

Appendix H

Updated Draft Comprehensive Plan Revisions

10/04

PROPOSED CHANGES TO THE DRAFT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN ISSUED ON JULY 1, 2004

The following are proposed changes to the Draft Comprehensive Plan issued on July 1, 2004. The changes are either in response to public comment, further corrections to data and maps, or as an outcome from revising the 2022 land use capacity and network analysis due to new information on the timing of development and redevelopment in the Totem Center study area.

The changes described below reflect the recommendation of the Planning Commission made on August 26, 2004 and the Transportation Commission on August 25, 2004. The Houghton Community Council made the same recommendation on August 23, 2004, except for the Economic Development Element. The Houghton Community Council deferred their recommendation on the Public Service Element's PS-2.1 to September 29, 2004 and then made different recommendation on the policy than the Planning Commission. The two areas of differences between the Planning Commission and the Houghton Community Council are described below in sections No. 6 and No. 8.

The new proposed text is underlined and the deleted July 1, 2004 text is dashed out. Before each revised text is the reason for the change.

1. Introduction Element

a. Reason for change (pages 3 and 4 in the Draft Plan): Correct the projected population based on the estimated decline in the average number of people per household.

POPULATION

With an estimated city population of 45,790 as of April 1, 2002, Kirkland's population has steadily grown at an average annual rate of 1.1% since 1990. This increase represents a combination of new births and people moving into Kirkland. By the year 2022, it is expected that Kirkland's population will grow to more than 54,790 persons 8,773 more than live in Kirkland in 2003.

Table I-1 below shows how Kirkland's population has grown over time and what the projected population is expected to be over the next twenty years.

Table I-1: Kirkland Growth Trends

<u>Year</u>	<u>Population</u>	<u>Population Increase</u>	<u>Land Area Increase</u>
-	-	-	-
1910	532		
1920	1,354	155%	0%
1930	1,714	27%	2%
1940	2,048	19%	0%
1950	4,713	130%	112%
1960	6,025	28%	6%
1970 ¹	15,070	150%	170%
1980	18,785	25%	16%
1990 ²	40,052	113%	67%
2000	45,054	12%	0%
2010 ³	<u>49,327</u>	<u>9.5%</u>	0%
2012	50,256	--	--
2020 ³	<u>53,898</u>	<u>9.3%</u>	0%
2022 ³	54,790	---	--
2030 ³	<u>58,287</u>	<u>8.1 %</u>	0%

1 Includes consolidation with the City of Houghton in 1968, which included 1.91 square miles.

2 Includes annexations of Rose Hill and Juanita in 1988.

Source : Office of Financial Management

3 City of Kirkland Planning Department Projections. Growth trends do not reflect Potential Annexations.

2. Introduction and Land Use Elements

a. Reason for change (page 2 of the Introduction and page 11 of the Land Use Element in the Draft Plan): Revise the Available Capacity projection based on a revised land use capacity analysis due to recent changes in assumptions for redevelopment of the Totem Center areas.

TABLE LU-4 and Table I-8
Comparison of Growth Targets and Available Capacity

	<u>2000 Existing¹</u>	<u>2022 Growth Targets²</u>	<u>Available Capacity³</u>
<u>Housing Units</u>	21,831	27,311 (at 5,480 new households)	<u>28,751</u>
<u>Employment</u>	32,384	41,184 (at 8,800 new jobs)	<u>54,565</u>

3. Vision Statement

a. Reason for change (page 2 in the Draft Plan): Respond to comments from the public about addressing the Bridle Trails equestrian community in the Vision Statement or Framework Goals.

A VISION FOR KIRKLAND

Kirkland in 2022 is an attractive, vibrant, and inviting place to live, work and visit. Our lakefront community, with its long shoreline, provides views and access to the lake and is a destination place for residents and visitors. Kirkland is a community with a small-town feel, retaining its sense of history while adjusting gracefully to changes in the 21st Century.

The city is a place where people are friendly and helpful, ideas are respected and action is taken based on collaborative decisions. We have a diverse population made up of various income and age groups from various ethnic and educational backgrounds. We are committed to developing and strengthening a healthy community by creating programs that assist those in need, encourage individual expressions and provide enrichment opportunities for an increasingly diverse population. High quality local schools are important to us. Our neighborhood, business, and civic associations; our faith based groups; and our school organizations have strong citizen involvement.

Our neighborhoods are secure, stable and well-maintained, creating the foundation for our high quality of life. Each neighborhood has its own character which is a community asset. People from all economic, age, and ethnic groups live here in a variety of housing types. Our residential areas are well maintained with single family and multi family homes, and include traditional subdivisions, waterfront-oriented neighborhoods, urban villages and an equestrian community. We have increased diversity and affordability with smaller homes on smaller lots, compact developments and accessory housing units.

Mixed land uses in neighborhoods help to minimize driving. Many of our apartments and condominiums are close to commercial areas and transportation hubs.

4. Community Character Element

a. Reason for change below (page 7 of the Draft Plan): Update Table CC-1 to reflect a recently approved historic overlay zone for the Malm House in the South Juanita Neighborhood.

TABLE CC-1
Historic Resources and Community Landmarks

Add the Malm House at 12656 100th Ave NE, an historic home that was rezoned in June 2004 for an historic overlay, to Table CC-1, Historic Resources and Community landmarks.

5. Land Use Element

a. Reason for change below (Figure LU-2 in the Draft Plan): Correct the classification on Figure LU-2 for one commercial area to be consistent with the definitions of each commercial area classification found in the Land Use Element.

Changed *Figure LU-2: Commercial Areas* to rename the “Market Business District” to the “Market Neighborhood Center.”

6. Economic Development Element

a. Reason for changes (pages 4 and 8 in the Draft Plan): Both the Planning Commission and the Houghton Community Council responded to a written comment from the Chamber of Commerce that the text should include the idea that the City should take a proactive role in working businesses and neighborhoods to improve the business climate in the community. Also, the Houghton Community Council agreed to remove the phrase, “consistent with community values, goals and policies” from Policy ED-1.1

Both the Planning Commission and Houghton Community Council recommend the following change to the draft element:

Policy ED-2.2. Create and maintain a tax and regulatory environment that is reasonable, responsive and timely.

A business climate that combines a fair and competitive tax environment with a positive regulatory environment contributes to business success. Kirkland has favorable tax rates and user fees compared with other cities in the region. The City should proactively work with businesses and neighborhoods to improve the business climate in our community for everyone's benefit. Businesses are encouraged to work with the City and neighborhood organizations to identify and make recommendations for changes to regulations and improvements to permit processes. Having clear and reasonably fast permit processes in government also contributes to a positive business climate. The City should continue to provide a regulatory environment that allows for flexibility without sacrificing community standards. Improvements to permit processes should be continually made so that permits are handled in a reasonable, responsive and timely manner.

The Houghton Community Council recommends the following additional change to the draft element in response to the Chamber of Commerce's comment letter. The Planning Commission does not recommend this change.

Policy ED-1.1: Foster a strong and diverse economy.

7. Transportation Element

a. Reason for change (page 15-17 in the Draft Plan): Adjust the level of service standards (LOS) in Tables T-2 and T-3 to reflect revisions to the 2022 land use capacity assumptions and transportation network system due to a change in land use capacity projections for the Totem Center area. In June 2003, the City completed a 2022 land use capacity assumption and transportation network analysis. This analysis was the basis for the LOS proposed in Tables T-2 and T-3 in the Draft Plan. Since June 2003, the City has received new information on the timing of the Totem Lake Mall redevelopment plan, and the development plans for several sites in the Totem Center area that the City previously had assumed would not redevelop in the next 20 years. This new information alters the City's land use capacity assumptions for 2022 and results in a projection of more household units and employment in the Totem Center area and proportionately fewer households units and employment in other areas of the city over the next 20 years. The change results in minor shifts in the LOS for each subarea in Table T-2 and T-3.

The Draft Environmental Impact Statement mentioned that the 2022 land use capacity assumptions may be revised which could result in revisions to the transportation network system and to the LOS in Tables T-2 and T-3.

TABLE T-2
Maximum Allowed Subarea Average V/C Ratio for System Intersections and Individual
Intersection LOS ,

<i>Use as Maximum Allowed Average V/C after January 1</i>	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008
Forecast for Year	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013
Subarea	Average V/C Ratio				
Southwest	<u>0.89</u>	0.89	<u>0.89</u>	0.90	<u>0.90</u>
Northwest	<u>0.88</u>	0.89	<u>0.89</u>	0.90	<u>0.91</u>
Northeast	<u>0.86</u>	0.87	<u>0.87</u>	0.88	<u>0.89</u>
East	<u>1.04</u>	1.04	<u>1.05</u>	1.05	<u>1.05</u>
Maximum allowed individual	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30	1.30
system intersection V/C ratio					

The LOS standards were calculated through the use of a computerized transportation model shared with Bellevue and Redmond, called the BKR model. The standards are the outcome of land use and transportation network choices which were entered into the model.

Table T-2 is designed to provide standards for the maximum allowed subarea average V/C ratio for the next few years. To pass the road concurrency test, new development may not exceed the maximum allowable subarea average V/C ratio for system intersections (see Table T-4 below) six years into the future starting from the date of making a concurrency application. The first row of the Table T-2 (italicized) indicates the year that a proposed development is submitted for a road concurrency test. The second row indicates the six-year horizon that a new development's traffic impacts are assessed. Each set of standards in the column below the application year and the horizon year is based on a LOS forecast for six years in the future. Forecasts are derived by linear interpolation between forecasts for 2004 and 2022 and include forecasted impacts of development that have been approved but not yet built.

Example of how to use Table T-2: A development is seeking concurrency approval during 2005. What is the set of standards for subarea average V/C that the development must not exceed? Since the project is seeking approval in 2005, the second column of numbers is used. This set of standards (Southwest subarea standard of 0.89 , Northwest subarea standard of 0.89 , etc.) corresponds to a forecast horizon year of 2010. The development's traffic impacts may not cause the level of service at the signalized system intersections to exceed these standards.

In addition, the LOS methodology requires both standards (Subarea Average V/C and V/C not to exceed 1.30) to be satisfied. Traffic from a new development may not cause the average V/C of system signalized intersections in a subarea to operate at an LOS lower than the average and may not cause any system signalized intersection to exceed a V/C ratio of 1.30 as shown in Table T-2.

The capacity (C) of a signalized intersection is determined by a wide variety of factors, including signal phasing, number of lanes and traffic mix. It is a measure of the maximum number of vehicles that can go through the intersection in a set period of time. The volume (V) is the sum of "critical" volumes that indicate maximum demand at the intersection. The volume to capacity

ratio (V/C) is the volume divided by the capacity. For the purpose of the plan, V/C is calculated for the PM peak hour.

A V/C of less than 1.0 means that the volume at the intersection is less than the capacity. If the V/C is equal to 1.0, the intersection's volume and capacity are equal. When the V/C is greater than 1.0, volume has exceeded capacity. As the V/C increases, the congestion at the intersection increases and the level of service gets worse.

Underlying the standards is the concept that the system is not considered failing if the peak-hour is congested. Use of the peak-hour for measuring level of service is standard in the region. This "worst case" measure implies that traffic will flow better during the rest of the day. Although very high, the V/C ratios in the standard are acceptable because there is a limited amount of funding available to improve the situation, and it is not possible to build our way out of congestion even if funds were unlimited. Road widening has quality-of-life impacts that many in the community find unacceptable.

The standards are based on congestion becoming worse in the future. This reflects the proposed network and funding, and an increase in trips. The need to move to alternative modes becomes all the more clear when we can see the peak-hour vehicular level of service forecasted for the future.

Table T-3 describes subarea average V/C ratios for 2003 traffic counts and for forecast 2004 and 2022 volumes. These numbers are provided for reference.

Table T-3
2003 and Forecasted Subarea Average LOS for System Intersections

Subarea Average V/C Ratio			
Subarea	2003 Traffic Count	2003 Traffic Plus Projects approved but not yet built	2022
Southwest	0.77	<u>0.89</u>	<u>0.92</u>
Northwest	0.83	<u>0.88</u>	<u>1.01</u>
Northeast	0.76	<u>0.86</u>	<u>0.99</u>
East	0.94	<u>1.04</u>	<u>1.10</u>

b. Reason for change (page 22 in the Draft Plan): Add the level of service standards (LOS) to Policy T-5.5 for completed bicycle and pedestrian corridors found in the adopted Non-Motorized Transportation Plan (NMTP). One goal of the Comprehensive Plan update project is the make the Comprehensive Plan consistent with the NMTP. This new LOS was not included in Policy T-5.5 in the Draft Plan.

Policy T-5.5:

Strive to achieve a level of service standard by 2022 of 59 miles of bicycle facilities and 155 miles of pedestrian facilities, six east-west and four north-south completed pedestrian corridors, and four east--west and two north-south completed bicycle corridors as identified in the Non-Motorized Transportation Plan.

c. Reason for change (page 35 in Draft Plan): Add a second south bound left turn lane to the TR20-15 project to maintain the LOS for the intersection of NE 132nd Street/100 Ave NE. The additional road project is needed to meet the maximum LOS of 1.3 for this intersection because of the revised 2022 land use capacity assumptions discussed above for Tables T-2 and T-3.

TABLE T-5
Project Descriptions for the 2022 Transportation Project List

TR20-15 Location: Description:	Intersection Improvements 100 th Ave NE/NE 132 nd Street Construct a northbound receiving lane on the north leg of the intersection and restripe existing northbound right-turn lane to a through/right-turn configuration. <u>Construct a second southbound left turn lane.</u> Funded CIP project TR-0083.
--------------------------------------	--

d. Reason for change (page 43-44 in the Draft Plan): Revise the text and Tables T-6 and T-7 to respond to the Washington State Department of Transportation’s comment letter. The WSDOT requests that Section E of the Transportation Element be changed to reflect the State’s new level of service methodology and standards for State facilities (the introductory text and Tables T-6 and T-7) and to replace the term “Highway of Strategic Significance” to “Highway of Statewide Significance.”

E. State Transportation Plans and Policies

State law requires that certain information about state facilities be provided in local Comprehensive Plans. The information does not represent a standard that must be met, but rather a disclosure of the status of State facilities now and in the future. Much of the required information is contained in Tables T-6 and T-7. Also, Figure T-1 shows State facilities in Kirkland. There are two State facilities in Kirkland, SR 908 and I-405. SR 908 runs from just west of I-405 to 132nd Avenue along NE 85th Street, a distance of 0.99 miles. It is an urban principal arterial and is designated as a Highway of Statewide Significance. From the southern border to the northern border of Kirkland, I-405 is 5.07 miles in length and is an Urban Interstate as well as a Highway of Statewide Significance.

For Highways of Statewide Significance, Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) uses an Annual Average Daily Traffic to one hour capacity ratio (AADT/C) to

determine the severity of congestion over a 24 hour period. AADT/C is the ratio of traffic volume to the physical capacity of the roadway. This is also known as the Average Congestion Ratio or ACR. Index values under this system range from 1 (little to no congestion) to 24 (theoretically, congestion over the entire 24 hour day). This congestion indicator enables the comparison of each highway's daily volume of traffic to a one-hour capacity. WDSOT has set the current LOS standard for I-405 in Kirkland at ACR 10.

The Washington State Transportation Commission adopted this congestion index measure (ACR) and established thresholds to identify "congested" highways at the index values of 10 for urban highways and 6 for rural highways. When compared to traditional peak hour measures, these thresholds approximate LOS D operation in urban areas and LOS C operation in rural areas. Highways which exceed these are identified as deficient.

SR-908 is a Highway of Regional Significance. Adoption of LOS standards for highways of regional significance (HRS) followed a year long process involving WSDOT and the region's cities and counties. WSDOT has set the level of service standard for SR908 at E-mitigated.

Since 2003, a corridor study for the entire I-405 corridor has been underway. A programmatic EIS has been completed, with further analysis of the alternates occurring in 2004. The exact nature and timing of improvements to I-405 is contingent upon funding.

REVISED Table T-6
Description of State Facilities in Kirkland

State Route		Posted Speed Limit	Number of Lanes	PM Peak Hour Two-way Traffic Volumes			WSDOT ACR-LOS		
				2003/2022	Roadway Capacity 2003/2022	Existing 2003 PM Peak Hour	Forecasted 2022 Traffic Volumes	Adopted LOS Standard	Existing 2003 V/C LOS
I-405									
From	To								
NE 32 th St	NE 70 th St	60	7/8	15,000/19,000	159685	250569	10	11	13
NE 70 th St	NE 85 th St	60	6/8	15,000/19,000	175124	268338	10	12	14
NE 85 th St	NE 116 th St	60	6/8	15,000/19,000	168416	256477	10	11	13
NE 116 th St	NE 124 th St	60	6/8	15,000/19,000	149861	257600	10	10	14
NE 124 th St	NE 132 nd St	60	6/8	15,000/19,000	126419	218708	10	8	12
SR-908 (NE 85th St)									
From	To								
SB-405 Ramp	NB-405 Ramp	35	5	4172	3774	5443	E-mitigate	0.90	1.16
NB-405 Ramp	120 th Ave NE	35	5	4172	3862	4841	E-mitigate	0.93	1.16
120 th Ave NE	122 nd Ave NE	35	5	4000	3355	3760	E-mitigate	0.84	0.94
122 nd Ave NE	124 th Ave NE	35	5	4000	3215	3410	E-mitigate	0.80	0.85
124 th Ave NE	126 th Ave NE	35	5	4000	3107	3713	E-mitigate	0.78	0.93
126 th Ave NE	128 th Ave NE	35	5	4000	3157	3387	E-mitigate	0.79	0.85
128 th Ave NE	132 nd Ave NE	35	5	4000	3093	4128	E-mitigate	0.77	1.03

REVISED Table T-7
Description of State Controlled Intersections

<u>Signalized State Route Intersections</u>	<u>PM Peak Hour Traffic Volumes</u>		<u>PM Peak Hour LOS</u>			<u>Planned Improvement Projects</u>
	<u>Existing 2003</u>	<u>Future 2022</u>	<u>Existing 2003</u>	<u>Future 2022</u>	<u>Corresponding Letter Grade LOS for 2022</u>	
I-405						
116 th Ave NE/NB Ramp	2546	2356	1.17	1.11	F	None
NE 72 nd Place/SB Ramp	2211	3005	0.90	1.09	F	HOV Queue By-pass
NE 116 th St/NB Ramp	2497	2792	0.83	0.68	C	None
NE 124 th St/NB Ramp	3869	4425	0.69	0.95	E	HOV Queue By-pass
NE 124 th St/SB Ramp	4160	4749	0.83	0.81	D	HOV Queue By-pass
Totem Lake Blvd/120 th Ave NE	2876	3912	1.00	0.92	E	None
SR-908						
NE 85 th St/114 th Ave NE	3900	4803	0.94	1.02	F	Signal Interconnect, add SB left-turn lane
NE 85 th St/120 th Ave NE	4295	5175	1.10	1.18	F	Signal Interconnect, Add 2 nd NB left-turn lane
NE 85 th St/122 nd Ave NE	3773	4044	0.95	0.80	D	Signal Interconnect
NE 85 th St/124 th Ave NE	4202	4604	1.00	1.05	F	Signal Interconnect, Add 2 nd EB left-turn lane

e. Reason for change (see figures in back of the Draft Plan): Combine Figures T-2 and T-8, the existing and proposed bicycle maps into one map and Figures T-3 and T-7, the existing and proposed pedestrian maps, into one map so that the overall existing and planned systems can be seen. Also correcting one error on the maps in the Totem Lake area.

Figures T-2 and T-8, the existing and proposed bicycle system maps, would be combined into one map and Figures T-3 and T-7, the existing and proposed pedestrian system maps, would be combined into one map. In addition, one correction is made to each map on the location of the system in the Totem Lake area.

f. Reason for change (page IX-2 in the existing Plan): Change Figure T-1 to update the classification of the city's major roads. The proposed changes to this figure were not in the Draft Plan of July 1, 2004. However, the proposed changes were described and made available at the public hearings and public open house held in July 2004 and at various public forums earlier this year. The changes to the Figure T-1 do not affect the nature or extent of improvements planned for the city's transportation network system.

Figure T-1 Functional Street Classifications and State Routes is proposed to be revised to reflect current traffic volumes and how the streets are used in the overall city's transportation network system. Some streets are upgraded to Principal Arterial or Minor Arterial and some are downgraded to Access Street.

8. Public Services Element chapter

a. Reason for change (page 7 of the Draft Plan): Respond to a comment from the public about the impacts of the Houghton Transfer Station on the surrounding neighborhood and make some additional minor edits to the text in Policy PS-2.1.

The Planning Commission's recommendation is as follows:

Policy PS-2.1: Coordinate with King County Solid Waste Division to ensure that levels of service for solid waste disposal and transfer are established and followed along with mitigation of the Houghton Transfer Station's impacts.

As the capacity of the Houghton Transfer Station is exceeded, the City should work with King County to ensure that solid waste disposal and transfer services meet local and regional needs . The County should implement mitigation measures to improve pedestrian safety and to reduce impacts of noise, odor and number of large trucks coming to the site. .

The Houghton Community Council's recommendation is as follows:

Policy PS-2.1: Coordinate with King County Solid Waste Division to ensure that levels of service for solid waste disposal and transfer are established and followed along with mitigation of the Houghton Transfer Station's impacts.

As the capacity of the Houghton Transfer Station is reached, the City should work with King County to ensure that the facility continues to meet regional needs until it is phased out. The County should implement mitigation measures to improve pedestrian safety and to reduce impacts of noise, odor and number of large trucks coming to the site. As alternative sites are examined, the City should ensure that the existing provision of services continues.

9. Map Corrections

Central Houghton Neighborhood Land Use Map would be corrected for Parcel # 6836200010 (6602 - 108th Ave NE) and Parcel # 8946500000 (6504-6520 - 108th Ave NE) to change the map from a low density residential to medium density residential land use designation.

This map correction was not included in the Draft Plan issued July 1, 2004, but was presented and made available at the public hearings and open house held in July 2004.

The Zoning Map, the Central Houghton Neighborhood Map and corresponding text in the Comprehensive Plan support this designation. The two sites contain a fire station and a multi-family complex. No reason has been found as to why the Land Use Map is incorrect.

South Juanita Neighborhood Land Use Map (Map SJ1 in the Map Corrections section of the Draft Plan) incorrectly listed the density range from 7-9 dwelling units per acre instead of 4-9 dwelling units per acre. The 4-9 dwelling unit range is consistent with the explanatory text in the Draft Plan and the text in the existing Comprehensive Plan.

Everest Neighborhood (E1 and E2), Moss Bay (MB1), Market/Norkirk/Highlands (MNH1), South Rose Hill (SRH1), and Juanita (J1): reflect map corrections to the RS 5.0 zones in these areas that should be designated on the Land Use Map and the neighborhood maps as low density residential (yellow) and not medium density residential (brown) to be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan text, the corrections to chart Appendix H in the Plan and the Zoning Map.