



CITY OF KIRKLAND

Planning and Community Development Department
123 Fifth Avenue, Kirkland, WA 98033 425.587-3225
www.ci.kirkland.wa.us

MEMORANDUM

To: Planning Commission

From: Angela Ruggeri, AICP, Senior Planner

Date: August 18, 2010

Subject: TOUCHSTONE (PARK PLACE)
FILE NUMBER: ZON07-00016

STAFF RECOMMENDATION

Recommend that the City Council:

1. Re-adopt Ordinances 4170 and 4171, which adopted changes to the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning for the Parkplace property; and
2. Adopt proposed amendments to the Introduction and the Land Use, Transportation and Capital Facilities Elements of the Comprehensive Plan.

The Planning Commission's recommendation will be considered by the City Council at a study session on September 1, 2010 and, if needed, another on September 21. Action by the Council is anticipated no later than October 5, 2010 in order to meet the deadline established by the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board.

BACKGROUND DISCUSSION

In December, 2008, the City Council adopted Ordinance Nos. 4170 and 4171 which amended the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code in association with a private amendment request for the Parkplace property (copies of these ordinances were included in the Planning Commission packet for the public hearing on June 24). The City's decision was challenged by a petition to the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board by Davidson Serles and Continental Plaza. The petitioners challenged the ordinances on a number of grounds. The Hearings Board issued its decision in October of 2009. While it upheld the ordinances and found in favor of the City with respect to most of the petitioners' objections, the Hearings Board found that: 1) the Final Environmental Impact Statement failed to include reasonable alternatives to the Touchstone proposal, including offsite alternatives; and 2) amendments were required to the Capital Facilities and Transportation Elements of the Comprehensive Plan to include all necessary capital improvements and a multi-year financing plan based on the ten-year transportation needs identified in the Comprehensive Plan.

The Hearings Board did not invalidate the ordinances; rather it remanded them to the City for the purpose of correcting the issues that the Board identified. The Hearings Board initially gave the City six months to comply, however, the Board later agreed to the City's request for additional time to allow the City Council to consider the proposed legislative amendments by October 5, 2010.

SUPPLEMENTAL EIS

On October 16, 2008, the City of Kirkland completed the Downtown Area Planned Action Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) addressing Parkplace and two other properties in its vicinity. To address the decision of the Hearings Board, a Supplemental EIS (SEIS) has been prepared. The Draft SEIS was issued on May 27, 2010. A Final SEIS was issued on August 16, 2010. The Final SEIS responds to comments received on the Draft SEIS and provides corrections to the Draft SEIS analysis. Paper copies of both the DEIS and FEIS were previously sent to the Planning Commission. The 2008 Draft and Final EIS and the Draft SEIS are available on line at http://www.ci.kirkland.wa.us/depart/Planning/Code_Updates/Touchstone_Orni_Altom.htm. The Final SEIS is available on line at <http://www.ci.kirkland.wa.us/depart/Planning.htm>

The SEIS evaluated alternative locations for accommodating additional commercial growth in or near Downtown Kirkland. The City previously studied additional employment growth and adopted ordinances approving the Touchstone (Parkplace) Private Amendment Request in 2008. The SEIS was prepared to review alternatives for growth on the Parkplace site to comply with the Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board order and State Environmental Policy Act Rules, which require consideration of off-site alternatives for legislative actions and private rezones in some situations.¹

The SEIS alternatives consist of different locations in or near Downtown Kirkland for accommodating the same amount of growth analyzed on the Parkplace site in the 2008 FEIS. The SEIS alternatives not previously studied in the 2008 FEIS include a Superblock Alternative, Unified Ownership Alternative, and Off-Site Alternative. In addition, the SEIS compares the three new alternatives to the same No Action Alternative studied in 2008.

The new alternatives do not constitute specific development proposals. No applications have been submitted, and the new alternatives do not presume to reflect the intentions of individual property owners or the availability of specific properties. Rather, the new alternatives evaluate different ways that additional office and retail growth could possibly be located in and near Downtown.

After the SEIS was published on May 27, 2010, the City established a 30-day comment period that closed on June 28, 2010. A Planning Commission public hearing was held on June 24, 2010. The hearing was left open for written comments until June 28.

¹ See WAC 197-11-440 (5)(d), as well as Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board Case, *Davidson Serles v. City of Kirkland* (October 5, 2009), Case No. 09-3-0007c.

PLANNING COMMISSION ACTION

In consideration of the information provided in the 2008 EIS, the new SEIS and public comment received, the Planning Commission is asked to make a recommendation to the City Council on the following:

1. Whether to readopt the Touchstone (Parkplace) amendments to the Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code adopted in 2008; and
2. Whether to adopt proposed amendments to the Transportation and Capital Facilities Chapters of the Comprehensive Plan, to meet the requirements of the Growth Management Hearings Board, as well as proposed corrections to charts showing growth capacity figures in the Introduction and Land Use Element of Comprehensive Plan.

1. Touchstone (Parkplace) proposal:

Staff has identified two options:

Option 1: Recommend re-adopting the two ordinances which allow for 954,000 additional square feet of retail and office uses on the Parkplace site. The ordinances were adopted by the City Council in December 2008. The ordinances include:

- Amendments to the City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan (Ordinance #4170)
- Amendments to Kirkland Zoning (Ordinance #4171)

These ordinances are presently still in effect. The Growth Management Hearings Board decision did not invalidate them. It remanded them to the City for the purpose of correcting the issues identified by the Hearings Board.

Option 2: Recommend consideration of Comprehensive Plan and/ or Zoning Code amendments alternative to those adopted by Ordinances 4170 and 4171. With this option, the Planning Commission would recommend the general nature of the amendments desired. If the City Council agrees with this recommendation, the existing ordinances would remain in place, while the Planning Commission develops and conducts public hearings on specific amendments

The Growth Management Hearings Board has required the City to comply with its order by October 5, 2010. If it is determined that changes are to be made to the ordinances, the City will need to go back to the Hearings Board with this decision and request additional time for completion of their requirements.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Option 1: Re-adopt Ordinance Nos. 4170 and 4171.

2. Comprehensive Plan amendments relating to other issues:

In accordance with the direction of the Growth Management Hearings Board, staff has prepared additional amendments to the Transportation and Capital Facilities Chapters of the Comprehensive Plan to include all necessary capital improvements and a multi-year financing plan based on the 10-year transportation needs identified in the Comprehensive Plan, including those supporting Downtown growth

Proposed changes to the charts and figures in the Comprehensive Plan are shown in Appendix B to the Draft SEIS.

<http://www.ci.kirkland.wa.us/Assets/Planning/Planning+PDFs/6SEIS+05272010.pdf>

General wording changes to the text of those chapters are included as Attachments 1 and 2 to this memo.

Minor amendments have also been prepared to the Comprehensive Plan Introduction and Land Use Chapters. The amendments are to Table I-7 and LU-4 in the Kirkland Comprehensive Plan, specifically the "Available Capacity" column since the three approved proposals added growth capacity (see Attachment 3). The figures in Tables I-7 and LU-4 have been revised to be in conformance with each other, to correct slight discrepancies in how the "Available Capacity" column was handled.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION: Adopt an ordinance including the proposed amendments to the Comprehensive Plan.

Attachments:

1. Comprehensive Plan amendments related to Transportation Chapter
2. Comprehensive Plan amendments related to the Capital Facilities Chapter
3. Comprehensive Plan amendments related the Introduction and Land Use Chapter

Cc: A-P Hurd, Touchstone, 2025 First Ave, Suite 1212, Seattle, WA 98121
Kenneth Davidson, Davidson, Czeisler & Kilpatric, P.S., 520 Kirkland Way, Suite 400,
Kirkland, WA 98033
File ZON07-00016

IX. TRANSPORTATION

Policy T-6.5: *Minimize change to topography to the extent feasible when building new rights-of-way.*

The provision of streets requires large public expenditures for construction and maintenance, as well as other nonmonetary costs to the living environment. This policy is intended to minimize these costs by preserving land and the natural landscape to the maximum extent possible.

Policy T-6.6: *Identify, evaluate, and minimize or mitigate the negative environmental impacts of transportation facilities and services whenever feasible.*

When planning and private, need to be evaluated for mitigation in transportation facilities and stream and stream quality deterioration, noise pollution, and landform changes.

The Capital Facilities Element also includes a list of projects over a 12 year period in time.

ies, both public and private, need to be evaluated for mitigation in transportation facilities and stream and stream quality deterioration, noise pollution, and landform changes.

FINANCE

The Comprehensive Plan's funding strategy gives high priority to maintenance of the existing circulation system in a safe and serviceable condition. The strategy for the remaining transportation resources largely devotes them to creating a better balance among travel modes. These new systems include pedestrian, bicycle, transit, and ridesharing facilities and services. This support of new systems results in a funding trade-off, financing the creation of a new, more balanced, circulation environment that gets more use by pedestrians and transit users, instead of financing road improvements that could potentially make it easier to travel by single-occupant vehicle.

Through mitigation some of the forecasted congestion could be reduced (though not eliminated) by substantially increasing the amount of transportation funding and using the revenues to increase system capacity (particularly road capacity). However, it has been assumed in the Comprehensive Plan that available financial resources will continue to be substantially

limited. In addition, the region's jurisdictions have already reached a consensus not to base their transportation future (nor funding for it) on a vastly expanded road system or the dispersed patterns of development that these systems support. This consensus is supported by State and federal policies and funding guidelines. Kirkland's plan and funding strategy are consistent with these larger systems and financial commitments.

The Growth Management Act requires local jurisdictions, including Kirkland, to identify and fund transportation improvements that are sufficient to sustain the level of service standard that has been selected and approved by that jurisdiction. The program of improvements must be funded by revenues that Kirkland agrees to commit toward their construction over the next six-year period. Revenues may include sources such as transportation mitigation fees, State and federal grants, and others.

Section D of this chapter contains a list and map of transportation projects that have been identified for the 20-year planning period. The Capital Facilities Element includes the six-year program of improvements with identified funding sources. Each year the six-year program will be reassessed with regard to funding commitments, project feasibility, and relationship to the implementation of the Comprehensive Plan.

In addition to local projects managed and financed primarily by Kirkland, a number of regional projects are expected to be implemented during the planning period. These projects include improvements to I-405 and its interchanges as well as a regional high-capacity transit system. For this Comprehensive Plan, the high-capacity transit system is assumed to be funded and constructed within the planning period consistent with transportation plans for the adjoining cities of Bellevue and Redmond. The Kirkland Comprehensive Plan can be amended to reflect any future changes in the regional system.

IX. TRANSPORTATION

traffic which may impact intersections or streets in adjoining cities. Interlocal agreements are legally binding documents spelling out how two adjoining cities will handle mitigation of impacts in these cases.

Policy T-8.5: Cooperate with adjacent jurisdictions to develop a regional network of facilities for nonmotorized transportation.

Bicyclists and pedestrians, like vehicular traffic, have needs which cross City boundaries. The best regional nonmotorized system is one which is carefully coordinated to provide the most convenient and safe routes to major destinations.

Policy T-8.6: Strive to meet federal and State air quality standards.

Kirkland is part of the central Puget Sound region which is a federally designated non-attainment area. In order to comply with the Washington State Clean Air Conformity Act, the federal Clean Air Act, and to be consistent with the Growth Management Act and Metropolitan Transportation Plan, the City must commit to strategies to reduce pollutants. As described previously in this Element, the City is committed to creating a balanced multimodal transportation system. The emphasis on increasing travel options and reducing single-occupant vehicle use is the City's primary strategy for complying with air quality legislation. The City will also coordinate with the Puget Sound Air Pollution Control Agency as needed to address air quality issues.

Traffic Improvements (which includes transit projects). Projects are grouped under these broad categories for ease of reference.

Table CF-9 provides the following information for each transportation project listed:

- ◆ Cost;
- ◆ CIP project number (if funded in CIP);
- ◆ Source; and
- ◆ Supporting goal.

Table T-5 contains a narrative description and more information about each project. Figure T-6 is a map of the projects.

Figures T-2 and T-3 are the Potential Pedestrian System and Potential Bicycle System, respectively. The potential projects shown on these maps are also shown in Figure T-6 and listed in Table CF-9, located in the Capital Facilities Element. Figures T-2 and T-3 show both the existing and proposed system and, therefore, display the total potential nonmotorized transportation system.

Figure T-7 is a map of the existing signalized intersections. Proposed signals and signal improvements are mapped in Figure T-6 and listed in Table CF-9, located in the Capital Facilities Element.

D. TRANSPORTATION FACILITY PLAN

Tables CF-8 and CF-9, located in the Capital Facilities Plan, and Table T-5 and Figures T-2, T-3, T-6 and T-7 in this Element are interrelated. Together they comprise the overall transportation system and network for the City. Table CF-8 is a list of funded six-year transportation projects along with a financing plan and Table CF-9 is a list of all 2022 transportation projects. Table CF-9 is divided into three sections: (1) Nonmotorized; (2) Street Improvements; and (3)

, CF-8A

; Table CF-8A is a multi-year financing plan for transportation projects through 2020;

XIII. CAPITAL FACILITIES

A. INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Capital Facilities Element

The Capital Facilities Element is a six-year plan for fully funded capital improvements that supports the City's current and future population and economy. The principal criteria for identifying needed capital improvements are level of service standards (LOS). The Capital Facilities Element contains level of service standards for each public facility, and requires that new development be served by adequate facilities. The element also contains broad goals and specific policies that guide implementation of adequate public facilities.

The purpose of the Capital Facilities Element is three-fold:

- (1) To establish sound fiscal policies to guide Kirkland in planning for public facilities;
- (2) Identify facilities needed to support growth and development consistent with the policies of the Comprehensive Plan; and
- (3) Establish adopted standards for levels of service.

What is a capital facility or capital improvement project?

Capital improvements include: the construction of new facilities; the expansion, large-scale renovation, or replacement of existing facilities; and the acquisition of land or the purchase of major pieces of equipment, including major replacements funded by the equipment rental fund or those that are associated with newly acquired facilities.

A capital improvement must meet all of the following criteria:

- ◆ It is an expenditure that can be classified as a fixed asset.

- ◆ It has an estimated cost of \$50,000 or more (with the exception of land).
- ◆ It has a useful life of 10 years or more (with the exception of certain equipment which may have a short life span).

Why plan for capital facilities?

It also includes a list of transportation projects over a 12 year period in time.

MANAGEMENT

required in the Comprehensive Plan in order to:

- ◆ Provide capital facilities for land development that is envisioned or authorized by the Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan.
- ◆ Maintain the quality of life for the community by establishing and maintaining level of service standards for capital facilities.
- ◆ Coordinate and provide consistency among the many plans for capital improvements, including:
 - Other elements of the Comprehensive Plan;
 - Master plans and other studies of the local government;
 - The plans for capital facilities of State and/or regional significance;
 - The plans of other adjacent local governments; and
 - The plans of special districts.
- ◆ Ensure the timely provision of adequate facilities as required in the GMA.
- ◆ Document all capital projects and their financing.

The Capital Facilities Element is the element that guides the City in the construction of its physical improvements. By establishing levels of service as the basis for providing capital facilities and for achieving concurrency, the Element determines the quality of improvements in the community. The requirement to

XIII. CAPITAL FACILITIES

might be five acres per 1,000 population, but the current level of service may be 2.58 acres per 1,000, which is less than the desired standard.

Setting the Standards for Levels of Service

The GMA requires the Capital Facilities Plan to be based on standards for service levels that are measurable and financially feasible for the six fiscal years following adoption of the Plan.

Because the need for capital facilities is largely determined by the levels of service that are adopted, the key to influencing the Capital Facilities Element is to influence the selection of the level of service standards. Level of service standards are measures of the quality of life of the community. The standards should be based on the community's vision of its future and its values.

The needs for capital facilities are determined by comparing the inventory of existing facilities to the amount required to achieve and maintain the level of service standard. More details can be found in Appendix A, Level of Service Methodology.

Community values and desires change and evolve and funding levels fluctuate; therefore, adjustments to level of service standards will be required over time. Level of service standards may be modified depending on changing priorities. The challenge is to balance the need for reliability (i.e., development should be able to count on the timely provision of improvements) with being responsive to changing conditions.

While level of service standards are measurements of the performance of facilities, other goals and policies as well as the Vision Statement should also be considered when making decisions on capital improvement projects and facilities.

What is concurrency?

The concurrency requirement in the Growth Management Act mandates that capital facilities be coordinated with new development or redevelopment.

Kirkland's concurrency ordinance fulfills this requirement. The City has determined that roads, water and sewer facilities must be available concurrent with new development or redevelopment. This means that adequate capital facilities have to be finished and in place before, at the time, or within a reasonable time period (depending on the type of capital facility needed) following the impacts of development.

Adequate capital facilities are those facilities which have the capacity to serve the development without decreasing the adopted levels of service for the community below accepted standards.

Concurrency is determined by comparing the available capacity of road, water and sewer facilities to the capacity to be used by new development. Capacity is determined by the City's adopted LOS standards. If the available capacity is equal to or greater than the capacity to be used by new development, then concurrency is met. If the available capacity is less than the capacity to be used by new development, then concurrency is not met. Policies CF-4.3 and CF-5.2 below address what options are available to the developer and/or by the City if concurrency is not met.

Meeting concurrency requires a balancing of public and private expenditures. Private costs are generally limited to the services directly related to a particular development. The City is responsible for maintaining adequate system capacity that will meet adopted LOS standards.

Relationship to Other Elements

The Capital Facilities Plan ensures that the public facilities needed to support many of the goals and policies in the other elements are programmed for construction. Level of service standards for capital facilities are derived from the growth projections contained within the Land Use Element. The Land Use Element also calls for phasing increases in residential and commercial densities to correspond with the availability of public facilities necessary to support new growth. The Capital Facilities Element also en-

XIII. CAPITAL FACILITIES

special districts. The City should coordinate the provision of these facilities in order to ensure that the levels of service identified in the plan can be achieved.

CONCURRENCY

Goal CF-4: Ensure that water, sewer, and transportation facilities necessary to support new development are available and adequate concurrent with new development, based on the City's adopted level of service standards.

Policy CF-4.1:

Monitor the levels of service for water, sewer and transportation facilities and ensure that new development does not cause levels of service to decline below the adopted standards.

The City should evaluate the capacity needs of new development against existing or planned capacity to ensure that the adopted levels of service are maintained for water, sewer, and transportation.

Policy CF-4.2:

Ensure levels of service for water and sewer are adequate no later than occupancy and use of new development.

Water and sewer facilities are essential to public health, therefore they must be available and adequate upon first use of development.

Policy CF-4.3:

Ensure levels of service for road facilities are met no later than six years after occupancy and use of new development.

The Growth Management Act allows up to six years to achieve standards for transportation facilities because they do not threaten public health, and because they are very expensive, and are built in large "increments" (i.e., a section of road serves many users).

Concurrency is a benchmark for determining the extent to which new development must address the im-

pacts that it creates on selected facilities: water, sewer and roads. If concurrency is not met, several options (or a combination thereof) are available to meet concurrency:

- (a) Improve the public facilities to maintain the levels of service; or
- (b) Revise the proposed development to reduce impacts to maintain satisfactory levels of service; or
- (c) Phase the development to coincide with the availability of increased water, sewer, and transportation facilities.

FUNDING AND FINANCIAL FEASIBILITY

Financial feasibility is required for capital improvements by the Growth Management Act. Estimates for funding should be conservative and realistic based on the City's historical track record. Financial commitments should be bankable or bondable. Voter-approved revenue, such as bonds, may be used, but adjustments must be made if the revenue is not approved. Adjustments can include substituting a different source of revenue, reducing the level of service, and/or reducing the demand for public facilities.

In addition, facilities should not be built if the provider cannot afford to operate and maintain them or to arrange for another entity to operate and maintain the facilities.

Goal CF-5: Provide needed public facilities that are within the ability of the City to fund or within the City's authority to require others to provide.

Policy CF-5.1:

Base the ~~six-year~~ Capital Facilities Plan on conservative estimates of current local revenues and external revenues that are reasonably anticipated to be received by the City.

, Table CF8A is a multi-year financing plan for transportation projects through 2020,

FACILITIES

C. CAPITAL FACILITIES PLAN

Introduction

The following Tables CF-8 through CF-12 list the capital improvement projects for the six-year planning period for ~~transportation~~, utilities, parks, and fire. In each table, the projects are grouped into one or more of the three categories:

- ◆ Funded projects;
- ◆ Utility funded projects;
- ◆ Bond projects.

and a multi year period for transportation projects through 2020.

The cost of each capital improvement project ~~over the next six fiscal years~~ is shown. All costs are shown in current dollars – no inflation factor has been applied. Costs will be revised as part of the review and update of the Comprehensive Plan together with the Capital Improvement Program.

Most of the funded projects for transportation and utilities are needed to meet the adopted six-year LOS standards for concurrency. In addition, many of the capital improvement projects listed will meet the adopted LOS standards, eliminate existing deficiencies, make available adequate facilities for future growth, and repair or replace obsolete or worn out facilities.

Projects

FUNDED PROJECTS – TRANSPORTATION, UTILITIES, STORMWATER, PARKS, AND FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES

Tables CF-8 through CF-12 contain a list of funded capital improvements along with a financing plan. Specific funding sources and amounts of revenue are shown which will be used to pay for the proposed funded capital projects. The funding sources for the funded projects are a reflection of the policy direction within the text of this Element.

The revenue forecasts and needed capital projects are based on the Capital Improvement Program. When the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is updated, the projects within the Capital Facilities Plan should be changed to match the CIP doc, **CF-8A**.

Transportation projects are found in Tables CF-8 and CF-9. They include nonmotorized, street and traffic intersection improvements. Transportation grants require matching City funds so the City should provide the funds from the funding sources found in Policy CF-5.3.

Table CF-8 contains the six-year project list and Table CF-9 contains the 20-year project list through 2022. As priorities change and/or projects on the ~~six-year list~~ are completed, projects from the 20-year list will be moved to the ~~six-year list~~. A descriptive list of the 20-year transportation projects is found in Table T-5 and a map showing the location of the projects is found in Figure T-6 contained in the Transportation Element **Tables CF-8 and CF-8A**.

these tables

Water, sewer and surface water utility projects are found in Table CF-10.

Park projects are found in Table CF-11. Several of the park projects are funded with voter-approved bonds.

Fire protection and emergency services projects are found in Table CF-12.

APPENDIX A – LEVEL OF SERVICE METHODOLOGY

THE GROWTH MANAGEMENT ACT

The Growth Management Act (GMA) requires the Capital Facilities Element (CFE) to identify public facilities that will be needed during the six years following adoption of the Comprehensive Plan. As required by GMA, the Capital Facilities Element must include the following:

- ◆ An inventory of existing capital facilities owned by public entities, showing the location and capacities of the capital facilities.
- ◆ A forecast of future needs for such capital facilities.
- ◆ The proposed locations and capacities of expanded or new capital facilities.
- ◆ At least a six-year plan that will finance such capital facilities within projected funding capacities and clearly identifies sources of public money for such purposes.
- ◆ A requirement to reassess the Land Use Element if probable funding falls short of meeting existing needs and to ensure that the Land Use Element, Capital Facilities Plan Element, and financing plan within the Capital Facilities Plan Element are coordinated and consistent.

One of the goals of the GMA is to have capital facilities in place concurrent with development. This concept is known as **concurrency** (also called “adequate public facilities”). In Kirkland, concurrency requires:

- (1) Facilities to serve the development to be in place at the time of development (or for some types of facilities, that a financial commitment is made to provide the facilities within a specified period of time); and
- (2) Such facilities have sufficient capacity to serve development without decreasing levels of service below minimum standards adopted in the CFE.

The GMA requires concurrency for transportation facilities. GMA also requires all other public facilities to be “adequate” (see RCW 19.27.097, 36.70A.020, 36.70A.030, and 58.17.110). This is noted in Goal 12 which states:

Public facilities and services. Ensure that those public facilities and services necessary to support development are available for occupancy and use without decreasing current service levels below locally established minimum standards.

The City has an adopted CFE and development regulations to implement the plan. The development regulations provide detailed rules and procedures for implementing the requirements of the plan, including concurrency management procedures that ensure sufficient public facility capacity is available for each proposed development.

The Capital Facilities Element of the Comprehensive Plan must be updated on a regular basis. The update should occur in conjunction with review of the City’s six-year Capital Improvement Program and budget. The update should be completed before the City’s budget is adopted in order to incorporate the capital improvements from the updated CFE in the City’s annual budget.

The level of service standards adopted in this element were based on an extensive inventory of capital facilities and the forecasted need based on growth. A six-year plan is included which identifies the projects as well as the costs and funding sources. Policies within the plan ensure that there are several options to choose from if the probable funding falls short of meeting the needs.

There is also a list of transportation projects over a 12 year period in time.

I. INTRODUCTION

Table I-7 below shows the 2000 existing household units and jobs, the total number of household units and jobs by 2022 based on the assigned growth targets and the 2000 available capacity for household units

and jobs. Based on certain assumptions for the 2000 available capacity, Kirkland will be able to accommodate its assigned 2022 growth targets.

Table I-7: Comparison of Growth Targets and Available Capacity

	2000 Existing ¹	2022 Growth Targets ²	Available Capacity ³
Housing Units	21,831	27,311 (at 5,480 new households)	28,751 ← 28,800
Employment	32,384	41,184 (at 8,800 new jobs)	58,400 → 54,565

Sources:

- 2000 housing units: Office of Financial Management (OFM). “Households” are occupied units, whereas “housing units” include households (occupied) and vacant units.
2000 employment: City estimate based on existing nonresidential floor area and information about the typical number of employees/ amount of floor area for different types of nonresidential uses. By comparison, the PSRC estimated 2000 employment was 38,828. Examination of PSRC records found errors suggesting this was a significant overestimate.
- Targets for household and employment growth between 2000 and 2022 were assigned by the King Countywide Planning Policies. Targeted growth was added to the 2000 totals to establish the 2022 totals.
- City estimates ~~as of June 2004~~.

B. ABOUT THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

Why are we planning?

In 1977, Kirkland adopted a new Comprehensive Plan establishing broad goals and policies for community growth and very specific plans for each neighborhood in the City. That plan, originally called the Land Use Policy Plan, has served Kirkland well. Since its adoption, the plan has been actively used and updated to reflect changing circumstances. The previous Comprehensive Plan has contributed to a pattern and character of development that makes Kirkland a very desirable place to work, live, and play.

Kirkland and the Puget Sound region, however, have changed significantly since 1977. Since the original plan was adopted, the City has not had the opportunity to reexamine the entire plan in a thorough, systematic manner. Passage of the 1990/1991 Growth Management Act (GMA) provided such an opportunity. The GMA requires jurisdictions, including Kirkland, to

adopt plans that provide for growth and development in a manner that is internally and regionally consistent, achievable, and affordable. The 1995 and 2004 updates of the Comprehensive Plan and annual amendments reflect Kirkland’s intention to both meet the requirements of GMA as well as create a plan that reflects our best understanding of the many issues and opportunities currently facing the City.

What is a Comprehensive Plan?

The Comprehensive Plan establishes a vision, goals and policies, and implementation strategies for managing growth within the City’s Planning Area over the next 20 years (see Figure I-2). The Vision Statement in the plan is a reflection of the values of the community – how Kirkland should evolve with changing times. The goals identify more specifically the end result Kirkland is aiming for; policies address how to get there. All regulations pertaining to development (such as the Zoning Code, Subdivision Ordinance, and Shoreline Master Program) must be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The end result will be a community that has grown along the lines anticipated by the Comprehensive Plan.

VI. LAND USE

Table LU-4
Comparison of Growth Targets and Available Capacity

	2000 Existing¹	2022 Growth Targets²	Available Capacity³
Housing Units	21,831	27,311 (at 5,480 new households)	28,900 ← 28,800
Employment	32,384	41,184 (at 8,800 new jobs)	54,600 ← 58,400

Sources:

- 2000 housing units: Office of Financial Management (OFM)
2000 employment: City estimate based on existing nonresidential floor area and information about the typical number of employees/ amount of floor area for different types of nonresidential uses. By comparison, the PSRC estimated 2000 employment was 38,828. Examination of PSRC records found errors suggesting this was a significant overestimate.
- Targets for household and employment growth between 2000 and 2022 were assigned by the King County Countywide Planning Policies. Targeted growth was added to the 2000 totals to establish the 2022 totals.
- City estimates.

LAND USE/TRANSPORTATION LINKAGES

Land use/transportation linkage policies address the relationship between the land use pattern and a multi-modal transportation system. Separation of jobs and housing means longer commute trips – generally accommodated on the City’s roadways either by private automobile or transit. When shops and services are long distances from residential areas, this also translates into additional vehicle or transit trips. Allowing residential and nonresidential uses to locate in closer proximity provide transportation options making walking or bicycling more feasible.

Site design standards also impact the ability of drivers, transit riders, pedestrians, and bicyclists to get around. Policies in this section discuss the importance of considering connections and alternative transportation modes when planning new development. The special needs of industrial development are also addressed.

Goal LU-3: Provide a land use pattern that promotes mobility and access to goods and services.

Policy LU-3.1: Provide employment opportunities and shops and services within walking or bicycling distance of home.

Kirkland presently has a fairly complete network of commercial and employment centers, and many of the City’s residential neighborhoods can easily access a shopping area. This policy attempts to further strengthen the relationship between urban neighborhoods and commercial development areas.



Juanita Village as a mixed-use center