?).

NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN ISSUES**Lakeview Neighborhood**

Chapter 35	Eliminate or revise FC III zone.
Chapter 45	Rename BC zone to Houghton Business District Zone
Chapter 45	Consider deleting storage services and auto sales from BC zone - or require retail frontage?

**POTENTIAL PROJECTS FOR 2011+
MISCELLANEOUS CODE AMENDMENTS****Multiple Zones**

	Consider allowing transfer of development rights (City Council 1/2/08)
	Comprehensively examine parking standards
	Review parking requirements for mixed use developments (e.g. medical office/regular office; business park; strip retail /restaurant/office (ES))

Chapter 48 - LIT Zone

	Re-examine the requirement that uses be limited to 2 stories (PS, 8/20/04 e-mail)
	Delete automobile sales use in Norkirk neighborhood - unless this also requires a Comprehensive Plan amendment

Chapter 115

	Consider allowing the keeping of chickens
115.07	Consider allowing ADUs in SF houses not on individual lots: i.e. condominium lots
115.23 & 5.150	Review common open space. Should it apply to detached & zero lot line attached units? Should there be maximum slope (see interpretation)
115.3	Allow more flexibility or modification option for horizontal façade general regulations in many zones.
115.45	Distinguish decks and porches from other enclosed (but open) areas that should be counted in FAR
115.125	Change rounding of fractions of dwelling units from .66 to .50

Chapter 142 - Design Regulations

	Consider making design principles for MF housing in Appendix C applicable to MF zones (not just business districts.)
--	--

Chapter 170 - Code Enforcement

	Consider more formal approach to interpretations, with comment and appeal process.
--	--

Subdivision Ordinance

22.28.080.b	Should lots be able to be subdivided if they access from an easement across another lot & therefore make the servient lot nonconforming because the easement area would have to be deducted from the area of the servient lot? (8/11/04 SC e-mail).
	Consider design standards to avoid awkward lots served from pipe stems. See e-mail from Houghton resident.

CHAPTERS 85 & 90: CRITICAL AREAS**Chapter 85 - Geologic Hazard Areas**

	Review to determine if standards are adequate
--	---

Chapter 90 - Drainage Basins

90.20.5	Clarify intended meaning of "normal or routine maintenance or repair."
90.55.4	Allow off-site mitigation in another drainage basin for essential public facilities
90.45.3	Allow stormwater outfalls to extend into wetlands
	Eliminate definitions that are common with with definitions applicable throughout entire code
90.140.5	Add criterion that limits disturbance of Type 1 wetlands (per Dave Asher)
	Allow reduced setbacks with minimal process where necessary to reduce wetland/ stream impacts.
?	If improved environmental conditions are created that would result in greater buffer requirements on neighboring properties, could those greater requirements be reduced?

Subdivision Ordinance

22.08.200	References Class A, B & C wetlands rather than Type 1, 2 & 3. Need to define the types. Also, section references lake classification which we do not have.
22.08.190	definition in 2004.

CHAPTER 100: SIGN REGULATIONS**Chapter 5 - Definitions**

5.10.550	Clarify "multi-use complex" for consistency with 100.4.3.b. Delete requirement for exterior entrance.
----------	---

Chapter 100 - Signs

	Create criteria to allow for deviations from sign code to be reviewed at a planner level.
100.115	Interp 95-4 - Temporary commercial sign - Add to definition of temporary sign?
	Interp 95-3R - Colors as signs, sign area - Add to definition of sign area?
	Allow electronic readerboards for schools and fire stations
5.115, 100.85	Interp 94-1 - Changing message center and similar signs. Additional criteria? Allow with Master Sign Plan.
100.115	Interp 92-4 - Fuel price signs
	Interp 86-17-100 and 115 - Temp. commercial signs when related to permitted temporary activities.
100.65	Interp 86-16 - Signs above rooflines
100.85(2)	Interp 86-13 - Sign regulations regarding holiday decorations
100.30, 100.75	Interp 86-11 - Window signs. Need to reexamine.
	Interp 85-8 - 5 and 100 - Status of neon lighting and lighted awnings as signs. Add to definition?
5.108, 100.15	Interp 85-6R - Sign regulations
	Real estate signs (on- and off-site) - review regulations to reduce number of signs (ES)
100.115	Interp 88-19 - Off-site real estate signs. Rethink rules on temporary off site signs. Private advertising signs - restrict size. Temporary commercial signs - limit to 30 days plus size limitation. Real estate signs - redraft to allow (2) 32 sf advertisement signs and (1) 6 sf per lot (not now clear); and revise to conform with Supreme Court Decision on Redmond signs.
	Address political signs duration and size (DG) - review temp sign chart with Rod Kaseguma.
	Under marquee signs - allow to be larger (AR). Allow 6 sq. ft.
	Reduce height of monument signs. Liberalize dimensions for sign base.
	Special signage for auto dealers? Probaly no, but may want to increase signage for large sites.
	Add cabinet signs in CBD and JBD - tie to "major nonconforming"
	Prohibit cabinet signs in Rose Hill and other business districts (citizen suggestion)

	Major nonconforming signs & amortization (e.g. billboards). Need to address constitutional issues
100.115	Allow under marquee signs for sign category A (and probably B). (8/11/04 ES e-mail)
100.55	Allow signs for commercial uses in mixed-use buildings to be calculated separately (8/11/04 ES e-mail)
100.5	Change "NE 106th St" to "Forbes Creek Drive" (SUpdegrave 04/12/05)
	Temporary advertising signs for public events (Csalzman 12/16/04)
	Allow reduced setback for ground mounted signs, subject to criteria.
100.52	Section needs to include NRHBD for consistency with design guidelines.

Chapter 125 - PUDs

	Comprehensively review and revise regulations.
	Consider way to establish quantifiable way to value of public benefits.

NONCONFORMANCE REGULATIONS - Chaper 162

	Interp 83-11 - (may also affect 115.80) - Nonconforming lots held in common ownership.
162.30, 162.35.7	Damaged improvements - What happens if damage exceeds 50% (P. 430)? Conflict with 162.35.7. Can damage be reconstructed under repair and maintenance clause?
162.35.2.a	Look at definition of "use" (e.g. office use). See JMCM.
162.35.2.b.1)	Be less restrictive on structural alterations for non-conforming uses. See "master list" for more info.
162.35.2.b.2)	Clarify time to cease use. Provide reasonable time for owner to seek new tenant per case law. See interpretation 85-4.
162.35.2.b.3)	Develop criteria for allowing change of nonconforming use. Alternatively, consider not allowing change of nonconforming use. (8/10/04 PS e-mail). Group with 162.9 and 10.
162.35.3	Clarify criteria for structure expansion: measured by all structures on property per interpretation 90-4
162.35.5.b	Minor Nonconforming Signs - Is a new sign a "structural alteration"? Is a new, less non-conforming sign permitted (p. 433)? Delete "minor" in first paragraph in b.3 (see P. 433 in file with DC comments). Incorporate interpretation 90-3
162.35.5.d	Delete 10 years time period and replace with Director discretion with criteria (p. 434)
162.35.7	Do not limit all structural alterations as we do now. When can windows and doors be installed without a variance (see Angela's e-mail) (P. 435). (maintenance & repair, etc)
162.35.8.a	Clarify improvement that 50% replacement threshold applies: the improvement to which alteration is being done per int. 85-4
162.60,90,135	Clarify continued provisions per 9/20/05 e-mail from Dawn Nelson.
	Classify cabinet signs in zones where cabinet signs not allowed as major nonconformance.
	Should City owned property be exempt from nonconformance rules? (Desiree)

NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN ISSUES

Moss Bay Neighborhood

50.32	Change buffering (reduce) in consideration of reduced setback - See e-mail from Lauri Anderson.
60.29-60.52	Consider including all or portions of PLA 5 in CBD (TSwan 04/11/05).
	Evaluate appropriate ground floor uses. Don't require retail S. of 2nd on Lake St.
	Consider so-called "parking lot list" from CC in early 2009.

South Rose Hill/ Bridle Trails Neighborhood

Chapter 47	Consider deleting storage services from BCX zone - or require retail frontage?
Chzpter 47	Rename BCX zone to Bridle Trails Business District Zone