CITY OF KIRKLAND

123 FIFTH AVENUE KIRKLAND, WASHINGTON 98033-6189 (425) 587-3225

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

To: Dave Ramsay, City Manager

From: Eric R. Shields, AICP, Planning Director
Michael Bergstrom, AICP, Consultant

Date: December 28, 2005

Subject: Single-Family Floor Area Ratios (FAR); File No. ZON05-00019

Recommendation:
Provide Staff with initial direction.

Introduction:
As requested in 2005 by the City Council, Staff and the Planning Commission are beginning to examine the Floor Area Ratios (FAR) established by the Zoning Code for single-family residences. The basic questions before us are:

1. Are the FARs working as intended?
2. If the FARs are not working as intended, how can they be corrected?
3. What is the best process to use to answer the foregoing questions?

Staff recently met with the Planning Commission to introduce this issue and to get initial feedback and direction. We are now requesting similar input from the City Council, to help us define a process that most efficiently and effectively answers the first two questions above.

Background:

In the late 1990's the City adopted FAR regulations for low-density zones, intended to result in houses that are sized in proportion to the lots on which they are built while reasonably accommodating the demands of today's housing market. FAR regulations do not apply within the boundaries of the Houghton Municipal Corporation. As the City Council is aware, some Kirkland residents are still concerned that some of the new houses being built in the city appear too large for their lot or seem out of scale with their surroundings.

Upon hearing residents' concerns, the City Council asked Staff and the Planning Commission to look into single family home sizes to determine whether the FAR provisions are achieving their intended goal, or whether changes to those provisions are needed. Staff met with the Commission on November 10, 2005. This memo summarizes the input received at that meeting, and proposes an approach for addressing the issue.

Existing Provisions:

FAR is the maximum allowable gross floor area permitted on a lot, and is expressed as a percentage of the lot size. FAR varies by zone, from a low of 20% (RS/RSX 35, PLA 16) to a high of 60% (RS/RSX 5.0, PLA 6C and 6E). The RS/RSX 12.5 zones allow 35%, and the RS/RSX 7.2 and 8.5 zones allow an FAR of 50%.

The following areas are excluded from FAR calculations:

- Attic area with less than five feet of headroom;
- Floor area with a ceiling height less than six feet above finished grade;
- Accessory structures located more than 20 feet from the main structure;
- Uncovered and covered decks, porches, and walkways;
- Upper levels of vaulted space, such as a vaulted entry.

Initial Planning Commission Input:

An October 31, 2005 memo prepared for the November 10 Planning Commission meeting describes current code provisions relating to FAR, as well as a brief analysis of 66 active single-family building permits that are subject to FAR regulations. In the interest of brevity, that information will not be repeated in this memo. The Planning Commission memo is included as Attachment 1 and should be referred to for further information.

Following is a summary of the input received by the Commission:

- A problem either does exist, or might exist; the issue is worth exploring further.
- The question should be framed carefully; don't just ask "Are new houses too big?"
- Large homes may be countering efforts for affordable (or "more affordable") housing.
- Accessory structures add visual bulk.
- Recent innovative housing projects provide examples of new construction built on a desirable scale.
- The FAR question should be examined on a parallel track with the innovative housing program.
- Neighborhood associations might be a good source of input.
- A broad-based community forum might be useful.

- Visual preference presentations might be helpful, but any depictions of specific houses that are considered "too big" should be disguised or generalized out of consideration for the owners.
- A walking tour with a focus group could help define the issue.
- Need to be realistic about market demands, economic forces.
- Land to building value ratios are important to know.
- Should include industry input (developers, builders, realtors, economists).
- Might consider allowing the same amount of FAR, but have it spread among more houses; e.g., if a property is large enough to short plat for two homes, maybe allow three homes as long as the total FAR does not exceed that allowed for two homes.
- Possibly consider a variable approach – greater FAR on smaller lots (or zones), lesser FAR on larger lots (or zones) (the Zoning Code currently does this to some extent).
- The exclusions to FAR calculations should be reviewed to see if they are appropriate.
- The problem might not only be one of scale, but also design; design review might be appropriate for houses exceeding a particular FAR.
- As an alternative to formal design review, "voluntary" design guidelines developed for the public might be helpful.

Options:

Process: As reflected by the Planning Commission's comments, several options are possible. Staff believes that the process should be generally in scale with possible solutions, which, as discussed below, are relatively few. The process should be focused, but broad enough to attract meaningful community and industry input. To that end, we propose the following:

- Meet with selected neighborhood associations, including at least Market and Norkirk. The meetings can be informal discussions, and might include walking tours of the neighborhoods.
- Seek the involvement of the Kirkland Heritage Society.
- Continue to collect and analyze data from single-family building permits that are subject to FAR regulations.
- Identify and seek input from appropriate industry representatives, to make sure we understand market forces, financing constraints, and the economic or market ramifications of any proposed changes to the FAR regulations.
- Identify the extent to which any changes to the FAR regulations will create nonconforming structures.
- Based on input received from the foregoing steps, determine whether more complex steps, such as community forums or visual preference surveys, would be beneficial.

Possible Code Changes: As seen from the discussion earlier in this memo, the FAR regulations are concise and do not contain a lot of elements that can be modified. If code changes are to occur, they would likely take one or more of the following forms:

- Reduce the allowable FAR in some or all zones, for example:
    - Reduce the FAR in the RS/RSX 5.0 zones to 50%; or

    - Reduce the FAR in the RS/RSX 5.0 zones to 55%, and in the RS/RSX 7.2 and 8.5 zones to 45%; and/or
- Modify the exclusions from FAR calculations, for example:
    - Modify the provisions for accessory structures separated by more than 20 feet, such as:
        - Allow a partial exclusion for such structures (e.g., allow 50% of the floor area to be excluded from the allowable FAR); or
        - Allow a partial exclusion, as above, and a greater exclusion (e.g., another 25% of the floor area) when the accessory structure will be used as an accessory dwelling unit; or
        - Remove the exclusion entirely; and/or
    - Count the upper levels of vaulted space toward FAR; and/or
    - Change how basement space is treated, such as:
        - Reduce the ceiling height that triggers the exclusion from 6 feet to 5 feet or some other dimension; or
        - Allow only a partial exclusion for basement space (e.g., 50%).

Conclusion:

If we create an appropriate review process and accurately identify the nature and scope of the problem, we should be able to arrive at a solution that balances the desires of the community with the demands of the housing market without making dramatic changes to the FAR regulations. We believe that the process and range of possible code changes outlined above will lead to that solution, and are seeking City Council concurrence on this approach. Once we receive direction from the City Council we will return to the Planning Commission with the work program, outline of the public process, and schedule.

Attachments:

1. October 31, 2005 Memo to the Planning Commission
2. November 10, 2005 Planning Commission Meeting Minutes

cc: Planning Commission
Angela Ruggeri
Michael Bergstrom
File

CITY OF KIRKLAND

123 FIFTH AVENUE KIRKLAND, WASHINGTON 98033-6189 (425) 587-3225

DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

To: Kirkland Planning Commission

From: Eric R. Shields, AICP, Director
Michael Bergstrom, AICP, Consultant

Date: October 31, 2005

Subject: Single-Family Floor Area Ratios (FAR)

Recommendation:

Conduct study session and provide Staff with initial direction.

The Issue:

Are the City's floor area ratios resulting in houses that are sized proportionate to their lots?

Background:

In the late 1990's, the City adopted regulations establishing maximum floor area ratios (FAR) for single-family residences. These ratios are intended to result in houses that are sized in proportion to the lots on which they are built, while reasonably accommodating the demands of today's housing market. FAR regulations do not apply within the jurisdiction of the Houghton Community Council, and they only apply to low density residential zones.

The FAR determines the maximum allowable gross floor area (gfa) for a given lot in a given zone. The FAR is expressed as a percentage of the lot size. For example, in the RS 7.2 zone the FAR is 50% of the lot size. Therefore, if a lot in that zone contains 7,200 sf, the maximum gfa allowed is 3,600 sf (50% of 7,200 sf). A 7,800 sf lot would allow 3,900 gfa, an 8,200 sf lot would allow 4,100 gfa, and so forth.

In recent months Staff and some City Council members have heard concerns from Kirkland residents about the size of houses being built in their neighborhoods. There is a perception

ATTACHMENT 1

among some residents that many houses are too large and out of scale with their lot or their surroundings. It is unknown how broad that perception is or how deeply the concerns run, but it is voiced often enough that the Council has asked that Staff and the Planning Commission assess the issue.

Current Code Provisions:

The primary sections of the KZC governing FAR consist of the following:

A. Floor Area Ratio (FAR) is defined as: "The maximum permitted gross floor area allowed, expressed as a percentage of the lot size (Gross floor area / lot size = FAR). See KZC 115.42."

B. Gross Floor Area is defined as: "The total square footage of all floors in a structure as measured from either the interior surface of each exterior wall of the structure or, if the structure does not have walls, from each outer edge of the roof. Exterior areas may constitute gross floor area. See Chapter 115 KZC."

C. Floor Area Ratios: The Zoning Code establishes the following floor area ratios:

Zone	FAR *
RS 35 / RSX 35	20%
RS 12.5 / RSX 12.5	35%
RS 8.5 / RSX 8.5	50%
RS 7.2 / RSX 7.2	50%
RS 5.0 / RSX 5.0	60%
PLA 6C	60%
PLA 6E	60%
PLA 16	20%

* *Note that, while allowable gross square footage is calculated based on the actual lot size, the allowable FAR as a percentage of lot size, i.e., the "multiplier", is determined by the underlying zone. In other words, if a person had a legal nonconforming 5,000 sf lot in the RS 7.2 zone, the applicable FAR would be 50%, since that is the FAR established by the RS 7.2 zone. Similarly, if a person had an 8,500 sf lot in the RS 5.0 zone, the applicable FAR would be 60% since that is the FAR established by the RS 5.0 zone.*

D. KZC 115.42 – Floor Area Ratio (FAR) Calculation for Detached Dwelling Units in Low Density Residential Zones specifically excludes the following areas from FAR calculation:

1. Attic area with less than five feet of headroom;
2. Floor area with a ceiling height, including the horizontal supporting members for the ceiling, less than six feet above finished grade (this might include a basement or portion of a basement);
3. Accessory structures located more than 20 feet from the main structure; and
4. Uncovered and covered decks, porches, and walkways.

Although not specifically addressed in the above, the upper reaches of "vaulted" space, such as a vaulted entry, are not calculated in the FAR since there is not a physical floor separating the lower and upper portions of that vaulted space.

Discussion:

It is difficult to know whether the concerns expressed are due to the FAR provisions, or whether they are a reaction to the aggressive development or redevelopment of homesites in Kirkland that can result in rapid change to a neighborhood, or some other reason. Much of the lot-by-lot redevelopment that has occurred in recent years has taken place in the Market and Norkirk neighborhoods, while much of the new growth, through subdividing, has occurred in the North and South Rose Hill and South Juanita neighborhoods. Due possibly in part to their view orientation, in part to heightened permit activity, and in part to the dramatic visual and physical change that occurs with the replacement of a small 1940's-era house by a large contemporary house, many of the concerns about house size have come from residents of the Market and Norkirk neighborhoods, and to a somewhat lesser extent the Highlands neighborhood.

In September of 2005, Staff analyzed 66 active single-family building permit applications, submitted from 2003 to present, to get an indication of actual FAR proposed with new construction. It should be noted that this is not a complete evaluation of every single-family building permit applied for or issued during that time frame; rather, it is an examination of active permits on file with the City, and does not include any permits from the Houghton area since FAR regulations are not effective there.

A. <u>FAR Breakdown.</u> The 66 permits fall within the following FAR ranges:

51 – 60%	4 *
41 – 50%	38
31 – 40%	15
30% -	9
Total:	66

** All of the construction with FAR of more than 50% was in the RS 5.0 zone, which allows an FAR of 60%. Three of these permits were in Norkirk, one in Everest.*

B. FAR by Neighborhood:

Neighborhood	# Permits	Permits at Max FAR	FAR Range	FAR Mean	FAR Median
Norkirk	18	4 (22%)	15% - 60% *	44%	46%
Market	13	7 (53%)	37% - 50%	47%	50%
South Juanita	9	0 (0%)	22% - 49%	39%	44%
Highlands	7	1 (14%)	14% - 50%	39%	43%
Bridle Trails	6	2 (33%)	13% - 50% **	34%	***
South Rose Hill	6	1 (17%)	22% - 50%	36%	***
North Rose Hill	4	1 (25%)	36% - 50%	43%	***
Everest	3	0 (0%)	43% - 55% *	49%	***

* *Includes some permits in the RS 5.0 zone, which allows 60% FAR.*
** *Includes one permit in the RSX 35 zone, which allows 20% FAR.*
*** *Too small of a sample.*

The most active neighborhoods according to this sampling are Market and Norkirk. They also have comparatively high FARs, though the Norkirk figures are somewhat skewed by the inclusion of three permits in the RS 5.0 zone with FARs of 57%-60%. Seven of the 13 Market neighborhood permits were right at the maximum permitted FAR of 50%. Overall, 16 (24%) of the 66 permits were at the maximum permitted FAR of either 20%, 50% or 60%, and 18 of the 66 permits (27%) had an FAR of 50% or greater.

As noted above, KZC 115.42 excludes from the FAR calculation accessory structures that are located more than 20 feet from the main structure. Two of the 66 permits had such a structure, one in Market and one in Norkirk. Had these structures been included in the FAR, the Market permit FAR would have been 66%, rather than 50%, and the Norkirk permit would have been 51%, rather than 35%.

Questions

There are two primary questions at hand:

A. Are the FAR regulations working? If the FAR regulations are working as they were initially intended, and the resulting houses are consistent with community expectations and market demands, then there is no need to review the regulations in more detail or search for a solution.

To answer this question, it may be helpful to provide a process for public input and discussion. Such input would help determine to what extent the concerns exist, and might help identify more concrete examples of what is perceived as "too big". The process could involve a focus group, neighborhood association meetings, roundtable

discussions, study sessions, and/or other measures. We are requesting Planning Commission input on such a process.

B. <u>If the regulations are not working, how should they be corrected?</u> This question only needs to be pursued if it is determined that the regulations are not working. At this point, possible changes to the FAR regulations appear to consist of the following general approaches:

1. Reduce the allowable FAR;
2. Revise/remove the exceptions of KZC 115.42, such as removing the exception for accessory structures or taking a different approach to vaulted space; or
3. Some combination of the above.

These approaches have not been analyzed to any extent, and need not be until the first question is answered. It is likely that additional approaches will be defined as the process evolves and public input is received.

Conclusion:
At this stage, we are requesting preliminary feedback and direction from the Planning Commission. Your initial thoughts, if any, on whether a problem exists would be helpful, but not critical. Any input you may have on an effective and efficient process for obtaining public input on this issue would be welcome. Following our initial discussion with the Commission, Staff will return to the City Council for any additional direction the Council may wish to provide.

KIRKLAND PLANNING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES - November 10, 2005

1. CALL TO ORDER/ROLL CALL 7:00 p.m.
Present: Matthew Gregory, Carolyn Hayek (Chair), Tom Hodgson, Byron Katsuyama, Janet Pruitt, Kiri Rennaker, Karen Tennyson
Staff present: Eric Shields, Paul Stewart, Nancy Cox, Teresa Swan; Mike Bergstrom, Planning Consultant

2. ANNOUNCEMENT OF AGENDA 7:01 p.m.
Waived.

3. REQUESTS FROM THE AUDIENCE 7:01 p.m.
None.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS 7:01 p.m.

A. 2005 Draft Comp Plan Amendments and Related Zoning Map Changes File No. ZON05-00026
Held the public hearing and discussed proposed amendments.

Ms. Swan reported on the minor "houskeeping" amendments for the Draft 2005 Comprehensive Plan Amendments. These amendments are in response to the recently amended Capital Improvement Plan and related Zoning Map changes to the Transportation Projects, Utilities, Surface Water, Parks, and Roads as outlined in her November 1, 2005 memo to the Planning Commission. The proposed new bicycle and pedestrian connection in the Highland Neighborhood will be reflected in the Citywide map if the Commission's recommendations are adopted by City Council. Also, corrections are proposed concerning "low" and "medium" density zone designations. There were two other minor corrections noted. Ms. Swan and Mr. Stewart responded to a few questions from the Planning Commission.

Chair invited public to speak on this issue. There was no public comment.

Motion: Approve Adoption of the Draft 2005 Comprehensive Plan Amendments and related Zoning Map changes. Carried.
Moved by Karen Tennyson, no second required.

5. STUDY SESSIONS 7:15 p.m.
A. Single Family Floor Area Ratios (FARs)
General discussion and provided initial direction to staff.

Mr. Bergstrom reported on the City's single family Floor Area Ratio (FARs) Regulations. He referenced his and Eric Shields' October 31, 2005 memo to the Planning Commission. He said the intent of the FAR is so that large houses don't dominate their neighborhood. Staff is seeking a way to learn whether there is a problem with the FARs working and how broad a problem the public feels this is. Staff has heard some converns, mostly from the Norkirk and Market Neighborhoods. He is seeking initial direction from the Planning Commission and

will touch base with City Council with regard to their input.

Mr. Bergstrom and Mr. Stewart addressed the Commission's questions. They discussed Net Floor Area vs. Gross Floor Area (GFA), Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs), and what areas do not count in GFA. There was lengthy discussion about the increasing land value that encourages builders to tear down cottages and build large homes, as well as discussion on energy use, lot changes, loss of affordable housing, and courtyard housing.

It was suggested that a "visual preference" survey may be used to determine what the public's perception of this issue is so that it can be determined whether there is a problem and, if so, how extensive it is.

When asked by the Commission as to what avenues they could take on this issue, Mr. Stewart said that the Commission could address this in the form of a Focus Group, Open Community Forum, or a Study Session with the Commission with a possible goal to:

1. Reduce FARs
2. Review and revise exceptions
3. Review and revise the design process

Innovative housing, such as the Cottage Company development, was discussed.

The Commission wants to be sensitive as to issue of "problem" properties but keep specific or identifiable properties out of the discussion. They feel that, in order for the FAR review process to be profitable, it has to be well-targeted, not just asking the public, "Are homes too big?". The style of homes was discussed. Affordable housing was discussed.

Chair invited public comment.

George DeBolt, 11714 NE 73rd Street, Kirkland, suggested the use of a variable FAR, in which smaller lots would be allowed greater FAR (60% - 70%) and larger lots would be allowed less FAR (30% - 40%), to give builders incentive to build smaller houses. He complimented the Commission on the way it does business.

There was further discussion regarding the idea of FARs being tied to lot size instead of zone.

Chair summarized issues discussed:
a. Commission is willing to look at exclusions and determine whether any house should be tinkered with and, if so, which ones.
b. Commission is concerned regarding large lots in a 5,000 zone.
c. Commission is concerned that innovative housing be on some sort of parallel track.
d. Some members want an upper limit cap on the FAR
e. Some members think Design Review is something worth considering for single family in certain circumstances Mr. Stewart spoke regarding staff time being expended on FARs. He asked what kind of process the Commission would like to see used to identify possible problems with the regulations. Avenues mentioned previously were reiterated with an additional comment that, if visual preference was used, drawings should be used to disguise addresses of specific homes. It was suggested that builders, real estate agents, developers, and economists be given the opportunity to provide their expert opinion on the subject, in order to educate Commissioners who can then base decisions on what is actually happening in the real estate market. Questions posed to these experts might include, "What impact would smaller

FARs have on the market?" Chair suggested that Commissioners read the book, "The Not-So-Big House."

Mr. Stewart suggested that Staff come back to Commission with a summary of what was discussed tonight and also with some options as to how to get input and an outline of a public process. They will incorporate feedback they get from Council. Commission concurred.

Chair declared a brief break.

B. Homeless Encampment Zoning Code Amendments 9:01 p.m.
File No. ZON05-00028
Reviewed issues and provided direction to staff.

Ms. Cox referenced her and Mr. Shield's November 2, 2005 memo to Commission. She said that homelessness is a very serious problem in King County and gave statistics on the number of homeless in the area. She discussed SHARE/WHEEL Tent City 4 that was in Kirkland recently. "Share" is the men's section and "Wheel" is the women's section of Tent City. Ms. Cox said many in Tent City are employed and the length of their stay in that facility varies. She gave the history of Tent City 4 and said many couples stay there also. They are scheduled to move to Bellevue November 19th.

Ms. Cox said that a Temporary Use Permit was used to permit Tent City. She explained the parameters of this type of permit and the appeal process. She said there was a lot of public interest in Tent City 4 and businesses and residents in the immediate area were notified of the permit.

Ms. Cox said that Tent City requested a 90-day stay but the ordinance provided only a 60-day stay. City Council passed an Interim Zoning Regulation so that a change could be effected in the provision to allow the requested 90-day stay. There was a lot of public input to this process.

Churches that host Homeless Encampments were deemed by Judge Scott and upheld by Judge Lum as being an exercise of religion protected by the First Amendment. She stated that King County has a ten-year plan to end homelessness. She referenced the website www.cehkc.org that is sponsored by the Committee to End Homelessness in King County. Ms. Cox reviewed Interim Regulations that are in place now; City Council has asked Staff to have the permanent regulations in place by March 2006. She reviewed options for the permit process, frequency and duration, and performance standards. Commission posed questions that were addressed by Ms. Cox and Mr. Stewart.

Other websites mentioned were www.tentcitysolutions.com (opposed to homeless encampments) and www.eastsidecares.org (supportive of homeless encampments). There is also a City of Kirkland link under the Planning & Community Development page.

There is a Memorandum of Understanding between SHARE/WHEEL and City of Kirkland that states that Tent City 4 will not locate in Kirkland again until August 2006.

Ms. Cox discussed problems with the appeal process currently in the code and related options to the permit process. She said the frequency and duration clause currently is 60

days, once each 365 days to the "same user." Proposed change of verbiage was discussed at length.

Ms. Cox reviewed the actions of the Staff team that worked on the Tent City 4 permit, including Fire & Building, Police, and Planning, along with the Seattle/King County Health Department, and how issues were resolved through standards imposed. SHARE/WHEEL Code of Conduct was discussed.

Ms. Cox reported on restrictions imposed on Tent City by various cities.

Proposed changes, notices, and other issues outlined in her memo, were reviewed by Ms. Cox. She encouraged the Commission to review the cited websites. Hearings will be December 15 and December 19.

Commission asked questions that were addressed by Staff, regarding fencing around Tent City 4, security issues, the number of homeless in Kirkland, causes of death among the homeless, expenses incurred by the City due to Tent City 4 being here. Other questions will be referred to the City Attorney.

Staff requested feedback requested from the Commission: Is Staff's recommended approach as drafted in Chapter 127, with underlines and cross-outs, acceptable to Commission for use in the public hearing? Three issues discussed there are:

(1) The Permit process
(2) Frequency and Duration
(3) Performance Standards

Chair commented on Paragraph K, that grammar should be corrected to say, "All requirements of the Kirkland Police Department related to identified sex offenders or prospective residents shall be met."

Commission discussed at length Tent City, SHARE/WHEEL, and the three issues. They agreed on (1) the Permit Process; they discussed (2) the Frequency and Duration (every 12 months for 90 days) - some felt it is too lenient, some felt it is too restrictive - the majority agreed with it as stated; They agreed on (3) Performance Standards.

Commissioners supported the Tent City 4 project and Chair stated how proud she is of the City in how this issue was handled. Several Commissioners had spoken with the residents and other homeless in Kirkland. Chair feels the ordinances make sense given all of the circumstances.

Ms. Cox encouraged Commission to look at www.tentcitysolutions.com, sponsored by the group opposing Tent City, so that the Commission understands what may be coming in the public hearing.

6. **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**
   None.

7. **NEW BUSINESS**
   None.

8. READING AND/OR APPROVAL OF MINUTES:
None.

9. TASK FORCE REPORTS
There was a report on the APA Conference. Chair mentioned that Mr. Shields was commended as co-chair of that Conference.

10. ADMINISTRATIVE REPORTS

A. City Council Actions
NE 85th Study Session
Tree and Landscaping Regulations
Mr. Stewart reported that a Staff presentation was made to City Council at their study session on NE 85th regarding the two non-conforming issues of the auto services centers there. Staff will go back to Council November 28 for further discussion. There was a lot of discussion about relaxing the buffer and height limits of 15'.

Also, City Council adopted the new tree and landscapting regulation. Interim regulations will be extended to January 1st so that time is sufficient to produce educational materials.

B. Thanks to Mr. Hodgson
Commission thanked Mr. Hodgson for his service to the Commission and wished him well as he takes his seat on City Council. He responded by saying that his time on the Commission was extremely productive and he was proud to have been a part of this body.

C. Public Meeting Calendar Update
Commissioners were reminded that the dinner is December 6 and the next meeting date is December 15. The retreat is in January.

11. COMMENTS FROM THE AUDIENCE
None.

12. ADJOURNMENT 10:40 p.m.

_____
Chair
Kirkland Planning Commission

_____
Planning Staff
Department of Planning and Community Development