



April 1, 2016

Kirkland City Council
c/o Ms. Desiree Goble, Planner
Planning and Building Department
123 Fifth Avenue
Kirkland, WA 98033-6189

Re: Applicant's Response to Challenge of Hearing Examiner's Recommendation to Approve Rezone and Subdivision for Bridlestone Estates
File No. SUB15-00572

Dear Council Members,

I am General Counsel for KLN Construction, Inc. ("**KLN**"), the applicant for the above-referenced project, which is an application for approval of a rezone of approximately 17.6 acres from RS-35 to RS-12.5 zoning together with a preliminary plat for a 35-lot single family subdivision commonly known as "*Bridlestone Estates*". The City's Hearing Examiner, Sue Tanner (the "**Examiner**"), recommended approval of the Bridlestone Estates proposal by her "Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation" dated March 16, 2016 (the "**Examiner's Recommendation**"). This letter responds to the challenge dated March 28, 2016 (the "**Challenge**") to the Examiner's Recommendation filed by Amy Supple, Jim Erckmann, Jennifer Duncan, individually and on behalf of the Lake Washington Saddle Club, Suzanne Kagen and Molly Lawrence (collectively, the "**Challengers**") and is submitted pursuant to Kirkland Zoning Code ("**KZC**") § 152.85.

Challengers assert that "the Hearing Examiner fundamentally erred when she recommended approval of the Bridlestone Estates rezone and subdivision." Challenge, at p. 1. Challengers entirely fail to present any argument as to how the Bridlestone Estates proposal fails to comply with the City's subdivision requirements and other applicable development regulations. Challengers instead focus solely on the proposed rezone. However, the Challenge fails to present any argument for denying the rezone that was not already presented to, duly considered by, and then rejected by the Examiner. Challengers fail to demonstrate that the applicable criteria for a site-specific, quasi-judicial rezone set forth in KZC § 130.40 have not been met. The City Council should, therefore, deny the Challenge and approve the proposed rezone and subdivision for Bridlestone Estates consistent with the Planning and Building

Department's "Advisory Report, Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation" dated March 1, 2016 (the "**Staff Recommendation**") and the Examiner's Recommendation.

1. *Applicant is entitled to approval of the proposed rezone because all of the applicable rezone criteria are met.*

Challengers first argue that KLN "has no right" to the requested rezone. However, the rezone should be approved if the four applicable rezone criteria are satisfied. The record overwhelmingly demonstrates that KLN has shown how the applicable rezone criteria are satisfied. KLN submitted with its application an analysis as to how the rezone criteria are satisfied. See Staff Recommendation, Attachment 7. The Staff Recommendation (at pp. 8, and 12-16) includes a thorough analysis as to how the rezone criteria are met. At the March 9th public hearing KLN provided detailed testimony to the Examiner regarding satisfaction of the rezone criteria. The Examiner -- after reviewing the Staff Recommendation and written record, hearing applicant's testimony, and hearing comments from the Challengers and other members of the public -- issued detailed findings and conclusions, recommending approval of the rezone and subdivision (and related code approvals). See Examiner's Recommendation, at pp. 4-8. The Challenge presents no argument or legal basis for the City to deny the rezone.

2. *The proposed rezone is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan ("BTNP").*

Challengers primarily make two arguments as to why the proposed rezone is purportedly inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan and BTNP. Their first argument is that the rezone should be denied because the BTNP requires single family development to be "equestrian oriented". The crux of their argument is that "equestrian oriented" requires "horse acre" lots under the current RS-35 zoning. Challengers cite the following language in the BTNP to support their argument:

"[D]evelopment in this area should be limited to low-density equestrian-oriented residential (one to three dwelling units per acre). In addition, the existing stable facilities should be encouraged to remain, and new equestrian facilities should be allowed as appropriate to complement Bridle Trails State Park."

BTNP, p. XV.C-4.¹ Challengers' argument is premised on the erroneous assumption that only lots capable of supporting equestrian use, and specifically the keeping of

¹ In December 2015 the City Council completed the "2035 Update" to its Comprehensive Plan, including a Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan Update (the "**BTNP Update**"). The BTNP Update is described in the document itself as a "minor update" and does not reflect any substantive change in policy from the BTNP which was in effect on the date the application for Bridlestone Estates was filed. Because the original application materials reference the version of the BTNP identified as "(printed September 2011)", for ease of review all additional references are to that same version and, if changes were made in the BTNP Update, those changes are noted.

horses, are “equestrian oriented.” That is simply not the case. Nothing in the BTNP requires that all residential properties within the Bridle Trails neighborhood be able to allow for keeping horses. In fact, the BTNP expressly identifies a “Vision Statement” (page XV.C-1) that the “[t]he primary policy direction for this neighborhood is to maintain the low-density residential character with some areas containing large lots capable of keeping horses.” (Emphasis added.)

The proposed rezone for Bridlestone Estates would result in approximately 2 dwelling units per acre, which is entirely consistent with the 1 to 3 dwelling units per acre contemplated by the LDR 1-3 designation for the site. The BTNP expressly contemplates that “some” – but not all – lots within the Bridle Trails neighborhood should be sufficiently sized for equestrian use. Indeed, the BTNP identifies that “[t]he single-family area north of Bridle Trails State Park and south of NE 70th Street contains some large lots capable of keeping horses.” BTNP, p. XV.C-3 (emphasis added). Those areas are designated on the BTNP Land Use Map as LDR 1 for lots sufficiently sized to accommodate horse keeping. Other areas are also designated on the BTNP Land Use Map for LDR 5 and 5-8 (5 to 8 dwelling units per acre), as well as areas designated for multi-family and commercial use.²

Thus, the BTNP Land Use Map on its face, and the text of the BTNP, refutes any argument that “equestrian-oriented” residential use requires horse-acre lots in the area designated as LDR 1-3 on the BTNP Land Use Map. As noted above, the Bridlestone Estates property is within an area along 116th Ave. NE where low density residential development “should be permitted” and the BTNP specifically identifies the appropriate density as LDR 1-3 (1 to 3 dwelling units per acre). In focusing solely on the “equestrian oriented” language in the BTNP Challengers entirely ignore the qualifying language that such residential development can be “1 to 3 dwelling units per acre.” Accepting Challengers’ argument – that anything more dense than 1 dwelling unit per acre (“horse acre” lots) under the current RS-35 zoning is not “equestrian oriented” – would render meaningless the language of the BTNP (and the map designation) allowing densities of “1 to 3 dwelling units per acre.” (Emphasis added.)

Based on these provisions from the BTNP cited above, the Examiner agreed with KLN’s analysis and concluded that “equestrian oriented” does not require lots capable of keeping horses. The Examiner specifically concluded that:

“[t]he rezone would also implement the Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan. It is clear from the explanatory statement under the vision statement that maintenance of the low-density residential character in the area is key, and that ‘some areas’ should continue to maintain large lots for horses. The Neighborhood Plan expressly directs that in the single family area

² Challengers also entirely ignore the language at page XV.C-1 of the BTNP, which recognizes that: “[t]he major policy direction for this area is to maintain the low density quality of the neighborhood, except as described below. New residential development should be low density (up to five dwelling units per acre) and conform with existing development.” (Emphasis added.)

north of the State Park and south of NE 70th Street, residential sites within areas that are equestrian-oriented should be designated to allow for keeping horses. It also expressly directs that Bridlewood Circle, Silver Spurs Ranch and Bridle View should remain 'very low' residential density, which is stated to be one dwelling unit per acre. But for the area in question, southwest of the State Park along 116th Avenue NE, both 'low density development and equestrian facilities should be permitted.' 'Low density' is repeatedly explained as being from one to three dwelling units per acre.

The Neighborhood Plan's discussion of 'very low density' as one dwelling unit per acre and 'low density' as one to three dwelling units per acre is consistent with the comparable zoning classifications for those densities listed in Table LU-3 of the Comprehensive Plan. Thus, the Neighborhood Plan does not conflict with the Comprehensive Plan."

Examiner's Recommendation, Conclusion E.1.b.(2), at p. 7-8 (emphasis added). Challengers have not demonstrated that the Examiner's findings and conclusions regarding consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and BTNP are either unsupported by substantial evidence or in any way erroneous. For all these reasons, "equestrian oriented" cannot simply mean lots sized to accommodate horse keeping without rendering the language "1 to 3 dwelling units per acre" meaningless. (Emphasis added.) The proposed rezone is in fact "equestrian oriented" consistent with the BTNP in that the proposal includes equestrian-friendly frontage improvements (i.e., a separated bike lane, as well as a separated equestrian/pedestrian trail along 116th Ave. NE) as well as providing a pedestrian/equestrian access between Lots 9 and 10 to maintain public access to Bridle Trails State Park.³

Challengers second argument as to why the proposed rezone is inconsistent with the BTNP is that "it will not be possible to keep horses at Bridlestone Estates as presently configured", citing the City's code requirements in KZC § 115.20 for keeping horses in residential areas. Challenge, at p. 4. This argument is a "red herring." As noted above, there simply is no requirement for any of the lots in Bridlestone Estates to support horse keeping. But even if there was such a requirement, the record before the Examiner reflects that the proposed lots for Bridlestone Estates range from 12,400 to over 24,000 square feet, and that 6 of the lots are over 20,000 square feet and could *potentially* satisfy the City's code requirements (although KLN has not, and is not required, to make

³ In addition to compliance with the LDR 1-3 land use designation in the BTNP, City Staff (Staff Recommendation, II.E.1.a.(a)) and the Examiner (Examiner's Recommendation, E.1.a.(4)) found the rezone would be consistent with specific policies in the Comprehensive Plan. KLN agreed with that analysis and provided testimony at the March 9th hearing as to how the rezone would also implement specific policies in the BTNP, including those calling for protection of open water courses such as Yarrow Creek (BTNP, p. XV.C-1), providing equestrian/pedestrian access to Bridle Trails State Park (BTNP, p. XV.C-7), undergrounding of utilities (BTNP, p. XV.C-10), providing a pedestrian/equestrian trail along 116th Ave. NE (BTNP, p. XV.C-8.1), and requiring adequate water and sewer service (BTNP, p. XV.C-10).

that evaluation to justify the proposed rezone). The Examiner concluded that “[a]s the subdivision is presently configured, it may be possible for a few lots to support horse keeping.” See Examiner’s Recommendation, Conclusion C.5, at p. 3.

Challengers make the unsubstantiated assertion that the Examiner’s conclusion is “incorrect”. In doing so, Challengers merely speculate that horse use could not be accommodated because none is shown on the proposed plat. But that is because KLN is not proposing horse use on any lots. They argue the proposed development could not support horse keeping based on the “outlines of the locations on each lot where they anticipate constructing the houses” (Challenge, at p. 4) shown on the proposed plat. However, the footprints of house locations shown on the preliminary plat are conceptual and do not necessarily reflect where houses will be constructed. The fact that KLN is not proposing horse keeping fails to demonstrate that certain lots could not meet the City’s requirements for keeping horses, just as the Examiner concluded. Indeed, if the demand for lots capable of keeping horses is as strong as asserted by the Challengers, it is possible that one or more of the planned larger lots could be sold and developed for that purpose.

Regardless, whether some or all of the proposed lots could support equestrian use is irrelevant because, as noted above, the BTNP does not require all lots in the Bridle Trails neighborhood – let alone within the areas designated as LDR 1-3 on the BTNP Land Use Map – to be capable of supporting horse keeping in order to be “equestrian oriented.” Moreover, whether members of the public believe there is demand for “horse-acre” lots is entirely irrelevant in determining whether KLN’s rezone application meets the applicable rezone criteria, including consistency with the Comprehensive Plan and BTNP.⁴

For all these reasons, the Examiner correctly concluded that the proposed rezone for Bridlestone Estates is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and BTNP.

3. *The proposed rezone is compatible with the existing land uses in the immediate vicinity of the subject property (KZC §130.40(2)).*

The proposed rezone is consistent with the land uses in the immediate vicinity, including the property to the north (the existing single-family residential subdivision of Sablewood (recorded in 1989) with lots slightly smaller in size on average to those proposed for Bridlestone Estates) and south of Bridlestone Estates (the existing single-family subdivision Cor-Sun Ranch Estates (recorded in 1982) with lots a half-acre and larger). In fact, KLN is requesting a rezone to the same RS-12.5 zoning that applies to the Sablewood subdivision. One of the Challengers acknowledged in his written comments to the Examiner (see Staff Recommendation, Attachment 5, at p. 88) that the proposed

⁴ Challengers also assert that the CC&R’s for Cor-Sun Ranch Estates do not permit horse keeping. Challenge, at p. 4. KLN respectfully submits that is not what the CC&R’s provide. The CC&R’s (Hearing Examiner Ex. I, at p. 3) appear to allow horse keeping provided the lot owner obtains approval from the HOA’s Architectural Control Committee.

rezone for Bridlestone Estates would be consistent with those existing developments. The record reflects that the proposed rezone would also be compatible with Bridle Trails State Park by providing a public equestrian/pedestrian trail connection for citizens generally as well as the residents of Bridlestone Estates to enjoy the extensive trail system in the park as well as the environmental stewardship and other cultural programs sponsored by the Bridle Trails Park Foundation. The Examiner, therefore, correctly concluded the rezone is compatible with existing land uses in the immediate vicinity. See Examiner's Recommendation, Conclusion E.1.b.(3), at p. 8. Challengers do not argue in their Challenge that the rezone for Bridlestone Estates is incompatible with existing land uses in the immediate vicinity.

4. *The proposed rezone bears a substantial relationship to the public health, safety, or welfare (KZC §130.40(3)), and is in the best interest of the community of Kirkland (KZC §130.40(4)).*

Challengers combine their arguments regarding the criterion requiring a rezone "to bear a substantial relationship to the public health, safety or welfare" with the criterion requiring a rezone to be in the "best interest of the community." In challenging the Examiner's Recommendation on these criteria, Challengers cite only to the Examiner's Conclusions E.1.b.(3) and (4) (Examiner's Recommendation, at p. 8) in which she concluded these criteria were met. Challengers baldly assert that "[t]his analysis and conclusions are entirely generic and would apply equally to redevelopment of the subject property at the current RS/RSX 35 zoning." Challenge, at p. 5.

Challengers argument, however, entirely ignores the detailed factual findings made by the Examiner upon which her Conclusions were based. Those findings are anything but "generic." See Examiner's Recommendation, § E.1.a., at pp. 4-7. Moreover, whether the Examiner's conclusions would apply equally to redevelopment under the existing zoning is irrelevant. The issue is whether the proposed rezone is consistent with the applicable rezone criteria. Washington law recognizes that a rezone consistent with applicable development regulations and applicable comprehensive plan furthers the public health, safety, morals and general welfare. See Henderson v. Kittitas Cy., 124 Wn. App. 747, 756 (2004) (holding a development that increases tax revenues and is consistent with the comprehensive plan is a benefit to the public health, safety, and welfare). KLN details above how the proposed rezone is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan and BTNP.

KLN respectfully submits that the best expression of the public health, safety and welfare, and the interests of the community, is demonstrated by compliance with the City's Comprehensive Plan (and, here, the BTNP) and adopted development regulations. The record before the Examiner overwhelmingly demonstrates that the Bridlestone Estates proposal is consistent with the City's adopted development regulations – including those for critical areas, storm water management, and tree preservation. The Bridlestone Estates proposal, including the rezone to RS-12.5

zoning, will bear a substantial relationship to the public health, safety, and welfare, and is in the best interests of the City, in many different respects:

- The past equestrian use of the site has had a negative impact on the on-site wetlands and associated buffers, which have become degraded over the years. The current proposal includes removal of existing encroachments upon the wetlands and their associated buffers, and significant wetland re-establishment, enhancement and mitigation that will result in a net increase in function and values of wetlands and buffers.
- The proposal will substantially benefit Yarrow Creek through installation of a new culvert that will enhance fish passage over existing conditions.
- The site in the past has had extensive equestrian use with no comprehensive storm water management, resulting in impacts to both the wetlands and Yarrow Creek. Numerous existing septic systems onsite will be replaced. The proposed development will include the design and construction of a storm water management system consistent with the City's adopted storm water management requirements, which will be a significant enhancement over existing conditions.
- The proposal substantially exceeds the requirements for retention of "significant" trees and further includes extensive planting of new trees and shrubs as part of the critical areas mitigation plan.
- The proposed development preserves a pedestrian/equestrian connection to Bridle Trails State Park consistent with the equestrian nature of the neighborhood.
- The proposed development will include frontage improvements along 116th Ave. NE that will include a bike lane and equestrian/pedestrian trail, which will improve safety over existing conditions.

Other than the proposed rezone, Challengers have not argued the proposal fails to meet any particular development regulations. Moreover, the proposed rezone for Bridlestone Estates is consistent with and fully implements the BTNP Land Use Map for all the reasons stated above. The proposed rezone therefore furthers the public health, safety and welfare, and is in the best interest of the community.

Challengers also assert that the proposed rezone is not in the best interest of the community because "the Hearing Examiner's analysis ignores the more than 60 people who appeared at the hearing against the proposed rezone and subdivision, . . .", and that "[e]liminating horse keeping on these properties would be a substantial blow to the equestrian character of Bridle Trails." Challenge, at p. 5. While the concerns of the equestrian community are understandable, KLN respectfully submits the City must also consider the issues and concerns of the property owners themselves. The BTNP (at p. XV.C-4) does not require, but only "encourages", existing equestrian facilities to remain. In addition, as the Staff Recommendation (II.C.1.b., at p. 8) notes, "[t]here are no specific statements in the Comprehensive Plan requiring that equestrian facilities must

be provided within this area.”⁵ Nothing in the City’s Comprehensive Plan or development regulations can compel equestrian use even if lots are big enough for such use.

The prior owner of Evergreen Equestrian Center, Michael Crooks, submitted written testimony to the Examiner as to his decision to shut down his facilities and sell his property because they were no longer financially feasible to operate. See Hearing Examiner Exhibit E. Similarly, Andrea Lorig, owner of the property on which Park Place Farm was previously operated, provided written comments how she had been operating her facility at a loss for years. See Hearing Examiner Exhibit L. While KLN can understand that the loss of those facilities is disappointing to the equestrian community, the fact that those facilities have been shut down by the property owners is not a basis for denying the proposed rezone. That is especially so where the City has no policies or regulations requiring existing equestrian facilities to remain or new equestrian facilities to be provided.

More importantly, Washington law recognizes that land use decisions cannot be based on community displeasure but must be based on adopted policies and standards. See *Maranatha Mining, Inc., v. Pierce Cy.*, 59 Wn. App. 795, 804-805 (1990) (holding that “[c]ommunity displeasure cannot be the basis of a permit denial”); see also *Washington State Dept. of Corrections v. City of Kennewick*, 86 Wn. App. 521, 533-534 (1997). Challengers fail to demonstrate that the proposed rezone is inconsistent with any of the applicable rezone criteria, or with any applicable development regulation.

5. *KLN did reach out to the community regarding its proposed development.*

In arguing that the proposed rezone is not in the best interest of the community, Challengers argue that: “[i]t was clear during that hearing that the applicant had made no effort to reach out to the community to hear, much less consider, their needs or interests.” Challenge, at p. 6 (emphasis added). That is simply not true.

KLN presented testimony to the Examiner at the March 9th public hearing regarding its efforts to reach out to three different groups.

First, KLN sent notices of a public open house to the property owners at the Sablewood and Cor-Sun Ranch Estates subdivisions. That open house was held in September 2015. Of the 70+ property owners in those two developments who were sent notices, only four people (two couples) came to the open house.

⁵ It should be noted that the City’s zoning prohibits any new commercial equestrian facilities. Thus, if any equestrian facility were provided or required to be provided it would have to be a non-commercial facility maintained at the sole cost and expense of the homeowners. Thus, the homeowners would incur the cost and expense of maintaining such an equestrian facility even if none of the homeowners actually keep a horse(s) on their property.

Second, KLN attempted for several months to set up a meeting with the South Rose Hill/Bridle Trails Neighborhood Association. Unfortunately, KLN was never able to set up a meeting time and location. (It should be noted that the Hearing Examiner's public hearing was specifically moved from March 8th to March 9th so as not to conflict with the Neighborhood Association's monthly meeting thereby allowing its members to attend the public hearing on Bridlestone Estates.)

Third, KLN did attempt to reach out to representatives of the equestrian community. As the City Council can tell from the public comments and list of parties of record, there is a wide range of people and groups all purporting to represent the "equestrian community." KLN acknowledges that it did not reach out to each and every person or group. But KLN did reach out to two persons/groups referred to KLN by City Staff as representing the interests of the equestrian community. One of those persons was contacted by KLN's public relations consultant, and chose not to respond. The representative of the second group to which KLN was referred (which group previously operated a training/boarding facility at the Evergreen Equestrian Center on the project site) stated there was probably no reason to meet unless KLN was willing modify its development proposal to provide a further equestrian amenity as part of the proposed development.

KLN respectfully submits it is disingenuous for Challengers to take KLN to task (falsely) for making "no effort" to reach out to the community. Indeed, KLN made multiple attempts to reach out to the various groups referred to KLN by City Staff as being representative stakeholders of the community. In addition, public notice of the application for Bridlestone Estates was sent out to the public, and City Staff established a project website which included information regarding how to communicate with the applicant. Yet KLN received no substantive communications or inquiries from members of the public, or anyone from the "equestrian community", seeking to begin a dialogue regarding their issues/concerns with the proposed development.

Challengers assert that the rezone should be denied because "[a]pproving the rezone and subdivision as currently proposed would represent the loss of nearly twenty acres of property that has been used for horse keeping for more than twenty years." Challenge, at p. 6. That argument ignores the unrefuted fact that, as noted above, the decisions to shut down those facilities were made by the prior owners because they were no longer financially feasible and/or were operating at a loss. Denying the rezone and subdivision will not bring those facilities back. As noted above, the BTNP merely "encourages" existing facilities to be maintained. There is no legal authority for the City to deny the proposed rezone based on the past/current property owners' decisions to shut down their equestrian facilities and sell their properties.

Conclusion

There is simply no legal basis in the City's Comprehensive Plan, the BTNP or the City's development regulations to remand this proposal and require KLN to negotiate with the "equestrian community" on a new configuration for the project that would enable horse

keeping. The BTNP has for 30 years recognized that this property could be developed at 1-3 dwelling units per acre. The proposed rezone and subdivision (2 dwelling units per acre) is entirely consistent with those densities. Nothing in the Comprehensive Plan, BTNP or development regulations requires the applicant to either retain existing equestrian facilities or provide new equestrian facilities as part of the development. The Bridlestone Estates proposal is "equestrian oriented", consistent with the BTNP, in that it (a) provides equestrian-friendly frontage improvements on 116th Ave. NE, (b) provides a pedestrian/equestrian trail connection to Bridle Trails State Park, and (c) has 6 lots over 20,000 square feet on which an owner could potentially apply to the City for keeping a horse.

For all these reasons, KLN respectfully submits that the proposed rezone to RS 12.5 zoning for Bridlestone Estates is fully consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, the BTNP, the rezone criteria and all applicable development regulations. KLN respectfully requests the City Council approve the Bridlestone Estates rezone and subdivision consistent with the Staff Recommendation and the Examiner's Recommendation.

Thank you for considering these comments.

Best regards,



Brian L. Holtzclaw
General Counsel
KLN Construction, Inc.
19000 33rd Ave. W., Ste. 200
Lynnwood, WA 98036
brian@village-life.net
Office: (425) 778-4111, ext. 108
Fax: (425) 778-0409
Cell: (425) 478-7453

Cc: Desiree Goble, Planning and Building Department (via delivery)
Parties or Record (see attached affidavit of service)

AFFIDAVIT OF SERVICE

I, Cher Anderson, being first duly sworn on oath deposes and says that I am 18 years of age or older. That I served the above Response from KLN Construction, Inc. to Challenge by Amy Supple, Jim Erckmann, Jennifer Duncan (individually and on behalf of the Lake Washington Saddle Club), Suzanne Kagen and Molly Lawrence regarding the Hearing Examiner's March 16, 2016 Findings, Conclusions and Recommendation to approve Bridlestone Estates Preliminary Subdivision and Rezone SUB15-00572, by the manners indicated below upon the following-named persons who are parties entitled to receive same and to participate in the land use proceeding identified in Kirkland Planning and Building Department File No. SUB15-00572. Those named below constitute all of the parties to this proceeding.

EXECUTED at Lynnwood, Washington on this 1st day of April, 2016.

Cher Anderson
Cher Anderson

DATED at Lynnwood, Washington, this 1st day of April, 2016.



Notary's Signature Teresa L. Gash
Print Notary's Name Teresa L. Gash
Notary Public in and for the State of Washington
Residing at: Snohomish, WA
My Commission expires: 06-20-2017

By Delivery:

The following party received the above Response to Bridlestone Estates Preliminary Subdivision and Rezone SUB15-00572 by Hand Delivery:

City of Kirkland
Planning & Building Department
ATTN: Desiree Goble
123 5th Avenue
Kirkland, WA 98033

By U.S. Mail:

The following parties received the above Response to Bridlestone Estates Preliminary Subdivision and Rezone SUB15-00572 by U.S. Mail:

Linda Lambert
825 8th AVE S
Kirkland, WA 98033

Rick Ostrander
9 Bridlewood Circle
Kirkland, WA 98033

Sarah J Sanford
8050 122nd AVE NE
Kirkland, WA 98033

Laura Fisher
7825 123rd AVE NE
Kirkland, WA 98033

Mary C and Christopher Meek
24 Bridlewood Circle
Kirkland, WA 98033

Dr. and Mrs. H.G. Plut, Jr.
17 Bridlewood Circle
Kirkland, WA 98033

Bruce and Alene Patterson
6 Bridlewood Circle
Kirkland, WA 98033

Laura Huddlestone
5222 18th AVE SW
Seattle, WA 98106

Lisa Miniken
7419 224th AVE NE
Redmond, WA 98053

Jim Erckmann
26 Bridlewood Circle
Kirkland, WA 98033

Peter Speer and Marian
Osborne
1520 2nd Street
Kirkland, WA 98033

Lynn Erckmann
26 Bridlewood Circle
Kirkland, WA 98033

Reiner and Mary Decher
5249 140th AVE NE
Bellevue, WA 98005

Jack Goldberg
4916 119th PL NE
Kirkland, WA 98033

Amy Supple
4649 137th AVE NE
Bellevue, WA 98005

Karen Perry
4 Bridlewood Circle
Kirkland, WA 98033

Dianna Connelly
10202 NE 197th ST
Bothell, WA 98011

David and Shannon Jones
243 10th AVE
Kirkland, WA 98033

Karen Walter
Muckleshoot Indian Tribe
Fisheries Division
39015 172nd AVE SE
Auburn, WA 98092
Meryl Keim
4531 112th AVE NE
Kirkland, WA 98033

Dave and Shannon Gies
5 Bridlewood Circle
Kirkland, WA 98033

Patrick McGraner
Department of Ecology/NWRO
3190 160th AVE SE
Bellevue, WA 98008

Carolyn Adams
13315 NE 61st ST
Kirkland, WA 98033

Susan Shecket
1214 25th AVE E
Seattle, WA 98112

Rosie Carey and Jeff Hoover
5535 127th AVE NE
Kirkland, WA 98033

Shai Steiner
4434 137th AVE NE
Bellevue, WA 98005

Carla F. Squires
21805 NE 161st ST
Woodinville, WA 98077

Krista Taylor
323 Prospect ST
Seattle, WA 98109

Nancy Mellman
4706 149th AVE SE
Bellevue, WA 98006

Jana Banjanin
17135 131st AVE NE, Apt N208
Woodinville, WA 98072

Michelle Peters
14425 NE 10th PL
Bellevue, WA 98007

Keeston Chin
Leader - Golden Wings 4-H
Club
139 164th AVE SE
Bellevue, WA 98008

Laura Gorcester
13525 Lost Lake Rd
Snohomish, WA 98296

Michael and Barbara Gordon
3838 134th AVE NE
Bellevue, WA 98005

Jennifer Duncan, President
Lake Washington Saddle Club
13219 NE 75th ST
Redmond, WA 98052

Glen Buhlmann
12813 NE 83rd ST
Kirkland, WA 98033

Patricia Moir
10610 NE 57th ST
Kirkland, WA 98033

Betsy Lewis
12014 NE 65th ST
Kirkland, WA 98033

Shannon Underwood
4210 132nd AVE NE
Bellevue, WA 98005

Linda Ström
208 19th AVE
Kirkland, WA 98033

Peter and Tracy Wise
3400 142nd PL NE
Bellevue, WA 98007

Shelly Bowman and Lizette
Hedberg
2440 140th AVE NE
Bellevue, WA 98005

Connie L. Patmore-Farr
2009 14nd PL SW
Lynnwood, WA 98087

Candice Boyd
3102 211th AVE NE
Sammamish, WA 98074

Andrea Lorig
4604 16th NE
Kirkland, WA 98033

Jane Paige
245 Lake Hills Blvd
Bellevue, WA 98008

Amy F. Itkin
8623 NE 10th ST
Medina, WA 98039

Olinda Blackburn
6115 133rd AVE NE
Kirkland, WA 98033

Pat McGiffert
13621 NE 42nd ST
Bellevue, WA 98005

Alice Prince
6021 136th AVE NE
Kirkland, WA 98033

Ann Shilling
10 E Roanoke ST, #5
Seattle, WA 98102

Molly Lawrence
c/o Van Ness Feldman
719 Second Avenue, Suite
1150
Seattle, WA 98104

Deborah Giddings
4649 137th AVE NE
Bellevue, WA 98005

Jessica Reaves
17514 West Riverside Drive
Bothell, WA 98012

Janka Hobbs
13506 NE 66th ST
Kirkland, WA 98033

Suzanne Kagen
36 Bridlewood Circle
Kirkland, WA 98033

Rob Hemingson
4682 140th AVE NE
Bellevue, WA 98005

Gavin Wissler
210 240th ST SE
Bellevue, WA 98021

Andy Held
5505 127th AVE NE
Kirkland, WA 98033

Kay Brossard
6602 57th AVE NE
Seattle, WA 98115

Mehri Kaufman
6330 133rd AVE NE
Kirkland, WA 98033

Paula Munson
6115 130th AVE NE
Kirkland, WA 98033

Nilufer & Robert Norsworthy
2829 140th AVE NE
Bellevue, WA 98005

Ksenia Nasielski
6540 116th AVE NE
Kirkland, WA 98033

By Email (no mailing addresses provided in written comments):

The following parties received the above Response to Bridlestone Estates Preliminary Subdivision and Rezone SUB15-00572 via Email:

Victoria Holland	vholland.inc@gmail.com	
Beth Smith	bethsmith.equestrian.97@gmail.com	
Sarah Moulton	harmonyh@freeland.net	
No Name	dunrockin@comcast.net	
Rose Taicz	taicz6@frontier.com	
Laura Giorgi	ltgiorgi@comcast.net	
Charles Murphey	charley.murphey@apmortgage.com	
McLean G. Carroll	leancarroll@comcast.net	
Cindy Costa	cindy1mike2ntm3@comcast.net	
Gunilla Beard	gunillabeard@earthlink.net	
Thomas & Linda Treece	ljtreece@comcast.net	
Emily Hawkins	eswang2@gmail.com	
Selma Dale	selmaldale@hotmail.com	
Michelle Plesko	michelle.plesko@outlook.com	
Dionne Brooks	dbrooks46@yahoo.com	
Kelly Huenefeld	kellyhuenefeld@gmail.com	
Klara Lukacs	klaracemily@gmail.com	
Don Samdahl	don@filmjabber.com	
Judy Willman (President, King County Executive Horse Council)		rayjudywillman@me.com